



City of Lake Charles

326 Pujo Street
P.O. Box 900
Lake Charles, LA
70602-0900

Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

Monday, September 8, 2025

5:00 PM

Council Chambers

OPEN MEETING

Chairman Reginald Weeks called the meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order at approximately 5:00pm, and requested a roll call.

Prayer: Gregory Pete

Pledge: Alvin Joseph

ROLL CALL

Present 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr., and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Absent 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill, and Gus Schram III

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Chairman Reginald Weeks asked if everyone received a copy of the minutes from the previous meeting.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Reginald Weeks asked if there are any special announcements?

Mrs. Bynum states that any person aggrieved by the decision of this Commission for a Major Conditional Use permit, Variance, or Special Exception may file a written appeal with the Director of Planning within (15) days of the decision of the commission.

COMMISSION BUSINESS

PREFNL 25-19

LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

APPLICANT: NCV PROPERTIES/PHIL VINCENT (RIVERRIDGE SUBDIVISION)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a 1.47-acre tract of land M/L into two (2) residential lots, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **4700 Riverridge Drive**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed resubdivision of a 1.47-acre tract of land into two (2) residential lots will meet the minimum lot size for subdivision development. Therefore, staff recommends approval. Any approvals are conditioned on the applicant adhere to any recommendations or infrastructure improvements set forth by the Department of Engineering and Public Works.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.

Phillip Vincent, 3718 Gray Willow Drive, Lake Charles, LA

Requesting permission to subdivide per survey, so that it can be developed.

Chairman Weeks asks if there any questions.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

MCU 25-12 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MICHAEL SHAMBLIN

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Minor Conditional Use Permit (Sec 5-203(14)(a)) in order to reconstruct a church multi-use worship center utilizing a metal building with metal façade materials, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **3626 Common Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a new church building utilizing a metal building with vertical metal siding. This is a replacement structure from hurricane damage. The previous structure utilized a brick façade. Staff's review revealed the proposed vertical metal siding does not appear to be architectural metal material and will utilize an exposed fastener system. Therefore, staff denied the MCU request.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.

Lauren Bynum states that additional documentation was supplied by applicant, a rendering that showed the material, it was sent to the Planning Commission, along with a link that showed the alternative brick material.

Michael Shamblin, 21485 Hwy 101, Iowa, LA

Presented to the staff the ten feet of Gen Stone material they would like to use. Most of the metal facade on the east end will be covered.

Gregory Pete indicates the additional documentation and asks applicant which of the two pictures provided is the option they would like to use.

Lauren Bynum states that option two doesn't need the variance, option one was what applicant stated was his preference, which is what is being submitted to the Planning Commission.

Thomas Sanders states for the record, to be clear option one is the partial brick.

Ms. Bynum confirms and adds the Building Official has reviewed the Gen Stone material and said it is an approved building material.

Chairman Weeks clarifies that option one is what will be voted on. Ms. Bynum confirms.

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any further questions.

Mr. Sanders clarifies that option one is the partial brick, ten feet high, up to the eve. Ms. Bynum confirms.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

SPC 25-10

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: ANGELICO CONSTRUCTION COMPANY, LLC

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to expand an existing non-conforming (industrial import/export facility) use by constructing a 5,000sq.ft. pre-engineered metal building warehouse, within a Light Manufacturing Zoning District. Location of the request is **604 N. Enterprise Blvd.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting a Special Exception in order to expand an existing non-conforming (industrial import/export facility) use by constructing a 5,000 sf pre-engineered metal building warehouse, within a Light Manufacturing Zoning District. The primary use for the property in within the Light Manufacturing District, however this expansion falls right outside of this and falls within a Mixed Use Zoning District of the property.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.

Hunter Burelson, 908 W Napoleon St, Sulphur, LA

Representing Angelico Construction Company.

Build a fifty by one hundred foot shop with a break room in it. The shop will be more of a storage building.

Mr. Sanders asks where the building will be located on the property.

Mr. Burelson states it is to the southeast of the driveway. When one pulls into the driveway it is to the right of the property, south of the tracks.

Mr. Sanders states there is an existing building there and a modular building south and east of it, and asks where will the new building be in relation to those buildings.

Mr. Burelson states it will be between the drive and the modular building.

Mr. Sanders asks if this building has already been constructed.

Mr. Burelson states no.

Mr. Sanders clarifies the new building will be on the south side of the tracks closer to Enterprise Blvd.

Mr. Burelson confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks if the new building is going to replace the modular building.

Mr. Burelson states no, the modular building is staying.

Mr. Sanders asks how long the modular building has been on site.

Mr. Burelson states he is unsure as it was before they became involved in this project.

Mr. Sanders asks if the applicant's company constructed the metal warehouse building that is adjacent to the modular building.

Mr. Burelson states no.

Mr. Sanders asks if the applicant knows how long it has been on site.

Mr. Burelson states no.

Chairman Weeks asks for further definition of expansion falls right outside of the light manufacturing zone.

Ms. Bynum asks that the location is brought up on the GIS map. Shows that the gray area is the Mixed Use Zoning District and the light green area is the Light Manufacturing Zoning District. The location in question falls right outside the Light Manufacturing Zone, and while it is an expansion of their use which is approved under light manufacturing, because the zoning is different the applicant had to come before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sanders asks staff what, if any, are the requirements for any facade or landscaping with respect to this structure.

Ms. Bynum states the landscaping will be across the site, it will require trees for the frontage. As far as the facade this is an accessory use to the primary operation of the building, there isn't going to be a facade material requirement.

Mr. Burelson states that on the southeast side, the road side, there will be a brick facade. Also states that it is on the plans.

Mr. Sanders asks what the height of the facade will be.

Mr. Burelson states as of now it is to the full eve of the building. He believes it is twenty feet.

Mr. Sanders asks the applicant if that is agreeable.

Mr. Burelson states yes, that is what they have drawn up.

Mr. Pete states if approved the brick facade will be used.

Mr. Burelson confirms.

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any further questions.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

SPC 25-11 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: KAREN PRIOLA

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to reduce required sixteen (16) parking spaces to fourteen (14) for four proposed duplexes, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **3715 Common Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting a Special Exception in order to reduce required sixteen (16) parking spaces to fourteen (14) for four proposed duplexes, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Staff's review revealed the proposed units are 2 bedroom and 1 bath. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward a position of support.

Special Exception 25-11 no longer needed due to approval of Variance 25-46. Parking requirements can and will be met.

SPC 25-12 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MINER ROGERS

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to reduce required forty-five (45) parking spaces to eleven (11) for proposed church facility, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is **2411 Mill Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting a Special Exception in order to reduce required forty-five (45) spaces to eleven (11) for proposed church facility, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. The proposed church is surrounded on all sides by single family residential properties. While the site previously had a church use, any overflow parking would have to be accommodated in a residential context and could be disruptive to the neighborhood. Therefore staff cannot forward a position of support.

Variance 25-47 was also read in.

Chairman Weeks asks the applicant to state name and address for the record.

Applicant not present.

Chairman Weeks asks staff if any communication was received from the applicant.

Staff states no.

Chairman Weeks asks person in opposition to state name and address for the record.

*Renee Olivier, 2415 East Mill Street, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Expressed concerns over noise disturbances, drainage onto her property, traffic and parking in front of her house. Also asks on the measurements how close is the building to her house.*

Mr. Sanders states the parking would be towards her house and is about two feet from the property line. Also asks for clarification on the drainage issue, if the previous structure flooded her carport from drainage off the roof.

Ms. Olivier states no not off the roof but from the property itself would flood her carport.

Ms. Bynum adds the property in question is in a flood zone and would have to be elevated to

meet the new requirements.

Mr. Sanders asks if the parking lot would have to be elevated or just the structure.

Ms. Bynum states the parking lot wouldn't have to be elevated just the structure.

Ms. Olivier asks about a privacy fence.

Ms. Bynum states it would be required.

Mr. Sanders states that those that are seeking the variances are not present. There are a lot of requests and he cannot support these. The drawing shows a sanctuary with one hundred and eighty six seats and only eleven parking spaces.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion failed by the following vote:

For: 0

Against: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

VAR 25-42 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: KPPM RADIO

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to deviate from required exterior materials for new construction of a radio station within the Nellie Lutcher Overlay District, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **413 Enterprise Blvd.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews reveal the applicant is requesting to deviate from required exterior materials for new construction of a radio station within the Nellie Lutcher Overlay District. Per code: Building facades shall be brick or stone and the façade material must turn the corner of the building a distance of no less than 12'. Applicant previously obtained a variance, VAR 24-64, for an increased front setback. Staff could find no evidence of hardship; therefore cannot forward a position of support.

Deferred per applicant's request.

VAR 25-43 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JOE B. STOMA/S & S CRAWFISH

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to eliminate the required permanently installed buffer fence around dumpster, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **2604 Lake Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews reveal the applicant is requesting a variance in order to eliminate the required permanently installed buffer fence around the dumpster area. While this is a seasonal business, it is a permanent use on the property year round. Staff can find no evidence of hardship and therefore cannot forward a position of support.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.

*Matthew Gilby, 7730 North Lakeside Drive, Beaumont, TX
Representing S&S Crawfish/Joe Stoma*

Had a question about the findings stating it was a permanent use. States the dumpster is only there when the business is in operation. From the middle of March to the first part of July. The dumpster is not there now and it is not there less than seventy five percent of the time.

Ms. Bynum states the business itself is viewed as the permanent use on the site. It is the primary and permanent use on the site, even though the business is seasonal the building is there. Even though the dumpster comes in and out, when it is there the requirements are still needing to be met. It is a permanent use on the site.

Mr. Gilby states they currently have six parking spots and when all the employees are there, there are about ten to eleven of them on site. One of the parking spots is used to temporarily house the dumpster, which is there twenty five percent of the time. If it required to put the fence up it will encroach on another parking space, and will limit the parking even more. They are already double stacking cars. They are asking for the variance to have the dumpster there without the fence. States they have met all other requirements. Asks to be treated fairly and equally compared to other places on Lake Street that don't have their dumpsters screened. States their dumpster is only there twenty five percent of the time. It is a small dumpster, less than four yards.

Mr. Sanders states in the rear most portion of the property, there is an area that is carved out and is not paved. Asks what would prohibit them from paving that and gaining three or four parking spaces.

Mr. Gilby states he thinks there is a water line that also runs there and believes there was a requirement that they had to have so much green space when they went through the initial planning.

Mr. Sanders asks if the water line has something to do with drainage or is a supply water line.

Mr. Gilby states he doesn't know. There is a water line that comes up in the grassy area that is required for hosing down the dumpster.

Chairman Weeks states they could call 811 and they will flag it, seems like paving it would help some of the problem.

Mr. Gilby states he understands the point, but it is their position that the dumpster is there less than twenty five percent of the time, it is an expense they do not want to incur in order to house a temporary dumpster.

Chairman Weeks states they are not incurring the expense now if the dumpster is being removed.

Mr. Gilby states if they paved it over it would incur more money.

Chairman Weeks states he was talking about the dumpster.

Mr. Gilby states that it is correct that they are not incurring an expense for the dumpster when it has been removed.

Mr. Pete states what he understands that the business is open from March to June.

Mr. Gilby states they open around March 15th and they close around the end of June.

Mr. Pete states the dumpster is there when the business is open. Mr. Gilby confirms. Mr. Pete states it is there when the business is open and when the business is closed the dumpster is removed. Mr. Gilby confirms. Mr. Pete states the dumpster is there one hundred percent of the time while the business is open. Mr. Gilby confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks if they can make another arrangement for the trash to be retrieved.

Mr. Gilby states they had looked into doing cans, doesn't feel they are sufficient relative to the size of the dumpster. Republic Waste comes onsite to dump the dumpster whereas the cans would have to be put out by the street.

Mr. Sanders states he is at a loss as to how they lose a parking space if they put a fence around the dumpster.

Mr. Gilby states the dumpster is there and if they put a fence around it they would have to create a little bit of a buffer around it, about two feet. If there are six parking spots, considers where the dumpster is to be spot four, and it would then encroach on spot five.

Mr. Pete states then they lose two parking spots. Mr. Gilby confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks the applicant how many times they have been before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Gilby states he thinks about three, this is the third time.

Mr. Sanders asks staff if it would be a problem if they graveled over the grassy area in the rear.

Ms. Bynum states no.

Chairman Weeks states with the gravel area it would free the parking space and it could be appropriately fenced.

Ms. Bynum states if it is in the rear of the building and only those couple of spots that would be acceptable.

Mr. Gilby states he understands the position and understands the request, they are asking for the variance to leave it where it is so they don't incur the cost of putting up a fence and graveling it over for twenty five percent of the year.

Mr. Sanders asks what the cost would be to fence in the dumpster.

Mr. Gilby states he doesn't know, it would have to have a gate, it would be several thousand dollars he imagines. They have a quote but it is a few thousand dollars.

Chairman Weeks states it would be a one time expense and then they would be good to go. If they are willing to go that route Chairman Weeks could amend the variance or it can be voted on as is.

Mr. Gilby states they don't want to do that.

Chairman Weeks asks they don't want to move it to the grassy area and fence it. Mr. Gilby confirms that is not what they want to do.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion failed by the following vote:

For: 0

Against: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

VAR 25-44 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: KALE C. CRAIN

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct four duplex dwelling units (8 units total) 1) maintaining an existing driveway encroaching required 15' bufferyard along east property line and 2) constructing a driveway less than 150 ft from the nearest intersecting street, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southeast corner East Street @ Bilbo Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews reveal the applicant is requesting variances in order to construct 4 duplex dwelling units and 1) maintain an existing driveway encroaching the required 15' bufferyard along the East property line and 2) construct a driveway less than 150 ft from the nearest intersecting street, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Staff's review revealed the property is bordered to the North, East, South by Residential properties and to the West by commercial property. If approved the applicant will be required to construct a 6' wood privacy fence on the East and South property lines. The property will also be required to meet all the landscape standards outlined in the zoning ordinance. Staff has a minor conditional use permit under review for the density.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.

Kale Crain, 413 East Street, Lake Charles, LA

David Minton, 2000 Lake Street, Lake Charles, LA

Mr. Minton states his company Cypress Engineering was hired to handle the site plan/layout. To the south is an eight unit residential duplex, it is basically a copy of what is being proposed here, just to clarify what the surroundings are. One of the variance requests is for the Northeast driveway, it is an existing driveway and they are asking to reuse it in its current position, rather than destroy it and pour a new driveway four feet to the west. The second variance request is because it is a corner lot, the exit to the left (indicating the picture being shown) that access location is supposed to be the furthest possible point but from a lot layout and location it would not have been a good use of the property to have the access on the south side and the units to the north closer to East Street. They are trying to keep the units further away from the roadways themselves. By putting it where they did they moved it as far south as possible and left a pretty sizable green space up on the corner.

Mr. Sanders asks why was it not advisable to locate the units closer and access them on the south side.

Mr. Minton states if you think about flipping the site that would put the rear or the backyards of those lots against the road itself, which is typically not an advisable situation.

Mr. Sanders states or they could have them like the structures that are immediately to the east, like cottages and they face the road.

Mr. Minton states with that scenario they would not have been able to have the loop around and the necessary parking spaces. Thinks that the Minor Condition Use for the density, the density allowed is 7.4 units and the minor is to round up to eight units. If they would have tried to wrap it around the structures there is not enough room to handle putting a drive to loop around the structures rather than be a turn around.

Mr. Sanders states the structures immediately to the south, they don't have a loop around they have entry and exit.

Mr. Minton confirms.

Mr. Sanders states it could be done on this one if they were pushed to the North.

Mr. Minton states they could but they felt it was a better use of the land to leave a larger green space closer to the intersection than to try to push the structures themselves closer to the intersection.

Mr. Sanders states Mr. Minton stated that if they had the entry and the parking to the South and the structures to the North that he would lose parking spaces.

Mr. Minton states they would lose the ability to have the driveway loop around.

Mr. Sanders states they would lose that but they wouldn't lose any parking.

Mr. Minton states he didn't state they would lose parking he stated they would lose the loop around.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion failed by the following vote:

For: 2 - Alvin Joseph and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 2 - Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

VAR 25-46 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: KAREN PRIOLA

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct four duplex dwelling units (8 units total) with 1) reduce required 25' front setback to 20' and 2) reduce required 15' bufferyards along north and south property lines to 8', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **3715 Common Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews reveal the applicant is requesting variances in order to construct four duplex dwelling units (8 units total) with 1) reduce required 25' front setback to 20' and 2) reduce required 15' bufferyards along north and south property lines to 8', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. The proposed property is bordered by what appears to be single family residential to the North and South, vacant property to the East, and commercial property to the West. While there are several examples of multi unit residential projects in the immediate area, staff could find no evidence of hardship for the listed variance, therefore cannot forward a position of support.

Variance 25-46 was read in with Special Exception 25-11.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.

Karen Priola, 19413 Hwy 90, Iowa, LA

South on Common Street there are duplexes that are the same layout that they are wanting to do at the location in question. Wanting to mimic what is already there.

Mr. Sanders asked if the other development required a variance for lot line or for parking.

Ms. Priola states she is unsure of any previous variances.

Mr. Sanders so the layout would be the same.

Ms. Priola states the other development is also eight feet off of the property line. Believes the parking spots for the other development are less as well. Indicates location of other development on the GIS map. For the parking, if we are allowed the variance for the setbacks there will be room to do a parking spot in front of the two duplexes that face each other.

Mr. Sanders asks if the parking would be parallel to the buildings.

Ms. Priola confirms. Two additional parking spaces, one in front of building one and one in front of building two. That would bring her to the required sixteen parking spots.

Ms. Bynum states the special exception wouldn't be necessary if the sixteen parking spots are met.

Mr. Pete moves to amend variance 25-46 to add the two additional parking spots in front of the building.

Mr. Sanders seconds the amendment.

Vote on the amendment: four in favor. Amendment approved.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote as amended.

Special Exception 25-11 is no longer needed due to approval of variance as amended.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

VAR 25-47

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MINER ROGERS

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting to construct a new church facility with the following Variances (Sec. 24-4-205): 1) construct church on tract less than required one acre; 2) reduce required 55' front setback to 20'; 3) reduce required 15' rear bufferyard to 9' 6 7/8" and setback from 10' to 9' 6 7/8"; 4) reduce required 15' west side bufferyard to 5' and setback from 10' to 5'; 5) reduce required 15' east side bufferyard to 2' 0 3/4"; 6) reduction of landscape requirements, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is **2411 Mill Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews reveal the applicant is requesting variances in to construct a new church facility with the following Variances (Sec. 24-4-205): 1) construct church on tract less than required one acre; 2) reduce required 55' front setback to 20'; 3) reduce required 15' rear bufferyard to 9' 6 7/8" and setback from 10' to 9' 6 7/8"; 4) reduce required 15' west side bufferyard to 5' and setback from 10' to 5'; 5) reduce required 15' east side bufferyard to 2' 0 3/4"; 6) reduction of landscape requirements, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. The proposed church is surrounded on all sides by single family residential properties. While the site previously had a church use, staff can find no evidence of hardship for variances listed, therefore cannot forward a position of support.

Variance 25-47 was read in on Special Exception 25-12.

Chairman Weeks asks the applicant to state name and address for the record.

Applicant not present.

Chairman Weeks asks staff if any communication was received from the applicant.

Staff states no.

Chairman Weeks asks person in opposition to state name and address for the record.

*Renee Olivier, 2415 East Mill Street, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Expressed concerns over noise disturbances, drainage onto her property, traffic and parking in front of her house. Also asks on the measurements how close is the building to her house.*

Mr. Sanders states the parking would be towards her house and is about two feet from the property line. Also asks for clarification on the drainage issue, if the previous structure flooded her carport from drainage off the roof.

Ms. Olivier states no not off the roof but from the property itself would flood her carport.

Ms. Bynum adds the property in question is in a flood zone and would have to elevated to meet the new requirements.

Mr. Sanders asks if the parking lot would have to be elevated or just the structure.

Ms. Bynum states the parking lot wouldn't have to elevated just the structure.

Ms. Olivier asks about a privacy fence.

Ms. Bynum states it would be required.

Mr. Sanders states that those that are seeking the variances are not present. There are a lot of requests and he cannot support these. The drawing shows a sanctuary with one hundred and eighty six seats and only eleven parking spaces.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion failed by the following vote:

For: 0

Against: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

VAR 25-48 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: BRIDGET EVANS, ARCHITECT

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting to construct a new church facility with the following Variances (Sec. 24-4-205): 1) to construct a new curb cut into a proposed parking lot less than the required 150ft. from the nearest intersecting street and 2) to reduce required 15' front bufferyard to 12', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **4855 Ihles Road**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews reveal the applicant is requesting variances in to 1) to construct a new curb cut into a proposed parking lot less than the required 150ft. from the nearest intersecting street and 2) to reduce required 15' front bufferyard to 12', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. The proposed property is bordered by commercial properties to the North, South, and West by commercial properties and to the East by a multifamily development. Due to access management concerns a curb cut onto Ihles Road is discouraged, therefore both curb cuts are accessing Petite Rue. Staff finds this variance reasonable and acceptable for passage.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.

Mr. Sanders states a correction: The item read in said to construct a new church facility but this is for a pharmacy not a church facility.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

*Bridget Evans, 702 Dr. Michael Debakey Drive, Lake Charles, LA
Architect for the project. To construct a new, just over five thousand square feet, tenant building business occupancy with a pharmacy. The first variance is for a curb cut, a curb cut onto Ihles Road was discouraged, it worked out better to put both curb cuts off of Petite Rue. The adjacent property is the same use and does the same thing so they thought it was appropriate for the area. The second variance is to reduce the set back to twelve feet rather than the required fifteen feet. The neighbor to the North is also a business occupancy and they are a little further out than that so they are set back a little further than they are and they felt that was also in keeping and a little bit friendlier to the neighborhood. There is a multi use, multi family development directly behind this property and they wanted to avoid being right up on their back fence as they already don't have much of a backyard. That is how they positioned the site.*

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any questions.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 4 - Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

Against: 0

Absent: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

MEETING ADJOURNED.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Reginald Weeks, Chairman
Lake Charles Planning and Zoning Commission

Lauren Bynum, Asst. Director
Office of Zoning & Land Use