



City of Lake Charles

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

Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

Monday, October 13, 2025

5:00 PM

Council Chambers

OPEN MEETING

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

Prayer: Alvin Joseph

Pledge: David Berryhill

ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asked if everyone received a copy of the minutes from the previous meeting.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chairman Gus Schram 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

REZONE-MA CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

J-VAR 25-05 **APPLICANT:** TELCOM RENTALS

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting to amend the official zoning map (Sec. 24-5-207) from a Residential Zoning District to a Business Zoning District in companion with a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 24-4-207(4)(b)) in order to construct a warehouse use with Variances to 1) eliminate required 15' bufferyard along north property line; and 2) allow use on local street vs. required location adjacent to and has access to an arterial or collector street. Location of the request is **629-633 N. Colletta Street and 624-628 Armstrong Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to amend the official zoning map from a Residential Zoning District to a Business Zoning District in companion with a Major Conditional Use Permit in order to construct a warehouse use with Variances to 1) eliminate required 15' bufferyard along

north property line; and 2) allow use on local street vs. required location adjacent to and has access to an arterial or collector street. Staff's review revealed the property is bordered to the North and East by residential properties, to the West by commercial properties and to the South by vacant property. The properties to the South and West are zoned Business.

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asked the applicant to state name and address for the record.

*Perry Vincent, 701 Martin Luther King Hwy, Resides in Westlake
Representing Telcom Properties*

Points out the properties he owns in the area around the property in question. Trying to clean up the area. Warehouse will be on 629-633 N. Colletta, business is growing. No intentions to do anything with 624-628 Armstrong at this time. Handles a lot of in and out business and needs more warehouse space. The goal in the next ten years is to buy up the remaining surrounding properties, keep the riff-raff out and putting up a nice fence. Wants to be a good neighbor and expand his business at the same time.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if this application is covering four lots.

Mr. Vincent confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks the applicant why not put the warehouse on the property he already owns to the east of the parking area.

Mr. Vincent states he does not own that piece.

Mr. Joseph asks why he would want to expand his business in a bad part of town.

Mr. Vincent states they have been there for about forty years and the area is getting better. It is not as bad as it was.

Mr. McBride asks if the applicant has any business development plans for the two lots fronting on Armstrong.

Mr. Vincent states no.

Mr. McBride states the rezoning request for those two parcels has no impact on their current use.

Mr. Vincent states it would allow him to push the fence on the left side back if he needed a little extra space.

Mr. McBride states his concerns is in the future development of that property might require access off of Armstrong Street and it would be a traffic problem.

Mr. Vincent states he understands Mr. McBride's point and he will abide by any restrictions given.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if he would be willing to considering dropping the two lots (facing Armstrong) from the request and if he would ever want to make them commercial in the future he could come back with another request.

Mr. Vincent states yes. Does not have any intentions to do anything with them, he bought them to keep someone else from coming in.

Mr. Sanders asks if the two lots (facing Armstrong) are to remain residential, does it effect any of the setbacks.

Ms. Bynum states the applicant is asking for a bufferyard reduction so it would be a bufferyard reduction on all sides.

Mr. Schram asks if that could be part of the amendment.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Mr. McBride proposes to amend the application to include only 629-633 N. Colletta together with the necessary bufferyard reductions for the building.

Mr. Joseph seconds the amendment.

Vote on the amendment 5-0, amendment approved.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote as amended.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote as amended for council consideration. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**MAJ-VAR
25-08**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: DARBY GUILLORY

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 24-5-301(3)(b)(i)) in order to construct a drive thru restaurant use with a building sf size variance, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **509-513 W. College Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a 3,000sf vs max allowed 2500sf drive thru restaurant with additional indoor limited seating. The application meets all other development standards including drive thru stacking requirements, parking, and bufferyards. Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition they obtain DOTD approval for access permits to College Street (State Roadway); screen all waste disposal areas from public view; and landscape according to Sec 5-210 of the zoning code. This project was previously approved in 2023, case MAJ/VAR 23-25, but failed to obtain permits within the year.

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

*Darby Guillory, 6934 Silver Lane
States last year it took a long time to get everything done with DOTD for the drainage.
Asking for a renewal to get going, everything has been squared away with DOTD.*

Mr. McBride asks applicant if everything will be cooked on site.

Mr. Guillory states yes.

Mr. Sanders asks if there is sufficient parking.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**MAJ-VAR
25-09**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: LASHAWNA EASTON & JAMES EASTON

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Major Planned Development in order to construct four (4) duplex dwelling units (total of 8 units) and ten (10) single-family units with Variances (Sec. 24-4--206) for 1) a bufferyard reduction of 5' vs. required 15' along West property line and 2) 20' front setback vs. required 30' 3) utilizing a continuous curbcut parking configuration that prohibits cars entering and exiting in a forward manner, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southside 2700 Blk. Lynn Street thru to Poe Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting a Major Planned Development in order to construct four (4) duplex dwelling units (total of 8 units) and ten (10) single-family units with Variances for 1) a bufferyard reduction of 5' vs. required 15' along West property line and 2) 20' front setback vs. required 30' 3) utilizing a continuous curbcut parking configuration that prohibits cars entering and exiting in a forward manner. If approved this proposal must meet all other development standards including but not limited to landscape according to Sec 5-210 of the zoning code.

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

James Easton 1724 9th St, and LaShawna Easton, 3904 Laredo Circle, Lake Charles, LA Started the project about three years ago with the rental restoration development project that came to the area right after the hurricane. There were a lot of delays and setbacks trying to get approval for different things and didn't realize that after a year that they would have to come back and get re-approval. A few minor things were redone/changed on the site plan. The previous request asked for more duplexes and those have been reduced to four duplexes and which allowed the plan to accommodate more single units. Thought of the community for the new development.

Vice Chairman Schram asks the applicant if some of the property is in a flood zone.

Ms. Easton indicates the GIS map and points out the portion that is in the flood zone. Also indicates the areas that have secured funding and that is where they will start. The City also just repaved the road, so it also adds to the development of the area. Feels it is important for local citizens to reinvest community to give back and not just depend on

the Administration and City Officials.

Mr. McBride asks about the two properties that have the flood zone intrusion, can they be built on.

Mr. Easton states yes, it has to be properly elevated.

Mr. McBride asks how much elevation is needed.

Mr. Easton states he thinks it is about three feet.

Ms. Easton states they have also checked with the City for the sewer and planning and everything was good on that end.

Mr. Sanders asks staff what the general landscaping requirements will be.

Ms. Bynum states for residential properties it is two trees per unit. While this is a multi-family development it is presenting as residential and will be treated as such.

Mr. Sanders asks where the two trees will go.

Ms. Bynum states only one tree is required in the front and the other can be in the back. The boxes shown (on the site plan) are not the actual footprints, there was a bufferyard requirement as well. There was a pre-development meeting and staff went through the requirements with them then.

Vice Chairman Schram states typically when there are all the driveways backing out into the street that is a red flag because it can be a traffic hazard, but in this case the roads are fairly low in traffic, so no red flags.

Mr. Sanders asks if the structures will have any kind of carport or garages.

Ms. Easton states no.

Mr. Sanders asks what is the depth of the parking.

Ms. Bynum states there is enough room for the two cars per unit. A finer grain review will be done as each unit gets permitted and staff will ensure that the requirements are met at each unit.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if all of the units will be rental units.

Mr. Easton confirms.

Ms. Bynum states the property will not be subdivided.

Vice Chairman Schram asks applicants if they intend to build sidewalks.

Mr. Easton states if it is required then they would have to. Ms. Easton states it is not in the plans.

Vice Chairman Schram asks staff if sidewalks are a normal requirement.

Ms. Bynum states that staff will talk to Engineering and see but they didn't bring it up in

the meeting. If it was a neighborhood development sidewalks would be required but the way this is viewed, even though it is presenting as residential units they are not subdivided, so they are not individual lots, so it was approached as a multi-family complex.

Mr. Sanders states he sees a proposal of a private road in the curve between Poe St. and Walker St. to access the units further to the east. Asks if trash (pick up) will be able to access that road.

Ms. Bynum states no, it is a private road. The units will have to bring the trash cans to the street. It is still up for negotiation and a conversation with Engineering to get use of the right of way.

Mr. Sanders states the trash truck runs on Poe, Walker and Lynn streets so the units will have to bring the cans to the road.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Mr. Schram states to clarify that this would be a private drive which appears to be built in a city right of way, and that it would be permission to build it there, with the understanding that no trash trucks will be going in there.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

SPC 25-13 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JONATHAN AUCOIN

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to replace a sign cabinet on an existing non-conforming pole sign, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **4737 Common Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to replace a non-conforming sign cabinet (sign face) with the same sq. footage on existing sign. The new sign requirements only allow a monument type sign structure for damaged or new on-site signage within the city. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward a position of support.

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

Jonathan Aucoin, 4737 Common St., Lake Charles

The sign was damaged during Hurricane Laura. It took a long time to fight with the insurance company and the landlord and by then the sign ordinance for the City had changed. The pole is expensive, goes eight feet into the ground, very big around, had to

get it engineer approved after Hurricane Rita, and would like to keep the pole, taken down the digital part and replace the sign with the same size sign.

Vice Chairman Schram asks applicant if he has discussed the new sign ordinance with staff.

Mr. Aucoin states yes.

Mr. McBride asks if the sign will be an electronic sign. Internally lit.

Mr. Aucoin states no, just a two faced sign with some lights on the pole that will come on at night to shine on the sign.

Mr. McBride asks staff if there any restrictions for internally lit vs. externally lit signs.

Ms. Bynum states not for this location.

Vice Chairman Schram states the application is clear in the ask of keeping the pole and replacing the sign.

Mr. Aucoin states yes, the sign is the last thing to be replaced.

Vice Chairman Schram states the sign will be externally lit.

Mr. Aucoin confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

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.

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

Cullen Washington, 2127 Veto St, Lake Charles, LA

States he spoke to City Councilman Donald Fondel and was told that the approved materials list may be changing to include materials such as stucco and hardy board.

Vice Chairman Schram asks applicant if he wants the Planning Commission to vote on this tonight.

Mr. Washington confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram asks applicant out of the materials he just mentioned what would he like to do.

Mr. Washington states hardy board or stucco would be more feasible.

Vice Chairman Schram asks Ms. Bynum about the City Council possibly considering adding stucco to the material list for the district.

Ms. Bynum confirms, and states that doesn't mean the City Council can't open the door for more materials, but the ask and what was discussed was stucco.

Vice Chairman Schram asks applicant if stucco would be desirable, if that is what City Council approves.

Mr. Washington states he could go with that.

Vice Chairman Schram states that it would be appropriate to have an approval contingent on what the City Council decides.

Ms. Bynum confirms that could be done or it could be amended. It could be amended to allow for that material or it can be contingent on what the City Council decides.

Mr. Sanders asks the applicant if the stucco were to be installed on the front of the building facing Enterprise Blvd., would the stucco extend from the porch floor to the eve or to the peak of the roof of the building.

Mr. Washington states from the walkway to the peak of the roof.

Mr. Sanders states for clarification if the material used is stucco or hardy board the whole front of the building would be covered.

Mr. Washington confirms.

Ms. Bynum states to be clear what is required is from the ground to the top and then wrap the sides twelve feet.

Mr. Washington states he has a problem with that twelve feet, and asks does that mean twelve feet long and twelve feet high or just twelve feet long.

Ms. Bynum states it would be twelve feet long and the entire height of the building.

Mr. Washington states his problem is that he has forty feet on both sides but no brick or stucco and that will look bad for his building. Doesn't have a problem with going twelve feet long but going twelve feet high will look bad.

Mr. Sanders suggests using stucco the whole way.

Mr. Washington states no. States he feels it would look better to do the whole front and leave the sides alone. States there are other businesses that have done that.

Vice Chairman Schram states the Planning Commission is not considering other businesses. Also states that this needs something specifically stated for this request. For purpose of discussion would offer an amendment subject to what the City Council may approve. That one of those materials would be used on the entire front and at least twelve feet down each side.

Mr. Sanders states with the understanding with whatever material is approved by the City Council that from the floor to the peak of the entire front of the building...

Mr. Washington interrupts stating his opposition to the wrapping of the sides, doesn't mind going twelve long but twelve feet long and to the top it is going to look bad.

Mr. McBride states he feels like the Planning Commission is trying to help by offering solutions, in fact City Council is basically considering the request.

Mr. Washington continues to state his opposition to the wrapping of the sides.

Mr. McBride explains the Planning Commission is tied to the rules as they are, which calls for a twelve foot wrap around that goes to the top of that building and as he understands that is the amendment that is being proposed and he feels that he could support that.

Mr. Washington states that he is confused as he thought it was just twelve feet long.

Mr. McBride clarifies it is twelve feet long and to the top and that are the rules as of today.

Mr. Washington states that he will do the whole front of the building.

Mr. McBride addresses Mr. Washington stating that if approved he will also have to do the twelve feet down each side as well.

Mr. Washington continues to state his opposition to the wrapping of the sides.

Mr. McBride states perhaps it is not appropriate to approve this if Mr. Washington is not going to do it anyhow.

Mr. Washington continues to state his opposition to the wrapping of the sides.

Mr. McBride addresses the Chairman stating he finds it difficult to support this amendment or the approval when the proponent seems unwilling to conform to the rules.

Vice Chairman Schram points out that the compliance officer is present and listening to all of this. If something is approved and it is not followed he will be watching what takes place.

Mr. Washington continues to state his opposition to the wrapping of the sides.

Mr. Berryhill states that Mr. Washington has made his argument and that is where it has

to stop.

Vice Chairman Schram restates the amendment as contingent on the City Council's decision, in an upcoming meeting, allow one of the materials approved to be on the entire front facade up to the peak and around the sides twelve feet in length and the full height of the building.

Mr. Berryhill seconds the amendment.

Vote on the amendment, 5-0 approved.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote as amended.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-45 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: GUL AWAN

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct a new driveway (curb cut) into a proposed parking lot less than 50ft. from the nearest intersecting street vs. the minimum 150ft., within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **4200 Ryan Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a new driveway (curb cut) into a proposed parking lot less than 50ft. from the nearest intersecting street vs. the minimum 150ft., within a Business Zoning District. Staff's review revealed Ryan Street is a DOTD regulated route and access directly onto Ryan Street is discouraged for access management and safety reasons. Additionally, the Seed Center entrance is not a city street and therefore we do not regulate the curb cut. Staff finds this request reasonable and acceptable for passage.

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

Gul Awan, 4200 Ryan St, Lake Charles, LA

DOTD discouraged Ryan Street access, asking for a second curb cut off of Orchid Street.

Vice Chairman Schram indicated the site plan showing a driveway over to the SEED center, and asks if it has been worked out or is it something that the applicant would like to do.

Mr. Awan states they have requested it but has not received an answer yet.

Mr. Sanders states that part is still in progress.

Mr. Awan confirms.

Mr. Sanders states if the SEED Center does not grant access then the only two accesses or drives will be off of Orchid Drive.

Mr. Awan confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-49 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JEFF KUDLA, AIA

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct a covered canopy addition 19' from front property line vs. required 50' front setback, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **4020 Hodges Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a covered canopy addition for pickups and drop offs 19' from front property line vs. 50' front setback required for a church use, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward a position of support.

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

Jeff Kudla, 429 Kirby St, Lake Charles, LA

An old building that was damaged by the hurricanes and the congregation is looking to do a modernization of the existing sanctuary and as part of that they have asked to have a covered drop off area at the building. Wanting to maintain the design integrity, the canopy will be a flat plane about a foot thick and aligning it with the geometry of the windows. It is incongruent to try to place this canopy anywhere else but on the front of it.

Mr. McBride asked if there couldn't have been a covered walkway from the existing parking lot to the building.

Mr. Kudla states the congregation requested, due to their aging and status in life as well as general fellowship, that it should be in front of the church. For example for funerals, weddings and other events the natural procession is to have this function at the front door.

Mr. McBride asks applicant if he feels this is the best solution to what the congregation wants.

Mr. Kudla confirms, stating it was a tricky problem.

Mr. McBride asks how high will the canopy be.

Mr. Kudla states about twelve feet.

Vice Chairman Schram states it is a unique building.

Mr. Sanders asks where they are going to relocate the sign to.

Mr. Kudla states they have enough room so the sign will stay where it is.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

Ms. Bynum states for the record there is still a quorum but Alvin Joseph has left the meeting.

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

For: 4 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Alvin Joseph and Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-50 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: FLOYD W. VASSUER

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to maintain an existing unpermitted ground sign vs. required monument style sign and allow setback of 0' from front property line vs. required minimum 10', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **2603 Common Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to maintain an existing unpermitted ground sign vs. required monument style sign and allow setback of 0' from front property line vs. required minimum 10', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward a position of support.

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

*Floyd Vasseur, 814 Topsy Rd, Lake Charles, LA
Bought the place in 2014, it had an existing sign, hurricane Laura destroyed it, rebuilt the sign then last year a tornado destroyed the sign again. Rebuilt it and admits he didn't get a permit at the time, but he just put his signs back up. The sign has always been there, exactly in the same spot, and it does encroach a little bit.*

Vice Chairman Schram states when it is stated that it encroaches asks if that is into the right of way into the road.

Mr. Vasseur states it is his understanding that the sign itself is a few inches into the right of way. It is several feet off of the sidewalk and road. Until he had it surveyed he had no idea where the property lines were.

Mr. McBride asks Ms. Bynum if there any consequences of the sign encroaching onto the city's right of way.

Ms. Bynum states it was such a small amount and it was there before, if ever our Engineering team or Public Works needs them to move it the applicant will have to

replace it at their own expense.

Mr. Vasseur states if he ever has to take it down, he will take it down.

Vice Chairman Schram reads a card.

Sean Solomon, 2605 Common Street, that does not wish to speak. In support. States the sign is fine and is better than one before.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

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

For: 4 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Alvin Joseph and Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-51 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MATTHEW WALKER

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct a new retail business 22' from front property line vs. required 25' front setback along collector route, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Northeast corner Common Street @ 18th Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a new retail business 22' from front property line vs. required 25' front setback along collector route, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Because this proposal is fronting an arterial/collector it requires an additional 5' setback. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward a position of support.

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

Matthew Walker, 8072 Miles Rd, Lake Charles, LA

The idea is to build a retail boudin sausage kitchen, designed in a way that could eventually grow to a wholesale business, there is limited parking but to get the profit needed this proposal is what will work.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if all the processing and preparation would happen at this site.

Mr. Walker confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if the applicant is saying he would sell wholesale.

Mr. Walker states he would start out as retail and down the road would like to move to a wholesale being able to supply restaurants primarily. The initial idea is to have a walk up window with very minimal items, boudin and sausage. With the limited parking wants to be able to get people in and out without having to wait and that way he can move product.

Mr. Sanders asks if all the products will be created on site.

Mr. Walker confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks if the applicant is going to smoke anything.

Mr. Walker confirms, and indicates the site plan where the building forms an L, the bottom of the L will be a covered area where the smokers will be.

Mr. Sanders states there is no parking on the Common Street side.

Mr. Walker confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram recognizes a card.

Sean Solomon, 2605 Common Street, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition, doesn't want to speak.

Concerns over fence between the two properties and concerns about the placement of the dumpster and grease trap.

Vice Chairman Schram states to address the first concern, assuming there are residential properties surrounding and the difference in uses requires there to be a privacy fence.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Vice Chairman asks about the placement of the dumpster and grease trap.

Mr. Walker states he got with City Planning and according to the setbacks and the requirements it was fit into the parking lot according to code.

Mr. Solomon asks to speak.

Vice Chairman Schram asks Mr. Solomon to come up.

Sean Solomon, 2005 Rose Street

States he does have a fence around the back of his property but the front part is what he is concerned about. There is very limited parking so he does not want the applicant's customers blocking his customers.

Mr. Walker states he intends to have his parking coming in off of 18th Street.

Mr. Solomon states he knows that the applicant has good intentions but people are going to do what they want to do. Would like to know if there will be a fence that will continue from his fence.

Mr. Walker states he doesn't have a problem doing that.

Mr. Solomon asks about the dumpster placement and if the applicant is going to have grease traps.

Mr. Walker states he will have a grease trap.

Mr. Solomon states he doesn't want anything leaking onto his property that would cause rats. Other than that he states he doesn't have a problem.

Mr. Walker states he doesn't want rats either, it is a very small property and will do everything he can to mitigate that.

Ms. Bynum states that no fence is required in between commercial properties.

Mr. Solomon reiterates his concern over fencing and parking.

Ms. Bynum states there will be no parking along Common Street. All of the parking will be behind the building.

Vice Chairman stipulates that the parties can meet up some time after this and discuss the fencing.

Mr. Walker states he wants to work with the people that are around his business and putting up a little fence is not a big deal.

Mr. Sanders states the property to the east is residential and there will need to be a fence there.

Ms. Bynum confirms and states if the parties do decide to put a fence between the commercial properties they will need to come to talk to the office first because there are stipulations on fences that come in front of a business that is on a collector or arterial street.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote.

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

For: 4 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Alvin Joseph and Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-53 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JUSTIN GRANGER

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct a new single-family dwelling unit with a street side setback of 8' 2 ½" vs. required 15' street side setback, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **744 Magazine Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a new single-family dwelling unit with a street side setback of 8' 2 ½" vs. required 15' street side setback, within a Residential Zoning District. The proposed plans showed the garage access from Magazine Street and not from the reduced side setback side of the property. Staff can find no evidence of hardship and therefore cannot forward a position of support.

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

Justin Granger, 744 Magazine Street, Lake Charles, LA

After the hurricane there was a home there, it has been torn down, since then it had just been vacant property. Applicant purchased the property about a year ago, picked a house plan, put it on the lot and applied for the permit. Was not aware that the side setback has to be fifteen feet, didn't realize it was different because of the street side. He was made aware of the fifteen foot setback and that he needed to apply for the

variance. Currently there is a thirteen foot easement from the curb to the property line so if approved that would be a little over twenty-one feet from the curb, where as the required setback with the easement would be at twenty-eight feet. Does plan on putting a privacy fence along the street side, so that side of the house will not show.

Vice Chairman asks if the privacy fence will go along the side street.

Mr. Granger confirms and adds he will also be putting trees there, wants to make it a pretty home place.

Vice Chairman Schram asks if this will be the applicant's personal home.

Mr. Granger confirms and adds if approved he is ready to pay for his permit and get started. Plans to meet all landscaping and zoning requirements.

Vice Chairman Schram asks in regards to the setback why didn't the applicant choose to move his plan to decrease the opposite side down to the required setback.

Mr. Granger states the initial house plans were just centered on the lot for uniformity. If required can definitely move it over, if it is amended, he states he is fine with pushing it over to the five feet giving the side setback to be eleven feet instead. If the home cannot be centered it is not a big deal, would like to proceed with construction.

Vice Chairman Schram states it would be a good solution for this application.

Mr. Granger confirms.

Vice Chairman Schram proposes an amendment to move house to the five foot setback on the west side which creates eleven feet two and a half inches setback on the Livingston Street side.

Mr. Sanders seconds the amendment.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote on the amendment.

Vote on the amendment: 4-0, amendment approved.

Vice Chairman Schram calls for a vote as amended.

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

For: 4 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Alvin Joseph and Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

OTHER BUSINESS

Planning Commissioner Alvin Joseph left the meeting after case VAR 25-45.

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*