



# City of Lake Charles

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

## Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Monday, May 12, 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.*

### ROLL CALL

**Present** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr., and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Absent** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, 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

#### ANX 25-04

#### CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

**APPLICANT:** LARRY THOMAS/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

**SUBJECT:** The applicant is requesting annexation approval of 0.98-acres M/L, and generally described as **5755 Big Lake Road**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed annexation is under review by the Registrar of Voters office and the Tax Assessor Office for Annexation Certification.

*Chairman Weeks asks if the applicant is present. Applicant not present.*

*Lauren Bynum states the City is the co-applicant and is present.*

*Chairman Weeks read in ANXZON 25-04.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**ANXZON  
25-04**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** LARRY THOMAS/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

**SUBJECT:** The applicant is requesting a zoning classification of Residential Zoning District of 0.98-acres M/L, and generally described as **5755 Big Lake Road**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed zoning classification of Residential is consistent with the current zoning classification of the Parish of Calcasieu (R-1). Therefore, staff finds the request reasonable and acceptable for passage.

*Chairman Weeks asks if the applicant is present. Applicant not present.*

*Lauren Bynum states the City is the co-applicant and is present.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**ANX 25-05**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** STEPHEN MCNAULTY/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

**SUBJECT:** The applicant is requesting annexation approval of 0.7-acres M/L, and generally described as **6819 Big Lake Road**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed annexation is under review by the Registrar of Voters office and the Tax Assessor Office for Annexation Certification.

*Chairman Weeks also reads in ANXZON 25-05.*

*Thomas Sanders states this homeowner is asking that the property comes in as residential and he is not seeking any kind of business or commercial use.*

*Lauren Bynum confirms and also states the city has to bring the property in as what it is and after a period of time the property owner can chose to apply to rezone it.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if the property is brought in a residential then there would not be requirements for a privacy fence. Lauren Bynum confirms.*

*Lauren Bynum states that the City of Lake Charles is the co applicant for the annexation and because of this the applicant is not always in attendance.*

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

*Mary Kennison, 6820 N Banbury Rd, Lake Charles- In Opposition  
Wants to protect the integrity of the subdivision. The subdivision has restrictions but is not an HOA. States she doesn't want part of the subdivision divided into in the City limits and part of it not. Would like to maintain the subdivision as it is. States the*

*property owner is doing the same thing Larry Thomas has done with his property on Big Lake Road.*

*Phillip Rogers- In Opposition, does not wish to speak.  
Does not want commercial property in the neighborhood.*

*Mr. Sanders states Ms. Kennison stated the new person is trying to do the same thing as Larry Thomas but the difference is this property is not asking for any business or commercial use. The property owner is wanting the property to be brought it as residential instead of what Mr. Thomas did.*

*Ms. Kennison states that Mr. Thomas did the same thing. There had been three signs and once it had been approved for the annexation he then applied for the property to be rezoned. If the same thing happens this time then this is just the first of the meetings and it will eventually be rezoned to commercial or business.*

*Chairman Weeks asks Ms. Kennison if her major concern is that the property will eventually be rezoned to commercial.*

*Ms. Kennison states yes that is one of the concerns and also the property was grandfathered into the subdivision because it was there before the subdivision was formed and the subdivision had restrictions on certain types of buildings. One of the residents checked with the city and they were told nothing could be done. Questions what would happen if a property two streets over wants to be annexed in to get city water. States the subdivision is on well water. States concerns over what effect all of this is going to have on the subdivision.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if the subdivision is an HOA. Ms. Kennison states no.*

*David Berryhill asks if a property asks to be annexed into the city limits it has to connected to or adjacent to a property that is already within the city limits. Lauren Bynum confirms.*

*Lauren Bynum states as a point of clarification all annexations go to the City Council so there will be another meeting for this. This meeting is a recommendation to the City Council. The Planning and Zoning department does not notify for annexations, the sign in the yard is the notification process. In addition the Parish nor the City will enforce any neighborhood restrictions, we only enforce our Zoning Ordinances. If there is anything happening against neighborhood restrictions that is a civil matter and the city does not get involved in that.*

*Mr. Sanders states for clarification that Mr. McNaulty is only asking for the property to be annexed in as residential at this point.*

*Ms. Kennison states that is what Mr. Thomas also did.*

*Lauren Bynum states after six months the property owner can come in and he can request to rezone the property. Any property owner can request a rezoning. With annexations the property will be brought into the city as what it is in the parish.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 3 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

**Against:** 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**ANXZON  
25-05**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** STEPHEN MCNAULTY/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

**SUBJECT:** The applicant is requesting a zoning classification of Residential Zoning District of 0.7-acres M/L, and generally described as **6819 Big Lake Road**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed zoning classification of Residential is consistent with the current zoning classification of the Parish of Calcasieu (R-1). Therefore, staff finds the request reasonable and acceptable for passage.

*Thomas Sanders states this homeowner is asking that the property comes in as residential and he is not seeking any kind of business or commercial use.*

*Lauren Bynum confirms and also states the city has to bring the property in as what it is and after a period of time the property owner can chose to apply to rezone it.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if the property is brought in a residential then there would not be requirements for a privacy fence. Lauren Bynum confirms.*

*Lauren Bynum states that the City of Lake Charles is the co applicant for the annexation and because of this the applicant is not always in attendance.*

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

*Mary Kennison, 6820 N Banbury Rd, Lake Charles- In Opposition  
Wants to protect the integrity of the subdivision. The subdivision has restrictions but is not an HOA. States she doesn't want part of the subdivision divided into in the City limits and part of it not. Would like to maintain the subdivision as it is. States the property owner is doing the same thing Larry Thomas has done with his property on Big Lake Road.*

*Phillip Rogers- In Opposition, does not wish to speak.  
Does not want commercial property in the neighborhood.*

*Mr. Sanders states Ms. Kennison stated the new person is trying to do the same thing as Larry Thomas but the difference is this property is not asking for any business or commercial use. The property owner is wanting the property to be brought it as residential instead of what Mr. Thomas did.*

*Ms. Kennison states that Mr. Thomas did the same thing. There had been three signs and once it had been approved for the annexation he then applied for the property to be rezoned. If the same thing happens this time then this is just the first of the meetings and it will eventually be rezoned to commercial or business.*

*Chairman Weeks asks Ms. Kennison if her major concern is that the property will eventually be rezoned to commercial.*

*Ms. Kennison states yes that is one of the concerns and also the property was grandfathered into the subdivision because it was there before the subdivision was formed and the subdivision had restrictions on certain types of buildings. One of the residents checked with the city and they were told nothing could be done. Questions what would happen if a property two streets over wants to be annexed in to get city water. States the subdivision is on well water. States concerns over what effect all of this is going to have on the subdivision.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if the subdivision is an HOA. Ms. Kennison states no.*

*David Berryhill asks if a property asks to be annexed into the city limits it has to be connected to or adjacent to a property that is already within the city limits. Lauren Bynum confirms.*

*Lauren Bynum states as a point of clarification all annexations go to the City Council so there will be another meeting for this. This meeting is a recommendation to the City Council. The Planning and Zoning department does not notify for annexations, the sign in the yard is the notification process. In addition the Parish nor the City will enforce any neighborhood restrictions, we only enforce our Zoning Ordinances. If there is anything happening against neighborhood restrictions that is a civil matter and the city does not get involved in that.*

*Mr. Sanders states for clarification that Mr. McNaulty is only asking for the property to be annexed in as residential at this point.*

*Ms. Kennison states that is what Mr. Thomas also did.*

*Lauren Bynum states after six months the property owner can come in and he can request to rezone the property. Any property owner can request a rezoning. With annexations the property will be brought into the city as what it is in the parish.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 3 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

**Against:** 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**PREFNL  
25-11**

**LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS**

**APPLICANT:** MOSS RENTALS INVESTMENTS, LLC (HARMON LANDING SUBDIVISION)

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a 2.39-acre tract of land M/L into four (4) tracts, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Northside 2500 Blk. Conoco Street thru to Crockett Street.**

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to re-subdivide a 2.39-acre tract of land M/L into four (4) tracts, within a Business Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable.

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

*Russell Moss, 4997 Hwy 14 E, Iowa, LA*

*Existing units, not building any units. Wanting to down size and sell some of the units.*

*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 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**PREFNL  
25-12**

**LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS**

**APPLICANT:** JOHN CLINT RILEY (INDUSTRIAL RESERVE ADDITION REVISED)

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to subdivide a 4.693-acre M/L tract of land into two (2) development tracts, within a Mixed Use-X Zoning District. Location of the request is **2150 E. McNeese Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to re-subdivide a 4.693-acre M/L tract into two (2) tracts, within a Mixed Use-X Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable.

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

*George Evans, 1001 Lakeland Dr, Lake Charles, LA  
Would like to subdivided the property to sell the back piece.*

*Thomas Sanders asks what is the access to the back piece. There is a private road on the western side.*

*Mr. Evans states there is an access easement with it.*

*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 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**PREFNL  
25-13**

**LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS**

**APPLICANT:** CITY OF LAKE CHARLES (OD JOHNSON SUBDIVISION)

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to subdivide a 4.79-acre M/L tract of land into two (2) development tracts, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **3100 Fruge Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to re-subdivide a 4.79-acre M/L tract into two (2) tracts, within a Business Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable.

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

*Mike Castille, Director of Community Services for the City of Lake Charles  
One of his divisions is Recreation and Parks. O. D. Johnson is back up and running, bringing in many activities and tournaments. Issues with not enough parking. Now able*

*to purchase from Community Coffee and will need to subdivide to address the parking issue. (Submitted an illustration of the parking to the commissioners.)*

*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 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**REZONE  
25-03**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** PHIL VINCENT

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting to amend the official zoning map (Sec 24-5-207) from a Neighborhood Zoning District to a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **2400 Opelousas Street and 330 N. Lincoln Street.**

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to amend the official zoning map from a Neighborhood Zoning District to a Business Zoning District. Staff's review revealed Business Zoning District immediately to the north of the proposed rezoning property, making this rezoning contiguous with an already established zoning district.

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

*Phillip Vincent, 3718 Gray Willow Dr., Lake Charles, LA*

*There is not a project, strictly rezoning. Everything has already been done would like to get the property off the major conditional use and have it permanently rezoned to business.*

*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 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**MAJ-VAR  
25-04**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** NEIL MIRE

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 24-5-302(3)(b)(i)) in order to construct six (6) duplex dwellings (12 units total) with Variance (Sec. 24-4--205) in order to allow a rear 10' bufferyard setback vs. required 15', within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Eastside 2500 Blk. Hazel Street.**

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting a Major Use Permit with a bufferyard reduction in the rear of the property. Staffs review reveals that the requested density could be reduced so that the rear bufferyard could be met. Staff cannot find any hardship involved therefore cannot

forward a position of support.

*Mr. Gregory Pete had to recuse himself from this item.*

*Therefore there is not a quorum. Case to be deferred.*

**MAJ-VAR  
25-05**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** LYNN M. POPE

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 24-5-302(3) (b)(iii)) in order to establish an office use (tax preparation) with Variance (Sec. 24-4--205) in order to maintain an existing driveway for parking thereby eliminating the ability to enter and exit in a forward manner, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is **2430 Opelousas Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to establish a tax preparation office within an existing structure and maintain the existing non-conforming parking configuration within a neighborhood zoning district. Staff feels the use, intensity, and layout are appropriate for the section of the Opelousas Street Corridor but have some concerns with the parking configuration as it relates to backing out onto the roadway.

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

*Lynn Pope, 2212 Pinewood Dr, Lake Charles, LA*

*Proposing to start a tax preparation business. By appointment only. Appointments on an hourly basis. The parking would consist of her car and the client's car.*

*Thomas Sanders asks if there is a plan to create any other parking other than the driveway that is there.*

*Ms. Pope states she is doing research into the vacant lot that sits behind the property. It is currently owned by the state and was told that after three years she could possibly obtain the lot. In the process of still investigating that option.*

*Chairman Weeks states that there would be an issue for parking with walk-ins or drive-ins, it would create more than the parking space will allow. Chairman Weeks asks if this would be a seasonal occupation or if it would be year around.*

*Ms. Pope states it would be year around.*

*Chairman Weeks states it will need to be advertised as by appointment only because of the parking situation.*

*Asks if she will be the only business and if it will be just her.*

*Ms. Pope states that she will be the only business but during the peak season she may hire an intern.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if there is sufficient space between the home and the property line to where you can pull up along side the home further than where the gravel exists now.*

*Ms. Pope states she had looked into putting in a circle driveway. Asks Kelly Miseles what the findings were on that.*

*Lauren Bynum states that it is to close to the intersection. Ms. Bynum states the commercial use will also require a six foot privacy fence along the east property line.*

*Mr. Sanders asks why not along the west property line.*



*Lauren Bynum states the west side is a street. The property to the rear is vacant.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if the rear would not need to be fenced because it is vacant even though it is residential.*

*Lauren Bynum states not until it is occupied. If a structure would go up on the vacant lot, Ms. Pope would be responsible for the fence along the rear property line at that time. If Ms. Pope purchases the property to the south the fence would have to go along that whole property and the rear property line.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if that is doable. Ms. Pope confirms.*

*Mr. Sanders asks staff if it would be possible for Ms. Pope to put in angled parking out front.*

*Lauren Bynum states it may be possible but tight, there is a bufferyard requirement, we would have to look at the amount of space there. Part of the staff findings indicated that more than one or two cars would be difficult to maneuver. Three cars would be very challenging. Twenty feet is the length of one parking spot.*

*David Berryhill asks if Ms. Pope will have to put in a concrete or asphalt driveway.*

*Lauren Bynum confirms that it would have to be an improved surface.*

*Chairman Weeks asks Ms. Pope if that is doable. Ms. Pope confirms.*

*Ms. Pope asks if it would need to go to the rear of the property.*

*David Berryhill states it would need to be wherever there would be parking. It would need to be the length to stack two vehicles and not block the sidewalk or the right of way. Any parking must be on your property. (Indicated the front property line.)*

*Gregory Pete makes a motion to add amendments, 1) improved parking surface, 2) privacy fence and 3) to advertise by appointment only.*

*Thomas Sanders seconds the motion.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote as amended.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**MAJ-VAR  
25-06**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** LAKE CHARLES ADDICTION AND WELLNESS CENTER, LLC

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 24-5-302(3)(b)(vii)) in order to establish a wellness center with Variances (Sec. 24-4--205) in order to 1) allow aggregate material parking area and 2) elimination of required 8' bufferyard setback along North side property line, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **2507 Hodges Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to expand a counseling center by adding rear parking and utilizing a gravel parking area vs asphalt or concrete and reducing the required bufferyard. Although there are existing non-conforming business use setbacks and parking areas in the immediate area, Staff could find no hardship involved therefore cannot forward a position of support.

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

*Stephanie Boyd, 2789 Crown Lane, Lake Charles, LA*

*Has a location on Alamo, moving to a larger area. Add a parking area in the back and the handicap parking in the front.*

*Thomas Sanders asks if the applicant had someone look at the plans to make sure they can gain access to the rear of the structure along side the building.*

*Ms. Boyd states yes they have access, there is a ten foot concrete area and then another six feet to the neighbor.*

*Lauren Bynum asks for clarification, if it is six feet to the neighbor's house or six feet to the property line.*

*Ms. Boyd states that the neighbor stated their house is just off the property line. So the six feet is to the property line.*

*Lauren Bynum suggests the applicant may want to have it surveyed.*

*Mr. Sanders states when he drove by he assumed that the property line was in between the houses. If the property line runs between the two houses a vehicle will not fit through there.*

*Ms. Boyd states that where the concrete is now that a vehicle will fit.*

*Mr. Sanders states his reservations about a vehicle fitting through that space.*

*Ms. Boyd states that she can park on the concrete and still get in and out both sides of her vehicle.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if she is referring to the driveway or the concrete along the side of the house.*

*Ms. Boyd states the concrete along the side of the house.*

*Chairman Weeks asks how wide the concrete is.*

*Ms. Boyd states ten feet.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if this is for residential patients or out patient.*

*Ms. Boyd states it is completely out patient.*

*Chairman Weeks asks how many staff on an average work day.*

*Ms. Boyd states there are five. A total of five.*

*Gregory Pete asks if the parking is to be in the rear.*

*Ms. Boyd states yes, they would drive down the concrete to access the back parking. It would be more privacy for the patients to be able to park in the back.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if they are parking on the ten foot area how will the clients access the back parking.*

*Ms. Boyd states they wouldn't park there, all of the parking would be in back.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if the staff will be parking on the side where the ten feet of concrete is.*

*Ms. Boyd states no she is requesting that they have twelve parking spots in the back.*

*Mr. Pete states his concerns that is one way in and one way out and it can accommodate two way traffic.*

*Ms. Boyd agrees and they suggested putting up a round mirror to see any on coming traffic.*

*Mr. Sanders expresses concerns about being able to access the back of the property, not knowing where the property line is, and concerns about fitting twelve vehicles in the space.*

*Ms. Boyd states there would be eight from the top corner down.*

*Mr. Sanders states that usually when they look at a parking area the parking spaces are twenty to twenty five feet in depth. With twenty feet behind for backing out. Suggests having someone look at the engineering.*

*Ms. Boyd states they have had it engineered and they would have eight parking spaces in the back.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if she has the plans.*

*Ms. Boyd says yes but they are not with her.*

*Lauren Bynum states that twelve parking spaces will not work.*

*Ms. Boyd states that eight parking spots are required and can bring in the other drawing that shows the eight spaces.*

*Mr. Sanders states that the property lines need to be defined. Let the staff review the parking plan. This case needs further information, suggests a possible deferment to the next meeting. Suggests meeting with staff of the city to get further definition on plans.*

*Ms. Boyd agrees and would like to meet.*

*David Berryhill states there is a view where you can see the fence of the neighbor and it is even with the house. That appears to be the property line.*

*Lauren Bynum asks if they have had the property staked and surveyed to see where the property lines are.*

*Ms. Boyd states not yet, they were waiting to go through Zoning first and then they were going to contact a surveyor, but they can do that now.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if the applicant can have a credit on her initial fee if it is deferred.*

*Lauren Bynum states yes that if the commissioners defer it she would not have to pay again.*

*Chairman Weeks suggests the deferral.*

*Mr. Sanders makes a motion that this case is deferred to next month.*

*Mr. Pete seconds the motion.*

**SPC 25-03****CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** CREMER VOLUNTEER PASTILLES/MICHAEL BUXTON

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to allow a temporary office trailer and parking area, within a Light Manufacturing Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southside 300 Blk. Jackson Street.**

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting a variance in order to place a portable building unit to be used for temporary office space (approximately two years) and a parking area for the office facility which will allow for the permanent reconstruction of their office complex at the plant site. Staff feels this request falls reasonable for approval.

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

*Michael Buxton, 19447 Hwy 383, Iowa, LA*

*Hurricanes Delta and Laura destroyed their previous office. Plan to rebuild, in the meantime asking for a temporary office trailer and extend the parking. Trailer will be placed east to west, facing north.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if that area has been unoccupied since the hurricane.*

*Mr. Buxton confirms. Indicates the site plan stating they would like to extend the parking a little to the south and up to the office trailer.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if the applicant has been using the gravel area on the north side of the lot as existing parking.*

*Mr. Buxton confirms.*

*Mr. Pete asks if additional gravel will be added.*

*Mr. Buxton confirms.*

*Mr. Pete asks when they are finished if the gravel will then be removed.*

*Mr. Buxton states they are going to keep that and it will be the permanent employee parking.*

*Mr. Sanders asks Lauren Bynum if the parking lot will need to come to the standard of a more permanent parking area.*

*Lauren Bynum states it could be handled that way or that a time limit of two years be put on the portable building and the gravel parking and then at that time they could come back in front of the commission to ask to maintain the gravel parking or to pave it appropriately. It does not meet any development standards so if it is to remain that is where it gets tricky if he wants to develop it. The lot was not evaluated for a permanent*

*parking lot. It was evaluated for a two year temporary use property. If the time line restriction is applied at the end of that time they can come back in front of the Planning Commission and either request a variance for it to remain or it can be developed to our development standards.*

*Mr. Buxton asks if by more permanent if that meant concrete slab. Lauren Bynum confirms.*

*Mr. Buxton states that would be fine as they move forward the site will grow and they will have more people. It is a prominent spot for the parking and if they have to concrete it or whatever the standards will be they will be more than happy to do so. If they have to come back in two years they are happy to do that as well.*

*Lauren Bynum states that the permanent use would require an approved parking surface of concrete or asphalt, and it will have a landscaping requirement as well. If that is something they would like to start now the applicant can come into the office to go over the requirements or if the commission allows it to be the temporary gravel use then in two years we would have to have that conversation then.*

*Mr. Buxton states that is fine.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if the property on the northeast corner of Ryan and Jackson is part of their facility as well.*

*Mr. Buxton confirms.*

*Mr. Pete moves to make an amendment to come back for a permanent surface in two years and to evaluate the aggregate parking.*

*David Berryhill seconds the motion.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote as amended.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

#### **SPC 25-04**

#### **CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** ROZALYN KING

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to re-establish a non-conforming use (child care facility) and reduce required twelve (12) parking spaces to seven (7), within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is **711 11th Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting an exception to re-establish a day care facility with the same parking configuration and setbacks within a neighborhood zoning district. Staff feels the use, intensity, and layout are consistent with the previous use of the property therefore recommends approval of the application.

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

*Rozalyn King, 562 Jumping Jack Lane, Lake Charles, LA  
Would like to re-open the childcare facility, however the required parking is twelve spaces and they currently have room for seven existing spaces. Also would like to add they will have a designated team member or floater to transport the children from the parents into the building so there wouldn't be any traffic.*

*David Berryhill asks the applicant if that is how drop off and pick up is typically handled.*

*Ms. King confirms.*

*Chairman Weeks asks how many staff members there will be.*

*Ms. King states five including her.*

*Chairman Weeks asks about special events that will incur more traffic.*

*Ms. King states that neighboring them is Beverage Associates and Ms. King has spoken with them and Beverage Associates has given them permission to use their parking area for special occasions. He had the same agreement with the company that operated the childcare previously. It is required by the state at least twice a year.*

*Thomas Sanders asks what is that requirement.*

*Ms. King states the requirement is for the parents to come into the building.*

*Mr. Berryhill asks what the plan would be if Beverage Associates did not allow the use of their parking area anymore.*

*Ms. King says there is property to the back where they would add more parking if they ran into a problem with parking.*

*Mr. Sanders states that he drives past this building every day and it has never been a traffic problem. Suggests the applicant get a written agreement from Beverage Associates about the use of their parking area for special events.*

*Chairman Weeks confirms that a statement in writing should be obtained.*

*Ms. King agrees.*

*Gregory Pete moves to amend that a memo of understanding be submitted within 30 days that the applicant can use the designated area for conditional parking as needed.*

*Mr. Berryhill seconds the amendment.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote as amended.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**SPC 25-06**

**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE  
APPLICANT: DAMON ALEX CHAUMONT**

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to replace a missing cabinet on an existing non-conforming pylon sign, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **4001 Louisiana Avenue**.

**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 and setbacks as the previous sign. The new sign requirements only allow a monument type sign structure for damaged or new on-site signage within the city. Due to the location of the pole sign and its location with the street intersection staff feels the replacement with a monument sign could be somewhat challenging due to visibility obstruction.

*Case deferred at applicant's request.*

**SPC 25-07****CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** BROSSETT ARCHITECT, LLC

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 24-4-206) in order to re-construct a non-conforming use/structure (baseball facility/stadium) with increased setbacks from original footprint, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **1450 5th Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed the applicant is requesting an exception in order to re-construct a non-conforming use/structure (baseball facility/stadium) with increased setbacks from original footprint. The proposed re-construction improves the original footprint setback therefore staff feels the request falls reasonable.

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

*David Brossett, 2406 Beau Chene, Lake Charles, LA  
Seeking to rebuild Alvin Dark Stadium, it was severely damaged in Hurricane Laura.  
Due to the configuration of the field itself they can only get so far from the road. They  
have been able to increase the setbacks from what it previously was.*

*Chairman Weeks stated the applicant has stated "we", asks who is we.*

*Mr. Brossett states the property is owned by the City of Lake Charles and it is managed  
by Lake Charles Ward 3 Recreation Department.*

*Thomas Sanders states it is cost prohibitive to move the field and they have created as  
much space as they could. Mr. Brossett confirms.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**VAR 25-16****CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** AR PROPERTIES, LLC

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to maintain an unpermitted monument sign with a 4'3" front setback from front property line vs. required 10', within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **4105**

**Common Street.**

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed the applicant is requesting a variance in order to maintain an unpermitted monument sign with a 4'3" front setback from front property line vs. required 10', within a Business Zoning District. The intent for the required setback of 10' is to not impair visibility exiting the property. Therefore, staff cannot forward a position of support.

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

*Tan Chaudry, 5146 W Worthington Drive, Lake Charles, LA  
Built the sign not knowing the 15 foot buffer zone, so they are four and a half feet to close. Requesting a variance to keep the sign.*

*Chairman Weeks indicates a picture of the sign and states the oncoming traffic is blocked by the sign from this angle.*

*Mr. Chaudry states the sign doesn't block any view when you are driving. There are several signs on the road that are closer to the road than his so he figured that it shouldn't be a problem.*

*Chairman Weeks asks who did the sign.*

*Mr. Chaudry states the general contractor and had his guy do the sign.*

*Chairman Weeks states it is closing the barn door after the horse is out but that when someone is hired they need to make sure they are within all of the ordinances required by the city before any construction begins. It would have saved a lot of time and trouble.*

*Mr. Chaudry states he will definitely do it next time. Also states he did not know they had to be fifteen feet away.*

*Lauren Bynum states that during the permitting process the setbacks would have been made known.*

*Thomas Sanders asks if this was permitted.*

*Lauren Bynum states no.*

*Mr. Chaudry states he did the permit for the whole building and this is the first time building a sign and did not realize he had to have a separate permit for the sign. Thought the building permit covered the sign as well.*

*Gregory Pete states there are ordinances and specifications that should be followed. Asks if the contractor did not understand that.*

*Mr. Chaudry states he did not understand that.*

*David Berryhill states Mr. Chaudry is the contractor.*

*Mr. Chaudry states that when he was told the sign had to have a separate permit he came in and applied for it.*

*Mr. Sanders asks staff aside from the fact that the sign is to close to the road does it meet all of the other requirements.*

*Lauren Bynum confirms.*



*David Berryhill states concern for not only this property but the adjacent property will have an obstruction with the sign and the utility poles that are there. The travel of vehicles and someone getting behind after looking left and right could still cause an obstruction.*

*Mr. Sanders asks staff if the property to the north has to back onto the road.*

*Mr. Chaudry states they don't have to back into the street they can make a turn and then go.*

*Chairman Weeks states there is no line of site and is weary about that because if there is an accident and they say they couldn't see because it was obstructed by the sign.*

*Mr. Chaudry states there was a sign there before. There was foundation underneath and they built the sign on the same foundation.*

*Chairman Weeks states he can't speak for what happened before but he is in the seat now.*

*Mr. Sanders indicates previous pictures stating there was not a sign there.*

*Mr. Chaudry states there was a tattoo shop and they had a sign right there.*

*Chairman Weeks asks the applicant if there is anything else he would like to add.*

*Mr. Chaudry states that is all.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 0

**Against:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

## **VAR 25-17**

### **CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** SPRINGFIELD SIGN/ALICIA WALTON

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to install two 8sq.ft. by 4' in height vs. required maximum 2sq.ft. by 2' in height, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **3005 L'Auberge Blvd.**

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed the applicant is requesting a variance in order to install two 8sf, 4' in height directional signage vs the required maximum of 2sf at 2' in height, within a Business Zoning District. Directional signage is not intended to have any branding or logos and to only provide patrons with directional wayfinding. Staff can find no evidence of hardship and therefore cannot forward a position of support.

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

*Matthew Sew, 3218 Ivy Lake Drive, Maurice, LA*

*Representing Springfield Sign. The general problem is the entrance is in the back and there is a lot of noise in the area, it is off a busy street, right off L'Auberge, the concern is being able to direct traffic with a two foot sign, it is not as easy to see. The request for*

*the additional square footage of the sign is to help the community with public way finding.*

*Gregory Pete states we currently have an ordinance that states the dimensions of the sign.*

*Lauren Bynum confirms, and also states that the signage is only for way finding not for logos or branding or identification.*

*Mr. Sew asks if it would be possible if they were to debrand the sign if that would make it functional.*

*Thomas Sanders asks why four feet is needed rather than the two foot.*

*Mr. Sew states it is visually easier to see. It is a dispensary so it has to be thrown in there face to make sure they know where to go.*

*David Berryhill asks if he is saying their clientele is at a disadvantage.*

*Mr. Sew states probably so.*

*Mr. Sanders states he drives by this site many times a week and has never seen a problem with vehicles going the wrong way or any cars meeting head on. Asks if there has been arrows painted on the concrete for direction.*

*Mr. Sew states he is unsure but it can be suggested to the sign company.*

*Sanders states he does not see the necessity to vary from the ordinance that provides for a sign that is two by two without an explanation as to why.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if they are preparing to do the signs. Mr. Sew confirms.*

*Chairman Weeks asks if they are good with the two square feet.*

*Mr. Sew states he is present to push the added height but at the end of the day they will go with whatever is allowed.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 0

**Against:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

## **VAR 25-18**

### **CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** DONALD RAY FRANKLIN

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to allow storage of commercial construction equipment on a vacant lot, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **2220 Lilly Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed the applicant is requesting a variance to in order to allow storage of commercial construction equipment on a vacant lot so that it may be secured within a fenced in area, within a Residential Zoning District. Staff can find no evidence of hardship and cannot forward a position of

support. This property previously came before the Commission (VAR 24-03). At that time the Staff Findings read: "Applicant is requesting to maintain an existing accessory privacy fence without a principal use being located on the property. The applicant is attempting to secure his property from unauthorized use and debris disposal. Staff feels this request is reasonable on the condition the property is not utilized for storage of any materials or equipment."

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

*Donald Ray Franklin, 2216 Lilly Street, Lake Charles, LA*

*The property in question is two houses down from where he currently lives. When the equipment was first purchased he had tried to put it in the country area to be out of the city limits but people have a tendency to mess with the equipment, can't afford to fix the equipment if people steal stuff off of it. Also states where the equipment is now he has a camera to keep an eye on the equipment. Does not have the money to buy or rent a commercial building to store the equipment.*

*Thomas Sanders states he was not at the previous meeting that applied to putting the fence on the vacant lot. Stating that the wooden fence was reasonable with the condition that it was not to be utilized for the storage of any materials or equipment. That was the understanding.*

*Mr. Franklin stated that at one time he had a couple of vehicles there, those were taken away and states he keeps the property clean and neat and he pays the taxes. Doesn't have a lot of money to pay to store it at a yard. It is his only means to make extra income. Wants to be able to secure his machine without putting it away somewhere else where he is not paying tax.*

*Mr. Sanders asks where is the machine now.*

*Mr. Franklin states it is at a friend's house.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if the applicant can make arrangements to keep the equipment elsewhere.*

*Mr. Franklin states people want money for that and he doesn't have a lot of money. States he pays the taxes and keeps it clean and neat around the property.*

*David Berryhill asks what type of equipment does the applicant have.*

*Mr. Franklin states that he has an excavator and a dump truck and he tries to park it where he can see it without people vandalizing it. States he keeps it clean and neat and the neighbors don't have a problem with it.*

*Mr. Sanders asks how long has the applicant owned the gooseneck trailer that the excavator was on, the dump truck, the utility trailer, etc.*

*Mr. Franklin states about four years. States he is just trying to make an honest living.*

*Mr. Sanders states it looks like it was the plan all along to put a fence up there and put the equipment behind the fence.*

*Mr. Franklin states he had the fence there before he had the equipment.*

*Mr. Sanders states then the issue with the fence wouldn't have been dealt with in 2024.*

*Mr. Franklin states he had the fence before that. States that he has complied with*

*everything the city has told him to do, just trying to make an honest living and states he doesn't have a lot of money. Doesn't know what else he can do with his equipment except try to make money with it and try to keep it from being destroyed elsewhere.*

*Chairman Weeks states he understands and no one is trying to deprive him the right to make a living, however, when a person chooses to go into a business that person takes all that comes with the business including city ordinances and fines and taxes along with that business. So you need to make a determination whether or not you can afford to keep this business running or is it detrimental to your finances. If you go into business you must do everything in the proper order to maintain it. We have an obligation to enforce the city code.*

*Mr. Franklin states there are rules you have to abide by, but when he bought the equipment he didn't know the rules for the city. It is a hard thing, paying taxes on the property and can't put his equipment on his property. States he has seen other people have equipment on their property in the city.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 0

**Against:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**VAR 25-19 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** JOHN HAWKINS

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to establish a cigar bar within 300ft. of Residential and Neighborhood Zoning Districts, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **2500 Kirkman Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed the applicant is requesting a variance to establish a cigar bar within 300ft of Residential and Neighborhood Zoning Districts, within a Business Zoning District. The property to the West is single-family residential and the properties to the North, South, and East are commercial properties.

*Withdrawn per applicant.*

**VAR 25-20 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICANT:** WALTER CRAWFORD

**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) to extend a previously approved Variance in order to maintain the placement of a storage container without a principal structure, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **701 Alamo Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed the applicant is requesting to maintain an existing accessory storage container without a principal use being located on the property by extending a previously approved variance (VAR 24-02). The applicant is attempting to secure material and equipment used to maintain his property. Staff finds this request is reasonable on the condition the property owner provide a reasonable timeline for establishing a principal use on the development tract.

*Deferred to the June agenda.*

**VAR 25-21      CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE****APPLICANT:** LEMOINE DISASTER RECOVERY**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct a new residence 26'8" from front property line vs. required 30' front setback, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is **2002 Phyllis Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting a variance in order to construct a new residence with a reduced front setback of 26'8" vs the required 30', within a Neighborhood District. Staff's review revealed the previous home on the lot had a 12.9' front setback vs the required 30' with other examples of reduced setbacks within the general area. Therefore, staff finds the request reasonable.

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

*Kevin Guidry, 4045 W Briarfield, Lake Charles, LA  
Asking for a variance for the front setback.*

*Justin Martinez, 3432 Eliza, Lake Charles LA  
Representing Lemoine Disaster Recovery. States they had found themselves in a perfect storm of staff change and it was originally going to be a restore but that changed and someone had forgotten to put the new permit into the system so they did the new house on the old permit. It was a big mess but it is all straightened out now.*

*Thomas Sanders asks if the house is mostly done. Mr. Martinez confirms.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if there is going to be a driveway.*

*Mr. Martinez states yes in the front.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if the driveway will be the width for one or two cars. To close to the road for two cars to park nose to tail in the driveway.*

*Mr. Martinez states he has the site plan that shows the driveway but not here with him.*

*Lauren Bynum clarifies it will be a part of the approval process for the permit when they do they final inspection it requires off street parking for two cars. Typically we see that they provide two parking spots.*

*Mr. Sanders states what they have built is improving the neighborhood.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph and Gus Schram III

**VAR 25-22      CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE****APPLICANT:** VERIFIABLE REAL ESTATE, LLC**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to place a portable building unit to be used for display purposes on a permanent foundation, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **2559 Moeling Street**.

**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting a variance in order to place a portable building unit to be used for display purposes on a permanent foundation system. This proposed building will be permanent but utilized for display only. Therefore staff feeling the use falls reasonable for approval.

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

*Huey White, 3601 NW Evangeline Thruway, Carencro, LA*

*Portable building sales. Building for display purposes, sales are slow here, hopes it will help in order to sell more buildings.*

*Thomas Sanders asks where does the applicant propose to locate the structure.*

*Mr. White states he was going to put it under the cover but there may be some height issues so it may have to go on the back side of it. Going to have the building finished out for customers to see, gives the customers a better idea of what is possible.*

*Mr. Sanders asks if this is going to be used as an office.*

*Mr. White states the office is next door.*

*David Berryhill states that there are other buildings on display.*

*Mr. White agrees and states they are just not finished out. Provides pictures to the commissioners of the other offices located in other cities as well as examples of some of the finished out buildings.*

*Gregory Pete asks where they are proposing to put the building on this property.*

*Mr. White states in the center right behind the cover or under it.*

*Mr. Pete states he thought the other buildings were still there.*

*Mr. White states no he had sold those buildings.*

*Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.*

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

**For:** 4 - David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, Thomas Sanders Jr. and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**Against:** 0

**Absent:** 3 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph 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*