



City of Lake Charles

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

Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

Monday, December 8, 2025

5:00 PM

Council Chambers

OPEN MEETING

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

Prayer: Alvin Joseph

Pledge: Gus Schram

ROLL CALL

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

Absent 1 - Adam McBride

Excused 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

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 25-06

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MATT REDD/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting annexation approval of 2.21-acres M/L, and generally described as the **Eastside 1200 Blk. Hwy 397 (vacant lot South of 1295 Hwy 397).**

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 the applicant to state name and address for the record.

Matt Redd, 1424 Ryan Street, Lake Charles, LA

States they would like to develop the site and have it annexed in by the City.

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any questions.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**ANXZON
25-06**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MATT REDD/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting a zoning classification of Industrial Zoning District of 2.21-acres M/L, and generally described as the **Eastside 1200 Blk. Hwy 397 (vacant lot South of 1295 Hwy 397).**

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

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

Matt Redd, 1424 Ryan Street, Lake Charles, LA

Chairman Weeks asks if there any questions.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

ANX 25-07

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MY PLACE BP PROPERTIES LLC/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting annexation approval of 2.02-acres M/L, and generally described as **4607 W. Prien Lake Road (including lot on Northside).**

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 reads in ANX 25-07 with PREFNL/MAJ/VAR 25-23.

Mr. Sanders makes a motion to defer.

Mr. Joseph seconds the deferment.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote to defer.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**ANXZON
25-07**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: MY PLACE BP PROPERTIES LLC/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting a zoning classification of Residential Zoning District of 2.02-acres M/L, and generally described as **4607 W. Prien Lake Road (including lot on Northside).**

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 reads in ANXZON 25-07 with PREFNL/MAJ/VAR 25-23.

Mr. Sanders makes a motion to defer.

Mr. Joseph seconds the deferment.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote to defer.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**PREFNL
25-22**

LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

APPLICANT: OUR TIME PROPERTIES (OUR TIME SUBDIVISION)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to subdivide a 3.0485-acre M/L tract of land into four (4) residential tracts, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is the **North and South sides 500 Blk. River Road.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to re-subdivide a 3.0485-acre M/L tract of land into four (4) residential tracts, within a Residential Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable. Any approvals are

conditioned on the applicant adhere to any recommendations or infrastructure improvements set forth by the Department of Engineering and Public Works.

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

Stanley Caldarera, 498 River Road, Lake Charles, LA

Cleared lot, brought up the elevation, Corp of Engineers approved bulkhead.

Chairman Weeks asks applicant if he is good with any infrastructure improvements set forth by the department of Engineering and Public Works.

Mr. Caldarera confirms.

Mr. Schram states he sees the property lines but asks about the line below the property line. Asks if this is where the bulkhead is located.

Mr. Caldarera states that is the old property line and that will be where the bulkhead will be located.

Mr. Schram asks if the applicant is reclaiming the land.

Mr. Caldarera confirms.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

PREFNL-MA J-VAR 25-23 LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS
APPLICANT: MY PLACE BP PROPERTIES LLC (MY PLACE BP PROPERTIES SUBDIVISION)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to subdivide a 2.02-acre tract of land into eight (8) residential lots including a Major Conditional Use Permit for private drive access and Variance for private drive to exceed 200ft. in length, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **4607 W. Prien Lake Road (including lot on Northside).**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to subdivide a 2.02-acre tract of land into eight (8) residential lots including a Major Conditional Use Permit for private drive access and Variance for private drive to exceed 200ft. in length, within a Residential Zoning District. Any approvals are conditioned on the applicant adhere to any recommendations or infrastructure improvements set forth by the Department of Engineering and Public Works.

Chairman Weeks reads in ANX 25-07, ANXZON 25-07 with PREFNL/MAJ/VAR 25-23.

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

Phyllis Loftin, 3866 N Jasmine Drive, Lake Charles, LA

States she doesn't have anything to say in regards to the annexation or zoning.

Ms. Bynum asks the Commissioners if they would like to handle the annexation and zoning separate from the other requests.

Ms. Loftin states the annexation of the property into the City was subject to the subdivision being approved.

Mr. Sanders asks the applicant if she would like the subdivision discussed first.

Ms. Loftin confirms and asks to speak on the subject issue first.

Chairman Weeks confirms.

Ms. Loftin states she and her husband purchased the property in 2021. The property has been for sale since March of 2025 and they have had a lot of interest in the property but nothing that seemed to fit into the surrounding neighborhood. Such as rentals and duplexes. They have been very selective as to the buyer and what they propose. States what they do have is an opportunity for the proposed subdivision they are presenting tonight. This opportunity maintains the integrity of the surrounding neighborhoods. The subdivision being proposed consists of eight lots, two fronting West Prien Lake Road, which are 12,300 square feet each, and six interior lots that are 10,200 square feet, all of which are well above the City's minimum requirement of 6,000 square feet. These will be custom homes with high end finishes and landscaping, and will be listed at 750,000, so they meet the criteria of the surrounding neighborhoods. On a side note, and most importantly, the team that has been organized to move this project forward are all local. A local architect, developer, contractor, designer and engineer, all with impeccable reputations within their respective professions. States they are also asking for a variance for a private road, sites other private roads in the area. The private road has been taken into consideration for emergency vehicles and the private road meets the criteria. States that they have satisfied the density issues that the neighbors had and the City as the lots being proposed are almost twice the minimum lot size requirement. Sites other lot sizes in the area and states that they are wanting to maintain that integrity of the neighborhood. States she had received the concerns from Mr. Vernon on behalf of the Country Club and one of the main concerns are drainage, and it is their intention to improve the drainage in the area as well as adhere to all of the City requirements. After the property was purchased they did significant work to maintain and improve the drainage on the two acres. The property was receiving water from the surrounding properties and they hired someone to clear it and make sure the water drained towards the road and they have not had any problems with the property holding water since that was done. Prior to that they could not cut on the Northeast section of the property because they were getting so much water from Little Drive and from St. Andrews. States they plan to adhere to all of the requirements of the City. The second concern from Mr. Vernon was creating a like and desirable neighborhood. States that she is a real estate agent and the people that live in the general area are either her friends or clients and she would never do anything to interrupt the integrity or the flow of that neighborhood. The subdivision will satisfy the concerns as the subdivision will have an HOA and will be newly constructed of like, kind and quality or better, to those in the surrounding areas. In closing change is inevitable, has seen changes great and not so great, and usually the not so great changes have been from out of state developers, building substandard houses, that is not the case here, the group working on this project are all local.

Chairman Weeks asks the applicant about the drainage construction that was done, when was it started and when was it completed.

Ms. Loftin states they cleaned up the Northeast section by clearing tree stumps and fallen trees.

Chairman Weeks asks when did they start and when did they complete it.

Ms. Loftin asks if Chairman Weeks is asking about what they did to clean up the Northeast corner.

Chairman Weeks states no, that she had stated there had been drainage construction done.

Ms. Loftin states no, they had consulted with Beau Pleasant.

Chairman Weeks states so no drainage work has been done yet.

Ms. Loftin confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks if the two lots that will front Prien Lake Road will have access to Prien Lake Road.

Ms. Loftin states no, just the private drive. Indicates the site plan and proposed plat on the screen. It is one curb cut and the curb cut is already there.

Mr. Berryhill asks how trash service will be addressed.

Ms. Loftin states it will be a private trash pick up.

Mr. Berryhill asks if there will any uses from the City.

Ms. Loftin states no City trash pick up, only City water. Private trash and sewer service.

Mr. Berryhill asks if there are any plans to do any type of retention for storm water on the property.

Ms. Loftin states according to what the preliminary engineering has reflected is that it can be done without retention by using oversized piping and catch basins.

Mr. Berryhill asks if it would be underground.

Ms. Loftin states yes it will all be underground, run off property drainage.

Mr. Berryhill states that the effects of building will retain water for a period of time and asks if there will be any additional effects after construction is complete.

Ms. Loftin confirms no additional effects and will satisfy what ever the city will require.

Mr. Sanders asks what the material will be to construct the road.

Ms. Loftin states concrete.

Mr. Sanders asks if it will be curb and gutter.

Ms. Loftin states they will have the engineers determine that.

Mr. Schram asks if the trashcans will be taken to the road or will they be taken out to Prien Lake Road.

Ms. Loftin states the trashcans will not be brought out to Prien Lake Road.

Chairman Weeks acknowledges the letters and cards of opposition.

*Mike Veron, PO Box 2125, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition
Attorney for Lake Charles Country Club. Expressed concerns of a lack of communication over the project, concerns about sewer, drainage, erosion and flooding, concerns about the effect of desirability of the area. Provided letter of opposition with many pictures illustrating drainage and flooding issues. Would like the developer to defer to gather further information for the surrounding neighbors.*

*David Saucier, 3101 Little Drive, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition
Expressed concerns about drainage.*

Mr. Berryhill asks Mr. Saucier if he has been dealing with any flooding on his property.

Mr. Saucier states the last big rain created a lake on the corner of the property in question and his property. States the schematic that is shown is showing an eight foot drainage area and he measured it and the part that has been coffered is twenty feet on the north side of the property, it is a substantial change to the land. It was done about four months ago.

Ms. Loftin states it was sometime in the past summer.

Mr. Saucier states it did improve what they had but there is still no where for all the water to go.

*Michael Eason, 3130 St. Andrews Dr., Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition
Expressed concerns about drainage. Calcasieu Parish Police Jury and Gravity Drainage are currently in a major multi-million dollar project to benefit drainage for all of Southwest Louisiana. Concerns about erosion. Major rains back up the laterals on Little Drive causing flooding. Asks that the project waits until the other phases for the benefit of drainage are completed.*

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Eason the location of the new laterals that were expanded.

Mr. Eason states to the south.

*John Bradford, 4431 W Prien Lake Road, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition
Expressed concerns about the signs that were posted were on the ground on more than one occasion, feels there was not sufficient notice. Also expressed concerns about drainage, and sewer. Provided photographs of flooding and drainage issues. Would like the matter to be deferred until there is more information about the drainage. Also speaking for Dr. Wallace, Sterling Dickson, Tina Lewis, and Mr. Height.*

Chairman Weeks asks if Mr. Bradford has any other points he would like to speak on that have not been previously mentioned.

Mr. Bradford states he doesn't feel the measurements for the lots are accurate as the current measurements are including the driveways.

Chairman Weeks asks Mr. Bradford if the signs were down on December 2nd.

Mr. Bradford states the signs were down on December 2nd and are still down now.

Gage Stewart, 4896 Muirfield, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Expressed concerns about flooding, just starting to get better, only a little bit better. Referred to the pictures that were submitted by Mr. Veron that illustrated the flooding and drainage issues. States he has worked with the parish on behalf of the Country Club on a new drainage project because the Country Club has been getting significantly eroded. The water has no where to go. The drainage in the area cannot handle anymore water. Feels issues in the area need to be resolved before any new subdivisions are brought in.

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Stewart if he has the name of the person or people that he has been working with for the drainage work that has already been going on.

Mr. Stewart states he has been working with Calcasieu Parish Police Jury, one of the head engineers for the parish, doesn't know all the names at the moment but could provide them to the Commissioners, also states he has worked with Allen Wainwright and Nick Young.

Cards of opposition of those whom did not wish to speak;

John Henry Faulk, 3142 St. Andrews Dr, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage, privacy, and property values.

Darleen Wallace, 3137 St. Andrews Dr, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage and added traffic.

David Wallace Jr., 3000 Bayou Bend Rd, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage and bypassing normal preliminary and final zoning protocols.

Debbie Dickson, 5 Little Drive, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage and flooding.

Nicholas Reina, 3146 St. Andrews Dr, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage. Also submitted a separate letter to Planning Commission in opposition.

Larry D. Stewart, MD, 3134 St. Andrews Dr, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage and flooding.

Michelle Andrus, 3138 St. Andrews Dr, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage, views and home values.

Jade Pedersen, 3133 St. Andrews Dr, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Concerns about drainage, landscape view, and traffic.

Chairman Weeks asks Ms. Loftin if she would like to give a rebuttal.

Ms. Loftin states that she understands the concerns over the drainage. The previous neighborhoods in the area were developed at a time when the drainage standards were not what they are now. It is their intention to move forward with this project with a higher level of drainage than the previous neighborhoods had. In respect to all of the individuals

in the area she is open to deferment to have further discussion about the concerns. Used to rent the property but stopped doing that as it was not in line with the surrounding areas, by right they could put two duplexes and rent a house but to be friendly to the neighboring areas has not done that. Willing to pull the application and come back again next month.

Mr. Sanders states no one should incur a fee for the deferment. Mr. Sanders makes a motion that the application be deferred to the January Meeting.

Mr. Joseph seconds the deferment.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on the deferment.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**PREFNL
25-24**

LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

APPLICANT: BLOCK 18 OF BARBE PROPERTIES LLC (TRACT K OF CONTRABAND POINTE)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to parcel a 1.2-acre tract of land M/L into one (1) development tract, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Northside 1500 Blk. W. Prien Lake Road.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to parcel a 1.2-acre tract of land M/L into one (1) development tract, within a Business Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable. Any approvals are conditioned on the applicant adhere to any recommendations or infrastructure improvements set forth by the Department of Engineering and Public Works.

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

Applicant not present.

Lauren Bynum states it is a simple subdivision request, the Commissioners could vote on it unless they wanted to have the applicant present.

Chairman Weeks asked if there were any questions or concerns.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

MCU 25-28 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: CONNOR GLENNON

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Minor Conditional Use Permit in order to construct a new RV/boat storage facility with metal façade material, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **5224 Nelson Road**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a new RV/Boat Storage Facility utilizing metal materials. Staff's review revealed that proposed metal material is an exposed fastener wall panel system. Staff finds this proposal does not meet the definition of architectural metal.

Chairman Weeks reads in MCU 25-28 with MAJ/VAR 25-13.

Mr. Sanders makes a motion to defer.

Mr. Joseph seconds the deferment.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

MAJ-VAR 25-13 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: CONNOR GLENNON

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 5-302(3)(b)(i)) in order to establish a storage facility with Variances to 1) allow a front setback reduction to 20' vs. required 25' and 2) reduction of landscape buffer along rear property line to 10' vs. required 15', within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **5224 Nelson Road**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit to establish a storage facility with variances to 1) allow a front setback reduction to 20' vs. required 25' and 2) reduction of landscape buffer along rear property line to 10' vs. required 15', within a Business Zoning District. Staff's review revealed the proposal is bordered to the North by a multifamily complex and to the West and South by vacant property.

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

Chris Khoury, 822 Ford St., Lake Charles, LA

States he had come before the Planning Commission a few years ago asking to build a three story self storage building, however due to the local market, demand and insurance rates and costs they have decided to make revisions to this project. It is a much smaller

scale project. The staff findings stated there were exposed fasteners, the purpose in doing a mixture of eifs and metal on a large building architecturally something is needed to break it up. Sites another building on the corner of Common and I-210 that their company has also built, stating this project will be of the same quality, single story, no additional impervious area, no negative effects on drainage. They had worked with the neighbors on the previous application to ensure no cars would be parked along the cross street, buffers, fence and that there would be light shields, and no windows facing the residential area. The developer is fine with these items that the neighbors had asked for with the previous application. Lower unit density, smaller project, less concerns over issues with traffic, and drainage. States they will also meet the architectural metal condition. If it was solid eifs it would not look as nice.

Mr. Schram states he did not see any of the specifics the applicant had agreed to with the neighbors sited in the application. Such as limited parking on the side street.

Mr. Khoury states they were items of concern that were brought up at the previous public meeting, maybe about two years ago. States they want to be good neighbors.

Mr. Schram states things that have been informally agreed to with the neighbors that the Commissioners are not aware of, the Commissioners can't do anything with that. One of the things that is important is entry and exit only to and from Nelson Road.

Mr. Khoury agrees.

Mr. Schram states he remembers from the previous discussion the concerns about traffic on the side street. Suggests if this application is approved that it is limited to the floor plan provided.

Mr. Khoury agrees. If the application needs to be amended to include those stipulations they are good with that.

Mr. Berryhill indicates the picture of the building that was provided with the application and asks Mr. Khoury if that is what they are building.

Mr. Khoury conforms.

Mr. Berryhill asks if it a two or three story building.

Mr. Khoury states it is a single story building.

Mr. Berryhill asks if the sign will be on the side of the building as indicated in the picture.

Mr. Khoury states that is the side that is fronting Nelson Road.

Mr. Berryhill states he had concerns about the signage being on the side of the building that faces the cross street.

Mr. Khoury states sometimes they do both the side and the front but it fine if it is just on the side that faces Nelson Road.

Mr. Berryhill would like to make a stipulation that the signage only be on the front of the building and meet all regulations with the current code.

Mr. Khoury states the signage will meet and exceed all requirements of the code.

Mr. Berryhill asks if all the lighting will be retained on the property, if any lights will shine onto the neighbors.

Mr. Khoury confirms the lighting will be retained on the property. They have been sensitive to the lighting with the residences that are adjacent.

Mr. Sanders states that Mr. Khoury had mentioned eifs but there is no rendering of the project (indicates the picture that was provided) stating it appears to be brick with some kind of metal facade.

Mr. Khoury states it will be eifs and metal.

Mr. Sanders asks if the eifs will be where the brick is in this rendering.

Mr. Khoury confirms and also states it might also be the part around the windows that would be eifs. States it is about a 55/45 mix of eifs and metal.

Mr. Sanders states the specific restrictions are no exposed fasteners for metal, but all of the proposals that were submitted specifically state exposed fastening system.

Mr. Khoury states he doesn't see any exposed fasteners on the renderings.

Mr. Sanders states not on the rendering but all of the attachments provided to the Commissioners state the exposed fastening system, and that is the problem, the floor plan shown gives an idea what the project will look like from overhead and then there are all the attachments from the manufacturer that show some kind of siding all of which are an exposed fastening panel system.

Mr. Khoury states they are happy to adhere to not allowing any exposed fasteners. States he has come across this problem before, when a supplier calls something an exposed fastener when there is none showing.

Mr. Sanders states the Commissioners have to go by what was submitted, and what was submitted was an EBD panel exposed fastening system.

Mr. Khoury states he believes there to be some disconnect with the engineering firm.

Mr. Berryhill asks Mr. Khoury if he would be opposed to postponing this application to next month and come back with a rendering that is appropriate for this ask.

Mr. Khoury states he could but would like to propose to keep going as it is the same project that had been approved before and they are happy to meet all requirements.

Mr. Berryhill states the problem is that it has occurred more than once where the Planning Commission are provided documents, photos and verbiage then it will be said none of that applies it is going to be different, therefore it is confusing for the Commissioners to make a sound judgment on what is being asked for especially when there is this large of a development and it is going in an area where there are residents, and there is a very busy road. Doesn't feel like the Planning Commission has all of the needed information and feels like it would be leaving it to chance.

Mr. Khoury states he agrees to defer and states they will submit a different page showing the correct metal system.

Mr. Berryhill states this discussion can go much quicker when they have the precise plans and materials being used.

Mr. Khoury states that this is the same as what was presented last time, except it is a single story and lower density.

Mr. Sanders states out of all that has been discussed all that the Commissioners have is a floor plan, and copies from the vendor. Also states it would be helpful to have a clear picture of what is being built on site.

Mr. Khoury states he thought that was more for the permitting process.

Chairman Weeks states that the Commissioners are here to approve the packet that was submitted.

Mr. Khoury states he wished they wouldn't have submitted that.

Mr. Sanders makes a motion to defer to the January meeting.

Chairman Weeks apologizes, he got ahead of himself, as there are cards of opposition.

Chairman Weeks recognizes Greg Norsworthy and states the application will be deferred and asks Mr. Norsworthy if he is good with that.

Greg Norsworthy, 1844 Rhorer Road, Lake Charles, LA

Mr. Norsworthy confirms.

Tim Castle, 1902 Linden Lane, Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

States the previous discussions about traffic on the Rhorer Road and the parking during construction. Would like something in writing from the developer. On the south side of the development it was said there would be landscaping there to break up the facade.

Mr. Sanders makes a motion to defer.

Mr. Joseph seconds the motion to defer.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

Chairman Weeks states in closing submit a clear and complete packet and also be a good neighbor. Many things can be hashed out before it comes before the Planning Commission.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-61 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: FRANCIS MILLER., JR.

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to maintain an unpermitted carport addition 12.5' from front property line vs. required 30' front setback, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **2733 Lorraine Lane**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to maintain an unpermitted carport addition 12.5' from front property line vs. required 30' front setback, within a Residential Zoning District. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward position of support.

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

Francis Miller, 2733 Lorraine Lane, Lake Charles, LA

Apologizes as he didn't know about the setback or the permit. States they had hired a contractor that told them he would take care of all that. The reason they put the carport up is because when it rains the concrete gets wet, he states he is 87 years old and is afraid of falling or slipping.

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any questions.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-62 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: HERMAN STEVENS

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to 1) construct a gravel parking lot behind existing commercial building and 2) reduce rear bufferyard to 5' vs. required 15' and reduce south side bufferyard to 8' vs. required 15', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **2100 Enterprise Blvd**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to 1) construct a gravel parking lot behind existing commercial building and 2) reduce rear bufferyard to 5' vs. required 15' and reduce south side bufferyard to 8' vs. required 15', within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Staff's review revealed the site is bordered on the West by a vacant lot.

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

Herman Stevens, 2912 McNeese Farm Road, Lake Charles, LA

Asking for a gravel parking lot behind an existing business. There used to be a home and one tree there, currently it is grass and 12 trees. Asking for gravel parking and to meet the intent of the law and regulations it will be screened, and a six foot privacy fence.

Mr. Joseph asked what happened to the home that was there.

Mr. Stevens stated it was damaged by the hurricane.

Mr. Sanders states gravel parking is not permitted but it can be done under certain circumstances. Typically that would involve an apron to where the gravel doesn't get out into the road. The distance of the apron can vary. Asks what the setback is on the north side from the building to the edge of the road way.

Mr. Stevens states he is unsure of the exact setback. Maybe 15 feet. States he will be extending a fence to the building and does not have an issue doing a concrete apron.

Mr. Sanders offers an amendment stating if the gravel parking is permitted then a concrete apron to be installed from the curb to the fence.

Mr. Schram seconds the amendment.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on the amendment.

Amendment passed 5-0.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote as amended.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-64 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: AAA SIGNS/RYAN WILKINS

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to 1) construct a multi-tenant pylon sign vs. required monument style sign; 2) allow height of 25 ¼' vs. required maximum 10' height; and 3) allow business logo on base on proposed sign, within a Mixed Use-X Zoning District. Location of the request is **1920 E. McNeese Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to 1) construct a multi-tenant pylon sign vs. required monument style sign; 2) allow height of 25 ¼' vs. required maximum 10' height; and 3) allow business logo on base on proposed sign, within a Mixed Use-X Zoning District. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward position of support.

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

Ryan Wilkins, 109 Burgess, Broussard, LA

Representing AAA Signs. Sites other signage in the area that are over the 10 foot range, as well as other multi-tenant signs. During this process he was told this sign does not qualify as a multi-tenant sign. There are seven tenants all separately operate out of this one building, feels it is multi-tenant and would think a multi-tenant sign would be allowed. With the speed limit on the road of 50 mph, 350 to 500 feet is needed for visibility to read

a sign. The maximum ten feet required height would not be effective, designed sign with data supporting it at a size that would be suitable and effective to help these businesses flourish. The building is already pretty close to the road and with the landscaping there is no visibility until a person is within 100 feet of the business. States they are not asking for anything different than what is already up and down the road.

Chairman Weeks asks what are the other businesses that were observed.

Mr. Wilkins states Dominos, Batteries Plus and seven others. States there is a 90% chance some of the reason the other tenants are vacant is lack of visibility.

Chairman Weeks states Dominos is not going to shut down their ovens of because their sign isn't up.

Mr. Wilkins agrees but states signage is important.

Mr. Sanders asks staff if a business has a sign on the building if there are any further restrictions to signage on a pylon sign and if they can have them both.

Ms. Bynum states the City's ordinance for multi-tenant signs refers to an office park or a multi-building complex. For example the mall. In a strip mall shopping center concept a person will see the facade sign on the building.

Mr. Sanders asks if a business can have a sign on the building plus a pylon sign.

Ms. Bynum confirms and states it is a monument sign and it is per lot not per business.

Mr. Sanders states a monument style sign and a sign on the structure itself.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Mr. Wilkins states that the ordinance doesn't specifically say they can't have it but it is confusing and it comes to interpretation.

Ms. Bynum adds that the monument sign ordinance is relatively new and it has been implemented for the last year and a half to two years, which is probably why there are signs in the area that would not comply to the new sign ordinance.

Mr. Wilkins understands but feels that it is classified incorrectly. It is a multi-tenant building so it should have a multi-tenant sign, the ordinance doesn't say office park, it states multi-tenant building. States he thought they were following the rules.

Mr. Sanders states the applicant was following the rules for a pylon sign by proposing a 25 foot sign but that is in violation of the ten foot height requirement.

Mr. Wilkins states because of how it reads they thought they followed all the rules because they thought it was a multi-tenant sign for a shopping center. It is kind of confusing.

Chairman Weeks asks when it became confusing did Mr. Wilkins consult with Planning and Zoning.

Mr. Wilkins states that is why they are here.

Chairman Weeks states Mr. Wilkins stated it was confusing and asked if he checked with Planning and Zoning prior.

Mr. Wilkins states it was only confusing after the application was denied.

Mr. Sanders asks how the height of 25 foot with an ordinance of 10 feet is confusing.

Mr. Wilkins states because it is multi-tenant sign and a multi-tenant building.

Mr. Sanders asks if there is a difference between a multi-tenant sign and a non multi-tenant with respect to height of the sign.

Mr. Wilkins states if it wasn't multi-tenant then they would be allowed a smaller monument sign for that specific business only. States if they were to put up a multi-tenant ten foot sign they would have about 12 inches of space for each tenant which is not adequate.

Mr. Schram states he didn't understand an answer to Mr. Sanders question about the height restriction on a multi-tenant sign.

Mr. Wilkins states he cannot answer that exactly and the sign was designed per the way they interpreted the code at the time. For example the signs at Planet Fitness and Urban Air are about 30 feet tall and on off the interstate that was just done that is about 40 feet tall.

Ms. Bynum states they came before the Planning Commission for a variance for that height. The current sign ordinance is ten feet and if it is off the interstate it is fifteen feet.

Mr. Wilkins asked if they got a variance for that sign.

Ms. Bynum states the one off the interstate, yes. Planet Fitness would be an example of an existing non-conforming sign, it was built well before the sign ordinance changed.

Mr. Schram states the only recent example that he recalls is the charter school that is down the block from this location and the Planning Commission allowed them to make a 15 or 16 foot monument style sign.

Ms. Bynum states she thinks it was fifteen feet and their mascot logo is what protruded not the whole sign.

Mr. Wilkins states that another hardship for this building is the position of the building and the parking. If they were to put a sign up where this is allowed because of utilities, the vehicles that park there are going to block 80% of the sign.

Mr. Schram states the bottom of these signs start at ten feet off the ground.

Mr. Wilkins states it was designed that way so it wouldn't get blocked.

Mr. Schram states there is more than enough room to clear a vehicle.

Mr. Wilkins confirms and states he is not opposed if they have to enclose the bottom and lower it a little bit. A ten foot sign would be inadequate and almost useless for the shopping center.

Mr. Sanders asks if they are willing to change it or would Mr. Wilkins like it to be voted on as is, if they are willing to reduce it to some level and we can vote on that as opposed to a 25 foot sign.

Mr. Wilkins states yes, it is not the size of the sign but the height. Willing to cut it down some and enclose the base of it.

Mr. Sanders states it is a big ask to go from a ten foot sign to twenty five feet.

Mr. Wilkins states twenty feet. Feels if they go any lower than that it wouldn't be very useful. The sign is very tasteful and will fit in down the road.

Mr. Sanders asks if twenty feet is the magic number.

Mr. Wilkins confirms.

Mr. Schram moves to amend the application to an overall height of 20 feet and also require that the entire base be enclosed to create a monument effect.

Mr. Berryhill seconds the amendment.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on the amendment.

Amendment passes 5-0.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote as amended.

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

For: 4 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III and Reginald Weeks

Against: 1 - Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-65 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: AAA SIGNS/KYLE STELLY

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to 1) construct a ground sign vs. required monument style sign; and 2) allow height of 17'8" vs. required maximum 10' height, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **3403 Broad Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to 1) construct a ground sign vs. required monument style sign; and 2) allow height of 17'8" vs. required maximum 10' height, within a Business Zoning District. Staff can find no evidence of hardship, therefore cannot forward position of support.

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

Kyle Stelly, 109 Burgess, Broussard, LA

This sign is for the new RV Park on Broad Street called Rustic Oak, customer wants a rustic looking sign. Would like to have two wooden timbers buried and the ground and come up to hold the sign. The ten foot height was originally agreed with but the owner

then put up an eight foot rod iron fence with ten foot stone columns. If they put up a ten foot sign the ten foot columns would block the signage. The sign cannot be located between the fence and Broad St. as it is a utility easement. The sign has to go on the interior of the fence and they need to bring the sign up to 17 feet to clear the top of the fence and the columns. On the design if the bottom is filled in it would take away the aesthetic of the wooden timbers and the rustic look that the owner is going for.

Mr. Schram states if he is not mistaken Broad Street is a collector street and it isn't supposed to have any fences along a collector road. From his point of view ignore the fence and the need to raise the sign up enough to clear it. States he doesn't have an opinion on the configuration of the sign yet.

Mr. Sanders asks staff if the fence is violation of an ordinance.

Ms. Bynum states yes, on a collector or arterial street a fence is not allowed to be in front of the setback of the building.

Mr. Stelly states he doesn't know if the fence is in front of the building, the fence allows the RV's into the side entrance. The fence and the front of the building are on the same plane.

Mr. Sanders clarifies there is a fence in violation and they are wanting to build a sign that is taller than the fence that is in violation of the ordinance.

Chairman Weeks confirms.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 0

Against: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-66

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: CITY OF LAKE CHARLES RECREATION DEPT./MIKE CASTILLE

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to remove and replace an existing ground sign vs. required monument style sign, within a Business Zoning District. Location of the request is **3801 Nelson Road**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to remove and replace an existing ground sign vs. required monument style sign, within a Business Zoning District. Staff's review revealed this sign replacement is part of a citywide park signage replacement plan.

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

Hannah Veasey, 219 Laurel Street, Lake Charles, LA

Representing the City of Lake Charles. In 2022 post hurricane a park re-branding campaign was started. A lot of the old signs were removed, this is an effort to continue that and some of the rules have changed since the start of the project. The current sign

that is there now is very similar to this one and the new sign will be set back a little further to improve visibility when entering and exiting the park.

Mr. Schram asks why did the City want to replace a sign and not comply with the City's ordinance.

Ms. Veasey states there has been some disconnect as to which parks are operated by who and when the other parks were re-branded they are trying to go with the same style of sign.

Ms. Bynum states that the comprehensive sign replacement plan was started well before the sign ordinance changed.

Mr. Schram states that the sign shown in the picture could be converted to a monument style sign and still keep the branding effect.

Ms. Veasey said there were considering changing the sign but they have to look at the pricing as well.

Mr. Schram states that the City has created this rule which is difficult to administer, it is not a good look for the City not to follow their own rule. In respect to the cost effect that is understood but asks if there is any appetite to turn the sign into a monument sign.

Ms. Veasey states it can be looked into, this is just the first step.

Mr. Schram states he would be willing to approve that if the bottom was closed in.

Ms. Veasey states she doesn't believe it would be an issue to enclose the bottom of the sign.

Mr. Berryhill states the applicant could withdraw the application if it is a monument sign (variance not needed) or they could vote on it the way that it is.

Chairman Weeks asks what the bottom of the sign needs to be constructed of.

Ms. Bynum states it would need to be non-metal, the ordinance states the material needs to match the building but in this case, there is no building. Also asks applicant what would help the conversation with finance.

Mr. Sanders states they are going to vote on the application as is.

Mr. Schram asks if a denial is better than a withdrawal.

Ms. Bynum states a denial would help more with finance.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 0

Against: 5 - Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-67**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

APPLICANT: CITY OF LAKE CHARLES RECREATION DEPT./MIKE CASTILLE

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to construct an accessory parking lot on a separate lot in order to support a city park, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southwest corner of Cessford Street @ N. Shattuck Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct an accessory parking lot on a separate lot in order to support a city park, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Staff's review revealed the proposed parking area is across from the community center to support Goosport Park. The parking lot will meet all development standards, therefore staff recommends approval.

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

Hannah Veasey, 219 Laurel Street, Lake Charles, LA

A parking lot to support Goosport park. Plans to beautify the area, will comply with all City regulations and ordinances.

Chairman Weeks asks if the pool is heated.

Ms. Veasey confirms.

Mr. Berryhill states that according to the satellite photo there is no crosswalk.

Ms. Veasey states they do intend to talk with Public Works to get a crosswalk.

Mr. Sanders asks if this application is because the parking lot is on a separate piece of property.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-68**CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE**

APPLICANT: SHANNON SMITH CONSTRUCTION

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to 1) construct two (2) additional curb cuts 100ft. M/L from intersecting streets (Kirkman Street and Swanee Street); and 2) allow 40ft. wide throat vs. maximum 30ft., within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **3735 Kirkman Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the applicant is

requesting to 1) construct two (2) additional curb cuts 100ft. M/L from intersecting streets (Kirkman Street and Swanee Street); and 2) allow 40ft. wide throat vs. maximum 30ft., within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Although there are other existing non-conforming curb cuts in the area, staff cannot forward a position of support.

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

Jason Doucet, 4051 Paul White Rd, Lake Charles, LA

Project manager for Shannon Smith Construction. Asking that the variance is approved as is, would like to have the 40 foot wide throat but could acquiesce to 30 feet if needed, but would like to have the 40 feet for the comfort of turning in.

Mr. Sanders asks if it will be a concrete parking lot.

Mr. Doucet confirms.

Mr. Schram asks what type of vehicles will be coming in that require a 40 foot turning radius.

Mr. Doucet states medium duty to a bit larger trucks will be coming in. The streets are small and would like to come in from Swanee.

Mr. Berryhill asks if they are currently having to back in.

Mr. Doucet confirms and states they are off loading in the street at the moment and would like to alleviate that.

Mr. Sanders asks if the trucks will come in from Swanee and then down the north side of the building.

Mr. Doucet confirms.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-69

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: CALCAM PARKING, LLC

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to allow a guard shack and chain-link fencing for a period of time which would exceed the permittable temporary allowance of 6 months, within a T-5 Urban Center Transect Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southside 100 and 200 Blks. of W. Pryce Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to maintain an existing unpermitted guard shack and chainlink fencing on a temporary basis exceeding the maximum allowable six month period. The anticipated timeline for this project is up to three years. Although this project is to support LNG

projects and the I10 bridge project, staff cannot forward a position of support.

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

Tom Gayle, 713 Kirby St., Lake Charles, LA

Representing on behalf of CalCam Parking LLC. These are the two old Harrah's employee parking lots, one is owned by the Stream family and the other by Mr. Patel. This location had been previously used as Park & Ride, DOTD is trying to get the LNG Industries to spread out their Park & Rides so that there is no football stadium effect, where there are a lot of people exiting onto the street at the same time. This Park & Ride will serve the LNG in Hackberry. Same previous use, but the difference this time is that a security fence was put up to discourage theft. Cannot use the old Bell lots that are located along the interstate anymore because of the bridge project. The guard shacks are C-cans, they have been finished out and they are there to have an attendant at the lot to ensure permitted parking and security. There are no sleeping quarters, there are no restrooms. Believes by the City's definition that makes it a temporary structure. They know that the lease contract is longer than that, and the other option is to move the guard shack on and off the lot every 6 months to keep it as a temporary structure. However, they felt it a better method to come before the Planning Commission and let known their intentions.

Chairman Weeks asks if this is not a permanent use and only temporary then is the ask is for an extension.

Mr. Gayle confirms, a variance to extend the temporary nature.

Chairman Weeks asks how much of an extension is being requested.

Mr. Gayle states it depends how long it takes LNG to build, and how long the lots are viable. Right now the lease time is three years.

Chairman Weeks states he doesn't want to commit the three years but is ok with a six month extension. At that time there will be more clarification on time.

Mr. Sanders states they have 6 months as of right and asks for clarification if it will be extended an additional 6 months to be revisited in one years time.

Ms. Bynum states for clarification the application asked for 3 years.

Mr. Schram states another factor is the new facility that is going to be built where the bank tower was has a year and a half to two year completion date on it. Parking and many things can change after that is built and doesn't feel this extension should be granted longer than the completion date of the new build.

Mr. Gayle states technically all that they are talking about is the guard shack, it's a parking lot and it is private property and it is leased for their parking, so the question is if they can have an attendant to keep the homeless people out and protect the vehicles. If the attendant is not allowed then it is still, as of right, a useable leased parking lot.

Chairman Weeks states he is not sure if the new build in place of the bank tower has started to get bids yet and it will be a clearer picture in 6 months.

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Gayle if all that is needed is approval for the guard shack.

Mr. Gayle confirms, the Stream family owns the parking lot and have leased it out as they

want and states they could be cutesy about it and pull the guard shack on and off every 6 months but feels that would be circumventing what they are trying to accomplish.

Mr. Sanders states that the ordinance reads exceeds the maximum 6 month period. Therefore they can have a guard shack on premises for 6 months.

Ms. Bynum states they would allow temporary uses, for example if they only needed it for 6 months, however this exceeds that temporary allowable time. Cannot call a three year period of time to be considered temporary.

Mr. Sanders states the way the ordinance is worded is exceeds the maximum allowable 6 month period, and asks if that means they can have it there for 6 months.

Ms. Bynum confirms, and states much like one would have a trailer on a job site.

Chairman Weeks asks if can be there an additional 6 months without it being voted on.

Ms. Bynum states it can be there for 6 months.

Mr. Sanders states that they could say an additional 6 months and that would give them a year and then the Planning Commission could come back and revisit. The first 6 months being of right.

Ms. Bynum confirms.

Mr. Sanders states that in a year there would be a better idea of what the applicant's projects look like and what I-10 would look like.

Mr. Gayle states again they are just talking about the guard shack. It is private property that will be leased as a parking lot whether it is approved or not.

Mr. Sanders states the way the application reads is an unpermitted guard shack and chain link fencing. Asks if there is an issue with the fencing from an ordinance stand point.

Ms. Bynum states the fencing has been there and if they were talking about a completely new use on the property the fencing would have to go and landscaping put in.

Mr. Sanders asks if before the application if anyone was saying the fence had to go and landscaping needed to be put in.

Ms. Bynum states no, the lot was not being used.

Chairman Weeks asks who is manning the gate.

Mr. Gayle states CalCam Parking, they way it works is the contractors will contract with an individual and in this case it is Cal Cam, and the contractor will say they need a parking lot in a location then they find a parking lot close to that location and a fence is put up and they have a person manning the gate to make sure who is pulling in and they have the right permit.

Chairman Weeks asks if that is 24/7.

Mr. Gayle states it depends on the job, needs and the shifts. DOTD wants to diversify the

parking, with workers coming in from the east they would stop at Chennault or here, and they do different lots at different times.

Mr. Sanders offers an amendment stating instead of the three year ask, they have would have a twelve month period then revisit.

Mr. Berryhill seconds the amendment.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment passed 5-0.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote as amended.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Adam McBride

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Weeks informed the commission that it is time to elect a new Chairman and Vice Chairman.

Mr. Schram nominated Mr. McBride as Chairman. Mr. Berryhill seconds the nomination. 4 were in favor, Reginald Weeks abstained.

Mr. Sanders nominated Reginald Weeks as Vice Chairman. Mr. Berryhill seconds the nomination. All were in favor.

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*