



City of Lake Charles

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

Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

Monday, February 10, 2025

5:00 PM

Council Chambers

OPEN MEETING

Vice Chairman Gus Schram called the meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order at approximately 5:00pm, and requested a roll call. Mr. Joseph led the prayer and Mr. Berryhill led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Gus Schram III, and Thomas Sanders Jr.
Absent 1 - Reginald Weeks
Excused 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asked if everyone received a copy of the minutes from the previous meeting. Mr. Joseph made a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Berryhill seconded the motion. All in favor.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Vice Chairman Gus Schram asked if there are any special announcements?

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

COMMISSION BUSINESS

ANX 25-01

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: LIONEL PESCHIER/LINDSEY PRIOLA/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting annexation approval of 1.09-acres M/L, and generally described as **5100 Powell Lane**.

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.

Vice Chairman Gus Schram then states now to back up to the first item annexation 25-01, applicant Lionel Peschier and Lindsey Priola, City of Lake Charles is requesting annexation approval of 1.09 acres more or less and is described as 5100 Powell Lane.

Lauren Bynum reads the staff findings.

Mr. Sanders states before the presentation he would like to abstain due to previous

involvement with the Peschier estate. Mr. Schram agrees.

*Mr. Tom Gale, 713 Kirby St., Lake Charles, LA 70601
This is a postage stamp area of the parish that is surrounded by the city. The idea is to have a residential development and annex it into the city, it is just off of Country Club Road. They will work on plans in the future but for right now the request is for the annexation. They do have city services and utilities already there. It seems logical that this will fit in with the city.*

Mr. Schram asks for questions and states there are a couple of cards.

*John Vickers, 4604 Powell Ln., Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Lives across the street from the property in question. This is referred to as the donut hole. No one pays taxes here. The house has been vacant since may of 2021. The house is two to three feet lower than the surrounding. A three sided canal is now a gully. If it annexed into the city is the city going to maintain the property? The property in question on the southeast side has two ditches that drain into the yard. The property holds water.*

Mr. Schram thanks him for his comments.

Mr. Schram states the next card does not want to speak but have comments for the record.

*Allen Sheffield, 5414 Powell Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Would like to be clear about what is to be done, and questions on property values.*

Mr. Schram states he is not sure what the question is, but none of us are authorities to determine property values, we respect property values but we can litigate that here.

Mr. Schram asks if there any other questions.

Mr. Schram asks for the vote.

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

For: 4 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Abstain: 1 - Thomas Sanders Jr.

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**ANXZON
25-01**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: LIONEL PESCHIER/LINDSEY PRIOLA/CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting a zoning classification of Residential Zoning District of 1.09-acres M/L, and generally described as **5100 Powell Lane**.

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.

Vice Chairman Gus Schram states this is a corresponding item.

Lauren Bynum clarifies that this is to establish the zoning.

Mr. Schram asks for cards and questions. Mr. Schram points out that all that is being done here is an annexation and a rezoning to correspond the city's zoning classification to what the parish 's zoning classification is at present. Any other development of this property that affects the drainage or the property will have to come here again in the future once they have the actual plan.

Mr. Schram calls for the vote.

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

For: 4 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill and Gus Schram III

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Abstain: 1 - Thomas Sanders Jr.

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

PREFNL-M LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS/CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORD. AJ 25-03

APPLICANT: NICHOLAS HOMES, LLC (NICHOLAS HOMES SOUTH SUBDIVISION)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a .56-acre tract of land M/L into four (4) residential lots including a Major Conditional Use Permit for private drive access, within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is **4153 W. Prien Lake Road.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the proposed subdivision of a .56 acre tract of land into 4 residential tracts with a Major Conditional Use permit for private drive access from W. Prien Lake Road. The property is bordered on all sides by what appears to be single family residential properties and to the North by an empty lot. If approved, applicant will have to comply with any recommendations made by the Department of Engineering and Public Works.

Vice Chairman Schram asked applicant to state name and address for the record. Jonathan Jimney, 4413 Lake St., Lake Charles, LA 70601 JK Custom Homes

Mr. Schram asks applicant to explain what they are going to do.

Mr. Jimney states they are asking for 4153 W. Prien Lake Rd. to have 4 homes built to be subdivided where they can be sold off one at a time if that were to be the owner's wishes.

Mr. Schram asks the applicant to repeat what he had said about the lot in between.

Mr. Jimney states the lot in between is currently being developed with six approved by the board in the last couple of years. They are very similar townhouse structures they are just independent.

Mr. Schram states but they are not subdivided. Mr. Jimney agrees the lot in between is not subdivided.

Mr. McBride asks if the four lots that are going to be subdivided met the minimum lot size requirements. Asks if this is maybe a question for Lauren Bynum. It is not stated in the text.

Lauren Bynum states yes it should meet the minimum lot size requirements. Yes it has been reviewed and it meets the minimum lot size requirements.

Mr. McBride states that it would be helpful to have that stated in the documentation. Lauren Bynum agrees.

Mr. Berryhill asks if there is a plan to build just the four homes.

Mr. Jimney indicates a site plan and says yes that shows the plan for four structures.

Mr. McBride asks where is the driveway.

Mr. Jimney states it is a private drive that goes down the middle.

Mr. McBride asks if the driveway is included in the lots or is it separate.

Mr. Jimney states it is included, the division line goes down the middle of the driveway.

Mr. Sanders asks if there is any plan to connect the two properties.

Mr. Jimney states no.

Mr. Schram asks what is the drainage setup.

Mr. Jimney states they will have a site survey done to figure out the drainage like they had done with the property just North of it. It did require some underground drainage, but everything will drain to the private road (concrete) and before it hits Prien lake Road a catch basin would be put in.

Mr. Schram asks if Mr. Jimney has anything else he would like to add. Mr. Jimney says no.

Mr. Schram states there are a few cards.

Tracie Wilfer, 4225 W. Prien Lake Rd., Lake Charles, LA -In Opposition

Ms. Wilfer states that she is the single resident house to the south of the property in question. Ms. Wilfer states that she came before the City Council two years ago when the same family wanted to put six homes on 4153 W. Prien Lake Rd., that was defeated and they have the same concerns now that they did then. This is a 0.56 acre tract of land for forty two years before the hurricane a very small single family residence sat on that property. Cannot image at 4153 four additional properties. expressed safety concerns and flooding concerns. Ms. Wilfer states that they would do anything to protect their single family residences with real neighbors.

Scott Scofield, 4112 magnolia Ridge, Lake Charles, LA -In opposition

Mr. Scofield states Ms. Wilfer lives right behind them. The property to the North of the vacant lot in his opinion are tall, not well built, real close to the street, they add no value and take value away from us, they have drainage issues. The owner of the empty lot has three empty lots in his neighborhood, why isn't he building them there. the ugly home that

he built, why didn't he build them next to his house rather than my house. We object to the build on the same grounds we objected to before.

*Louis Haxthausen, 2715 Myrtle Grove, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Live in the Shadows subdivision that is adjacent to the property in question on Prien Lake Rd. John Sturlese and the Parada's build four patio style homes, they were very nice, brick veneer, the drainage is there and everything is fine. The problem is next door they built two that are not consistent with the neighborhood. For lack of a better term they look like clapboard houses, there is no brick veneer, they are not nicely appointed, it is as if they built these as cheaply and inexpensively as possible. If this does not have proper drainage it will cause problems. Objects to it being rezoned. Is not impressed with what is seen with the first two.*

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Jimney to come back up.

Mr. Jimney asks if he can give a quick point of clarification. The four houses that were referenced were built previously, they do have a different facade. On the property already approved for six only two have been built so far. Didn't want anyone to think that he had misspoke or gave bad information. The four that are completed are north of us and the first lot that we are working on now was approved for six a couple of years ago. we are asking for four here (4153 W. Prein Lake Rd.) I cannot begin to tell you what the facade will be for those, it is not even in the planning stages yet. Respects all the neighbors and their opinions, that is why we are here but as of right and Lauren can correct if I am wrong, but believes that two of anything residentially can be built on the lot in question tomorrow and we wouldn't even be here. It is big enough, two access points could be made, and those could be any size, any height, no quams, no questions, this is really just about splitting the property into a quadrangle, four pieces so those could be sold off. Doesn't know that the intention is going to be rent, Doesn't know what kind of neighbors as that is yet to be determined.

Mr. Schram asks for an explanation of intention for the four units here and the six units in the other spot.

Mr. Jimney asks intention (meaning).

Mr. Schram asks if they are going to continue to build out the six units. Mr. Jimney says yes.

Mr. Schram asks if they (the six units) are all on one piece of property.

Mr. Jimney states yes all on one piece of property.

Mr. Schram states they can't be sold individually.

Mr. Jimney agrees and states they can't be sold individually if all six are built there. They can be sold as a lump.

Mr. Schram states that it would then be an investment for somebody then. Mr. Jimney agrees.

Mr. Schram states that the four in question are intended to be sold separately.

Mr. Jimney states they could be sold independently.

Mr. Schram states the intention is not know then if the four will be sold individually or rented. Mr. Jimney agrees.

Mr. Jimney states that they wanted the option for either.

Lauren Bynum states as of right they could put five units on that property.

Mr. Schram asked space wise. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Jimney then states then why are we here.

Mr. Joseph states he thinks we are here because there are concerns, because they have been living in the area for so many years. So when something is said like that, I could do this and they can be at home.

Mr. Jimney agrees that this step has to be done.

Mr. Joseph states that when you make a statement like that it makes me think that you don't care, whatever you could put anything.

Mr. Jimney apologizes. Mr Jimney goes on to explain that it was stated that they could have five and they are here begging for four with hat in hand.

Mr. Haxthausen states he has a question.

Mr. Schram calls him back up.

Mr. Haxthausen states he drives by these pretty regularly and in front of both of them (that have already been constructed) there is a for sale sign and also a for rent sign.

Mr. Sanders discusses the previous development and states that a drainage study had to be done. Lauren Bynum agrees. Mr. Sanders also states that there had to be no windows on the eastern walls, an eight foot privacy fence and a concrete pad leading out to W. Prien Lake Rd. had been added. Lauren Bynum agrees.

Mr. Sanders states that previously they had asked for six units and now they are asking for four. Asks is the only difference in the request between then and now is the number of units.

Lauren Bynum states that the difference is now four units instead of six but also that it is subdivided, so they could sell the property if subdivided. To the point there is no other difference, the concerns remain the same.

Mr. Sanders asks if there would be a fence requirement on the northern and southern border because they both would all be residential.

Lauren Bynum states the southern border because it is single family residential would require a six foot privacy fence. Reading the previous amendments a taller, eight foot fence was required. The eastern side would require a six foot privacy fence as well. he is asking to subdivide to make it single family residential so a fence would not be required in between.

Mr. Sanders states there would have to be a six foot fence on the southern side, and there would be a six foot fence on the eastern side or not.

Lauren Bynum states yes.

Mr. Sanders states that previously they had said an eight foot rather than six foot fence on the eastern side.

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Sanders if he is thinking they should lay in the same amendments. Mr. Sanders confirms.

Mr. Schram asks if this would need to happen before they would consider the proposal. Mr. Sanders confirms.

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Sanders to read in the proposed amendments.

Mr. Sanders states he would like to make an amendment. Prior to any construction a drainage study be conducted and provided to staff, that there would be no windows on the eastern facing walls at the rear of the development, that would be number two, that if it does not already exist an eight foot privacy fence be constructed along the eastern property line, that would be number three, number four would be a concrete pad installed along W. Prien Lake Rd. for trash cans on trash day, number five there would be a minimum of four parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Schram asks for a second.

Lauren Bynum asks if they want the six foot fence on the north and the south.

Mr. Sanders states thank you for reminding me, yes, that there would be a six foot privacy fence that would be in conformity with the City of Lake Charles requirements, running east and west on the northern border and running east and west on the southern border.

Mr. McBride states he seconds that.

Mr. Schram states that there is an amendment. Asks if there is any discussion of it. He doesn't see any hands going up.

Mr Jimney asks if that question was for them or for all.

Mr. Schram asks if Mr. Jimney would like to make a comment.

Mr. Jimney states that he has a question about the fence on the northern border, that would be connecting to the same owner's property. Asks Lauren Bynum for clarification if that is something that would be required, the border is requesting that, but that would be the length of the property, and it would be there if the ownership changed.

Lauren Bynum states technically since you are subdividing them to single family residential it would be the responsibility of the northern property owner to provide the fence, but since it is all one property go ahead and do the fence.

Mr. Schram calls for a vote on the amendment.

Lauren Bynum states four in favor, one against. The amendment has been approved. Lauren states she will read it in. Mr. McBride in favor, Mr. Berryhill in favor, Mr. Schram in favor, Mr. Joseph against, and Mr. Sanders in favor.

Mr. Schram states they are now back to voting on the amended proposal. Asks if there is any further discussion of that. No further discussions.

Mr. Schram calls for the vote.

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

For: 0

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

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**PREFNL
25-04**

LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

APPLICANT: TROY STINE (TERRE SAINTE SUBDIVISION, PHASE 3)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a 1.93-acre tract of land M/L into seven (7) residential lots, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southside 1100 Blk. W. Sallier Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the proposed re-subdivision of a 1.93-acre tract of land into seven (7) residential lots, within a Residential Zoning District, meets the minimum lot size and configuration set forth for a Residential Zoning District. Staff recommends approval of the application on the condition applicants adhere to any recommendations by the Department of Engineering and Public Works.

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

Troy Stine, 800 Ryan St. Ste. 200, Lake Charles, LA

Mr. Stine states that they had developed Terre Sainte a while back and this portion of Terre saint is facing Sallier. Currently it is subdivided into eleven lots, they are finding that larger lots are being requested so they are requesting to rezone to seven lots that are wider with front entrances. Between St. Ann and St. Joseph they will mirror the width to the lots across from them. Also states that it will look better from Sallier and have more appeal for the property owner. Two of the lots will be donated to St. Jude to build the St. Jude house.

Mr. Schram ask for any questions. Mr. Schram states there are no cards.

Mr. Schram states to Mr. Stine that according to his correspondence that he may have someone who wants to but all the lots.

Mr. Stine states lots sixteen and nineteen are going to be for Laroque Homes to build the St. Jude homes. This year lot sixteen and next year lot nineteen. In addition two custom builders but no on the other three lots.

Mr. Schram calls for a vote.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

**REZONE-M
AJ-VAR
25-01**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: PETERSON VENTURES, LLC/MARK PETERSON

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting to amend the official zoning map (Sec. 24-5-207) from a Residential Zoning District to a Neighborhood Zoning District in companion with a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 24-4-207(4)(b)) in order to establish a pediatric therapy clinic with Variances to 1) exceed allowable sq.ft. of gross floor area; 2) allow bufferyard reduction to 1ft. vs. 15ft. along north and south property lines to allow for driveway and parking; and 3) reduction of bufferyard/landscaping along front property line. Location of the request is **3717 Lake Street**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to rezone the property to establish a pediatric therapy clinic with variances to 1) exceed allowable sq.ft. of gross floor area; 2) allow bufferyard reduction to 1ft. vs. 15ft. along north and south property lines to allow for driveway and parking; and 3) reduction of bufferyard/landscaping along front property line. Staff's review revealed the property is surrounded on all sides by residential properties. Staff can find no evidence of hardship and therefore cannot forward a position of support. If approved the property must meet landscape and bufferyard requirements in including a 6' privacy fence.

*Vice Chairman Gs Schram asked applicant to state name and address for the record.
Mr. Milo Nickel on behalf of Mark Petterson, 3808 Placid Ln., Lake Charles, LA*

Mr. Nickel stated the first part of the proposal is to change the zoning from residential to neighborhood. In 2019 a study had been done, this area was identified as upgraded to a proposed neighborhood, that was the long term plan, so it is consistent with that long term plan. The first variance is to increase the square footage of the house. The house is a little over 2500 now and they would also like to close in the garage structures outside to be used for storage. The buffer zone is because of the parking and driveway situation. On the front of the property there is a driveway now and some additional parking will also be in the front which is why they have asked for the buffer variance on the street frontage. On the North and South of the property, the North side is where they presently have a driveway and the garage structures. The south side is how we would access the parking behind the house. The only way to get to that parking would be along the south side. The building itself is a pediatric therapy facility, mostly doing speech and occupational therapy for kids. Not very much staff, a total of eight, but half of those work in the community and at the different schools so there is only about four working inside the location with one receptionist, so the staffing would be fairly small. We believe this would be a minimal affect traffic wise for that area.

Lauren Bynum adds some clarification to the buffer along the roadway, it is required to be 15 feet to buffer parking along that corridor. We didn't have the exact measurement from the right of way to the proposed parking but it is required to be 15 feet.

Gus Schram asked Lauren Bynum if she didn't know what the drawing indicates.

Lauren Bynum responded there is no measurement but it appears because the parking is

angled that was the one spot that there wasn't a measurement but we can tell it is not the 15 feet.

Gus Schram asked Mr. Nickel is the two foot change in the buffer because of the garage that already sits close to the property line.

Mr Nickel responded on the North side, yes.

Mr. Schram stated he did go by the property and saw a survey marker on the Northwest corner but asked if that is a current marker.

Mark Petterson came up to speak. Mark Petterson 3990 North Blue Sage Rd. Lake Charles, LA.

Yes we had a recent survey done, on the North side there is eight foot.

Gus Schram stated so this drawing is not accurate.

Mark Petterson responded that it seems to be pushed over a little bit, yes. On the south side we have about seventeen feet between the property line and the house. There is a driveway already on the north side and that would already be inside the buffer zone. On the south side the only way to access the rear parking is to put a driveway down the south side.

Mr. Schram suggested that they go through the variances and ask about each one of them.

Mr. Sanders asked before that happened he ask the intent, you have a drawing here that shows three or four parking spaces in the front and multiple parking places in the rear. Who would park in the front of the structure and who would park in the rear.

Mr. Petterson stated it would be the intent to have the patients have access to the parking in the front, where they can pull in and sometimes just drop off. Employees would park in the rear. Unsure if they will do the amount of parking that is shown on the drawing but wanted to show that they had the room for the required amount of parking spaces.

Mr. Schram asked if they would not be opposed to reconfiguring the parking to allow for landscaping in the front.

Mr. Petterson stated yes, we have a drawing and it seems a little off but we would need ten feet in the front to allow any kind of parking in the front. if we had anything less than we would not be able to have any parking in the front, just the circle drive. We would have landscaping in the buffer. We are asking fifteen foot to ten foot.

Mr. Mcbride asked what is the square footage total that you expect to have.

Mr. Petterson stated that the house is currently 3300 living square feet and would like to be right about 5000 square feet.

Mr. Mcbride asked what is the required number of parking spaces for that square footage.

Lauren Bynum stated that for the 5000 square feet 17 parking spots are required.

Mr. Schram stated that even if there is no parking in the front it could all be

accommodated in the rear.

Mr. Petterson said correct.

Mr. Schram stated by looking at the drawing it would be possible to have some parking in the front with the landscaping and would still meet the required setback. Mr. Petterson agreed maybe one or two.

Mr. Schram asked about the buffer yard reduction from fifteen feet to one foot along the North and South property lines.

Mr Petterson stated we had determined eight feet on the North side. It is the south side only that the reduction of the buffer yard would be needed to allow the driveway to the rear parking.

Mr. Sanders stated he thought there was a minimum of a two foot buffer.

Lauren Bynum stated that is correct for structures but in this case it is for the driveway.

Mr. Schram suggested formulating an amendment to cover the changes to the parking that had been discussed.

Mr. Joseph suggested that we listen to the others that had requested to speak first. Mr. Schram agreed.

Lauren Bynum wanted to state for the record at the end of 2023 we did a city wide rezoning effort and this area was identified and then taken out of this effort.

Mr. Schram excused those standing and stated we would hear from the people that had filled out cards.

Mr. Berryhill commented that while they had spoken about a few of the possible restrictions he had though of some in addition. Put restrictions in to further narrow the application to what is actually being requested. We could reduced the parking, narrow down the use specific to this clinic, and this type of clinic. Then addressing the public in attendance commented that should keep these things in mind and state what they are and are not ok with.

Mr. Scharm stated that before we get to those who want to speak he was going to go through the cards of those who did not want to speak.

James and Elizabeth Hoffpauir, 709 W. School St. Lake Charles, LA- In opposition Lived on W. School St. for 48 years-keep area residential. Thank planning for not agreeing to changing. See Lake St. study.

CJ Scheufens, 1109 Contraband, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition Lake St. does not need more traffic and businesses.

Brandi Gautreaux, 817 Bayou Oaks Ln, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition Do not want residential lot changed to commercial property. No matter the type of business it is still not necessary in a residential area.

Sarah Lowry, 800 Bayou Oak Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition I oppose this simply for the reason of keeping our neighborhood residential. There are

plenty of commercial properties available in town there is no need to disrupt our homes. The potential to affect our property value, the noise, the safety of our children with the extra traffic will be a detriment to our neighborhood.

*Nancy Cartie, 817 Treasure Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
My Treasure lane Street opposes this rezoning- It changes the safety and integrity of our neighborhood. Once we open this up to a business, it will continue. This affects traffic and the possibility of unwanted businesses in the neighborhood. There are plenty of retail spaces throughout Lake Charles that could support their business.*

*Kent Lanier, 3707C Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Possible effects on property value. If approved, no one will be returning to ask for rezoning to return to residential thus opening the door to making this section of Lake St. like Lake St. south of Sale St.*

*Lorna Lanier, 3707C Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
No written statement on card.*

*Margaret Cleaton, 810 W. Lagrange St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
I would like Lake St. between Sale and 210 to stay residential. We have for years been trying to keep our neighborhood zoning residential. This is a special neighborhood. All of the people in our area love our area. One year ago they said they wouldn't change the zoning.*

*Pamela Courtney, 717 W. School St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Opposed!*

*Anne Marie Chrisoulis, 3725 Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
This is a neighborhood only section of Lake St. Putting business here will increase the traffic in an already heavily congested area and negatively impact property values. This is a 40 mph stretch of Lake St. where many people drove over the speed limit upwards to 60 mph and turning across lanes (without a center turn lane) increase risk for accidents.*

*Brian and Michelle Jordan, 3707 Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Concerned and opposed to a commercial development on this Lake St. block.*

*Janet Meaux, 3801 Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
This portion of Lake St. is 100% residential and should remain as such. This is not a place for a business nor one with a 24 space parking lot.*

Mr. Scharm concludes the cards of those not wishing to speak. Moving forward with those that would like to speak. Called Scott Kingery.

*Scott Kingery, 820 Terry Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
This is residential, seems like trailblazing. No other businesses between there and 210. It an older neighborhood but a neighborhood with character. If something happens to that property it is already zoned in, anything could go there and it will create a domino affect.*

*Justin Gautreaux, 817 Bayou Oaks Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
18 year resident, variety of commercial property in the city. Started a petition in opposition to this rezoning. Does not feel a residential area should be rezoned. If the business out grows this space then who knows what will move in. Concerned about parking and what it will do to the drainage in the area when there is already existing issues. Wife is a occupational therapist and each session is about 30 minutes. This*

would create a lot of in and out traffic.

Mr. Joseph states to the public that if they have a petition they could turn it in to be reviewed. It is turned in.

Mr. Schram calls the next person to speak.

Hannah Babineaux, 3721 Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Lives on the south side of the property in question. parking lot would look into her bedroom. Her house is 150 years old and has big windows. The property in question holds water and parking spots would make it drain into her property. Once this business leaves, concerned about what will come in. Expressed concerns about traffic. Vehicles would be going along her back fence, her daughter plays in the backyard, what would happen if there was an accident in the parking lot and they went through her fence.

Naomi Scheufens, 1109 Contraband Ln., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Been here many times before for the same types of concerns. Expressed concerns about traffic. Feels allowing a business there will set a precedent. Opposes any commercial business between Sale and 210.

Jean Kauffman, 3713 Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Lives on the north side of the property in question. More than opposed. Expressed concerns about flooding and drainage. Walked the streets for the petition and collected about 140 signatures.

Mr. Schram states the end of those in opposition that wanted to speak. Calls Megan Mousso.

Megan Mousso, 1100 Henrietta Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In favor
Business owner. Wants to clarify that wants the change in zoning to neighborhood not business. Wanted to create a home environment not a medical environment. The house created the desired environment. Home based family centered therapy. Knew there would be a lot of opposition to this because it is a change and change is hard and different. Was under the impression that what they were applying for was very specific and could be a tattoo parlor or the like. Started her business in 2016. Asks Lauren Bynum to clarify if it is a single use variance.

Lauren Bynum states the way it works is this is rezoning the property and the major conditional use don't live with the owner of the property or the business itself, it typically is the use until the use changes. So it couldn't be a bar, a restaurant, or a massage parlor. It would stay with that use but however, with that use it could be another type of medical office clinic. It could be any other professional office.

Ms. Mousso asked it is not commercial it is a neighborhood use. Lauren Bynum confirmed it is neighborhood use, but neighborhood commercial. It is technically a commercial use but it is neighborhood and that zoning is much more restrictive. This approval would allow any other office use spaces to go there.

Mr. Schram asked if they had the authority to restrict and approve only this particular business.

Lauren Bynum stated yes and Corey Rubin would help us if we go that route.

Mr. Schram stated so that would be a tighter restriction than what Lauren Bynum had

described. Lauren Bynum confirmed that is the way the zoning works now but could be further restricted.

Ms. Mousso stated that she doesn't plan on (moving) stating we are all here.

Mr. Berryhill asked Lauren Bynum if multiple clinics in this space. Lauren Bynum confirmed. Everything is determined by the square footage and the parking.

Mr. Corey Rubin addresses Vice Chairman Mr. Schram stating that Ms. Brandi Gautreaux would like to make a rebuttle.

Mr. Schram agrees.

Brandi Gautreaux, 817 Bayou Oaks Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
A business is a business no matter what the use. She is an occupational therapist. Home therapy is provided in the clients home. Concerned about the traffic increase in the area. The business of occupational and speech therapy is important just not in a residential neighborhood. It is not the appropriate setting.

Mr. Schram addresses Mr. Nickel or Mr. Petterson to see if they have anything they would like to address at this time.

A member of the public would like to speak. Mr. Schram agrees and asks her to come up.

Donna Little Comeaux, 719 W. School St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Expressed concerns about traffic and parking. Also concerned about commercial lighting and trash pickup. Wondering what changes would have to be made to accommodate for commercial plumbing. She has been an educator for 30 years and while therapy is needed it is just not in this location. Expressed concerns about what would come next and has drainage concerns. It is a dangerous precedent to reduce the buffers.

Sarah Lowry asked to speak. Mr. Schram granted one minute to speak.

Sarah Lowry, 800 Bayou Oak Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In opposition
Both of her kids have gone to Magnolia Therapy and they are wonderful. I love them. However, it is worrisome that Ms. Mousso stated that they had no intention on moving because this would be actually their third move. How do we know they aren't going to move again.

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Nickel if he would like to have a short rebuttle here.

Mr. Nickel states he is open to additional restrictions. Also has a petition in support of this change in zoning. Mr. Petterson has the petition in support.

The commission nor planning has a copy of the support petition.

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Petterson if the petition was turned in. Mr. Petterson states no it was emailed but he has a copy.

Mr. Schram asks Mr. Petterson to come up and tells us what that is. Mr. Petterson stated they also contacted people in the area that would be in favor of the rezoning and had them sign the petition. They have about 150 names. Of which 15 or so are neighbors that live within a half mile or so from the property in question. The other names are from

former patients and other business owners.

Mr. Berryhill questions Mr. Petterson that he owns the property in question. Mr. Petterson confirms that he and his father own the property. They have owned it for about a year. They have looked at other options for the property and they feel this would be the best use for it. Knows that people have negative thoughts about it but they feel this is a good location for a neighborhood type business.

Mr. Berryhill states also to clarify this is currently zoned residential. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Petterson states that was what Ms. Mousso was trying to say is that it would be neighborhood rather than going to mixed use.

Mr. Schram clarifies that if any other business wanted to come in there they would have to come back to the planning Commission to try to get that approved. Could layer on further restrictions. No other businesses would be allowed to go in that spot.

Mr. Berryhill states that the comprehensive zoning effort the decision was made to pull the item out of the zoning packet.

Mr. Joseph asks if the rezoning packet was approved by the commission. Lauren Bynum stated yes, by the commission and then to City Council. With any rezoning whether approved or denied it will go to the City Council and the decision from the commission will go as a recommendation to the Council.

A member of the public would like to ask a question. Lauren Bynum asks her to come up to the mic.

Anne Marie Chrisoulis, 3725 Lake St., Lake Charles, LA- In opposition Asking for clarification on the item being pulled back from the rezoning study. Does that mean that Lake St. will remain residential.

Lauren Bynum stated no, we cannot stop anyone from submitting a rezoning request.

Mr. Schram asks if they are going to deal with all of the variances and go over all the details.

Mr. Schram states that the commission is wanting to vote on the proposal as it is. Asks if there are any amendments to be offered.

Mr. Berryhill states that because this is going to City Council should they discuss amendments so that they would have a better idea of what the commission's thoughts are.

Mr. Schram states that making the amendments would support that so that they City Council would have that to see.

Mr. Schram asks if Mr. Sanders would like to approach that.

Mr. Joseph states before they starting discussing amendments he would like to acknowledge the amount of community members that had showed up for the community meeting to keep Lake St. residential. Now a business wants to come in and he cannot support that.

Mr. Schram states they are going to vote on the proposal as is presented with no amendments.

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

For: 0

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

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

MAJ 25-02 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: GULF ISLAND SHRIMP & SEAFOOD II, LLC

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 5-302(3)(b)(i)) in order to construct a 7,000sq.ft. warehouse for Big Easy Foods, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Westside 3900 Blk. Hodges Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the proposed construction of a 7,000 sf warehouse for Big Easy Foods, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. This property was recently part of the Citywide rezoning to allow for a more commercial development pattern to support the businesses along Ryan Street, therefore staff finds the request reasonable. Any deviations from the development standards will require a variance.

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

Mr. Tom Gale, 713 Kirby St., Lake Charles, LA 70601 -on behalf of Big Easy Foods

Mr. Gale stated Mr. Avery and Senator Abraham are here. Mr. Gale stated they would like to build a warehouse next to Big Easy foods, has bigger plans for in the future but for the time being they would like to make an expansion.

Tom Sanders addressing Mr. Gale stating that he saw the site plan for the structure but would like to know the height of the structure.

Mr. Gale stated twenty-two less that twenty five feet. The GIS map with the assessor's office has not been updated. On the application there are hand written comments but they know where there property is and they are have a legal survey, it is going to be adjacent to the existing ware house and will face Hodges Street.

Mr. McBride asked if the new warehouse will be connected to the existing warehouse.

Mr. Gale stated it was a separate building, but will be on the same development. There will be a walkway connection. A separate structure but adjacent.

Mr. Schram asked Mr. Gale what is the set back from the street.

Mr. Gale stated the area to the east will be a whole parking area. Right now it is being used as a gravel parking area. They will hard surface that and push the warehouse back to match the connection to the other facility.

Mr. Schram states that one of the concerns he has is the fact that this faces a

residential street and the general rule for metal buildings in the city they require a facade.

Mr. Gale stated they will do it.

Mr. Schram states non metal.

Mr. Gale agrees with that stipulation.

Mr. Schram asks about the fence situation.

Lauren Bynum states if it is adjacent to any residential use then they require a fence but if it adjacent to another commercial use it wouldn't require a fence. At the time of permitting we will identify if any fencing is required, but it would be a six foot privacy fence.

Mr. Sanders asks if they would be adjacent to the McNeese townhomes.

Mr. Gale states that is inaccurate, because of the issue with the GIS map the driveway is actually the property line and there is another property owner to the South of Big Easy, that property would be adjacent to the residential property.

Mr. Schram asks if Mr. Sanders is done. Mr. Sanders said yes.

Mr. Schram asks if there any other questions and if there are any cards.

Mr. Schram offers an amendment that the building would follow the city's general requirements having a non-metallic facade facing the street.

Mr. Berryhill seconds the amendment.

Mr. Schram asks for a vote on the amendment. Lauren Bynum states five in favor the amendment has been approved.

Mr. Schram asks for a vote on the application as amended. Lauren Bynum states five in favor it has been approved as amended.

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

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

Against: 0

Absent: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Excused: 1 - Mitchell Gregory Pete

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

MEETING ADJOURNED.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

Gus Schram, Vice Chairman
Lake Charles Planning and Zoning Commission

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