



City of Lake Charles

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

Meeting Minutes Planning and Zoning Commission

Monday, March 10, 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 Mr. Alvin Joseph
Pledge Mr. Adam McBride*

ROLL CALL

Present 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks, and Thomas Sanders Jr.
Absent 2 - Gus Schram III, and 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 25-02

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting annexation approval of 0.17-acres M/L, and generally described as a **50ft. x 150ft. M/L section of Ogea Road @ intersection of Benoit Road.**

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

Chairman Mr. Reginald Weeks asks if there is anyone representing.

Lauren Bynum states it is the city of Lake Charles. Essentially there are other properties on that, there is a portion of the street that was owned by rather annexed by the city on either side and we wanted to grab that as well to make everything continuous.

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any questions from the panel.

No questions from panel.

Chairman Weeks calls for the vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**ANXZON
25-02**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: CITY OF LAKE CHARLES

SUBJECT: The applicant is requesting a zoning classification of Neighborhood Zoning District of 0.17-acres M/L, and generally described as a **50ft. x 150ft. M/L section of Ogea Road @ intersection of Benoit Road.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed that the proposed zoning classification of Neighborhood is consistent with the current zoning classification of the Parish of Calcasieu (R-2). Therefore, staff finds the request reasonable and acceptable for passage.

Chairman Mr. Reginald weeks asks if there any questions from the commissioners.

Mr. Alvin Joseph states there are no cards.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**PRELIM
25-01**

LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

APPLICANT: LAKE CHARLES HOUSING AUTHORITY (MID CITY NEIGHBORHOOD)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3) in order to subdivide a 38.3-acre tract of land into ten (10), development tracts, within a Neighborhood and Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southeast section of Lake Street @ 18th Street thru to Creole Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to subdivide a 38.3 acre tract of land into ten (10) development tracts, within a Neighborhood and Mixed Use Zoning District. This was previously an approved master planned development in October of 2022 (MAJ 22-14) later revised in July of 2023 (MAJ 23-11). The developer is now moving forward with the infrastructure development and establishing development parcels and street layouts. Therefore, staff finds the request reasonable.

*Chairman Mr. Reginald Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record.
Josh Collins- Developer, Representing the Housing Authority 812 Gravier St. Ste. 200*

New Orleans, LA

Looking for approval on what was started over two years ago with the choice neighborhood grants and planned unit developments. This provides more specificity and consistent to what was approved two years ago. Thinks he speaks for everyone that submitted purple cards they did so to show support and not everyone wants to come and speak.

Mr. Weeks states we are going to find out in a minute.

Mr. Weeks asks if anyone is here for opposition.

Mr. Weeks asks if there are any questions from the commissioners.

Mr. Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

PREFNL-VA LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

R 25-05

APPLICANT: AZUCENA MADRIGAL (MADRIGAL SUBDIVISION)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a .18-acre tract of land M/L into two (2) development lots including Variances in order to 1) reduce lot size requirement (4,000sq.ft. each vs. 5,000sq.ft.) and 2) create side setback property line encroachment, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southeast corner of N. Shattuck Street @ Commercial Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to subdivide a .18 acre tract of land into two development lots including Variances in order to 1) reduce the lot size requirement and 2) create a side setback property line encroachment, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Both of the existing structures on the property have current Unsafe Structure cases open and the commercial building has an active demolition permit. Staff cannot forward a position of support due to the commercial redevelopment of these individual subdivided properties will make it challenging to adhere to the development standards. Sec 4-205(5)(a)(ii) of the Zoning Ordinance states Variances should not be granted which would permit the creation of a lot or parcel that cannot be developed in compliance with this ordinance and other regulations applicable thereto.

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

Azucena Madrigal, 12314 New Brunswick St, Houston, TX

States the commercial is her property. Apologizes, says her English is bad. Ms. Madrigal states she has two properties together at Commercial and Shattuck. Intends to separate both properties, the first one has been demolished. The second property has a compliance issue. State she has people that want to buy the property to remodel it.

Mr. Weeks addresses the person standing with Ms. Madrigal asking if she has something to add or if she is moral support. Person states they are there in case Ms. Madrigal needed a translator.

Mr. Weeks thanks them and asks them to stand by for now.

Mr. Weeks asks if there is anyone opposing or if any cards have been turned in.

Mr. Weeks asks if there are any questions from the commissioners.

Mr. Sanders asks the applicant about the demolition for the property on the corner of Commercial and Shattuck.

Ms. Madrigal answers yes it has been demolished.

Mr. Sanders asks what is the purpose in subdividing.

Ms. Madrigal states she would like to separate them because she would like to do something newer. It was not in good condition and that is why it was demolished. The other one she states she has someone who wants to do the remodeling and she would like to keep one of the properties for herself.

Mr. Sanders states that usually people subdivide because they want to sell off a piece.

Ms. Madrigal states yes. Person (translator) states she is selling off part of it and continuing with the other part.

*Translator is asked to give name and address for the record.
Stephanie Rivera, 703 Sycamore St. Lake Charles, LA
States she is the translator.*

Ms. Madrigal states she has people that would like to buy the property, and when she sells to them they will be getting all the permits to remodel the place.

Mr. Sanders asks if she is taking about the two story structure. Ms. Madrigal confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks how many units are in the two story.

Ms. Madrigal states there are four units.

Mr. Sanders asks how many parking spaces.

Ms. Madrigal states yes and that she has a picture she can show. In the front is the parking lot and there is parking on the left side too. States there is plenty of parking.

Mr. Sanders inquires about the units, if they are one bedroom or two bedroom.

Ms. Madrigal states one of the apartments has only one room, a single, but the other ones have two bedrooms.

Mr. Sanders asks if there are two that are one room and two that are the two bedroom.

Ms. Madrigal states three because there are four. Two downstairs and two upstairs. The right side, that apartment has only one room, the left side they have two, and two.

Mr. Weeks states that he has an issue because the planning and zoning commission gave you a status of unsafe structure, asks if there has there been an in depth creation of what would make it a safe and given or just overall.

Lauren Bynum states that the cased could be pulled up to see where they are at.

Ms. Madrigal states that the people have the experience of a contractor to build this the right way with the permits.

Ms. Rivera states that the part Ms. Madrigal plans on keeping has been demolished completely.

Mr. Sanders asks for clarification if the property she plans on keeping has been demolished. Ms. Rivera confirms.

Mr. Sanders states that she would like to sell the two story building and have someone rebuild it.

Ms. Rivera states that someone else will continue with the permits and getting it back up to code.

Mr. McBride states that the question is the building that she wants to sell has an unsafe designation what is planning to be done about that. It is not safe for habitation.

Ms. Rivera states it is not going to be used for habitation right now. She is selling it to someone else who has the funds and the ability to make it a safe building again.

Ms. Madrigal confirms the other people will be doing the remodeling and safety and they will get the contractors to do it. It will be safe and in good condition with everything new.

Ms. madrigal states she has pictures.

Ms. Rivera states that Ms. Madrigal's phone has the pictures.

Mr. McBride states that if there are four living units in that two story building I do not see that there is enough parking. There is not enough parking there.

Ms. Madrigal states ok let me see.

Mr. Berryhill asks what the setbacks would be for the two story building of the property line.

Lauren Bynum states it is a current non-conforming as far as the setbacks go, it is mixed use so it would be a twenty foot front setback.

Mr. Berryhill asks what the side setback would be if this is approved. What would the side setback be if the property is subdivided for that building. It currently looks to be about a foot.

Mr. Sanders states it looks to be almost zero. Mr. Berryhill confirms.

Lauren Bynum states it would be five and five and twenty in the front.

Mr. Berryhill states what he is getting at is that based on past decisions we wouldn't be able to approve this with that building there.

Lauren Bynum confirms that is correct. They could push the lot line over since the other property at the time there is nothing there just a demolition permit and it hadn't been demolished yet. The site plan that was received showed the two buildings on the property.

Now since one isn't there, technically they could push the proposed lot line over to get the five feet or at the minimum three feet. The issue staff had with it is the redevelopment of the parcels is difficult because you are taking what was already non-conforming and cutting it in half so the development of the property will be very difficult, it will require a lot of variances most likely unless it is developed residentially. The parking requirements for the remaining tract would be eight parking spaces and none of the things that are off street are conforming.

Mr. Berryhill states that the problem here is that a plan has not been presented on how this building, the layout and what is going to be done, it is hard to then make a determination today.

Ms. Rivera asks if Mr. Berryhill is referring to the remaining building.

Mr. Berryhill confirms. What changes to the proposed lot line that you have on subdividing it is about down the middle, it looks like it is to close to the existing building so it would be completely non-conforming.

Mr. Berryhill asks if the applicant would she like to postpone this proposal, table it for another month.

Mr. Berryhill states he is only making that as a suggestion. It would be better if you could forward that to the city and they could print that out in the packet.

Ms. Madrigal states this is the first time she has come and she is not prepared. She didn't know what she should do but she will bring in all of the pictures.

Mr. Weeks gives a couple of options. It can be voted on as is, and if it is determined to be a nope, then you have the right to appeal, and I don't want to take that out of your hands, or you can back and reassess. Back up and reassess and come back with a better plan.

Mr. Weeks asks Lauren Bynum if the applicant would have to pay the fees again.

Lauren Bynum states if it is deferred she wont have to pay the fee again.

Mr. Weeks asks the applicant if she is willing to redo it. Mr. Weeks states it is up to the applicant, doesn't want to take the appeal process away, just making suggestions.

Lauren Bynum states a subdivision is not appeal able to the council.

Mr. Weeks notes the mistake.

Ms. Rivera states that Ms. Madrigal is going to go ahead with the postponement and will come back and approach it at a better time.

Mr. Sanders states that he is going to make a motion to defer this matter to the next meeting.

Mr. Weeks asks if that is going to be enough time.

Ms. Rivera asks when is the next meeting.

Mr. Weeks states in one month.

Ms. Rivera states yes she will be better prepared then.

Mr. Weeks states lets do two (months).

Mr. Sanders asks staff if that can be done.

Mr. Weeks addresses applicant and states let's do two, that will give you more time. Unless you are in an absolute hurry.

Ms. Madrigal states yes it is important for her to do it.

Mr. Sanders makes a motion to defer this matter for two months. Mr. Joseph seconds it.

Ms. Madrigal says the only thing really important is separating. If the planning commission decides on the other side she will take it down too. States she wont have a complaint.

Mr. McBride states this is a very difficult lot configuration, and difficult building structure on that. As this is drawn it is hard to pass as is. If this can be redrawn and work with staff, it may get closer but unsure. It doesn't work like it is. It is one month until the next meeting but now that the building is down, perhaps the lot line can be adjusted, do some different things and talk to the staff people, they will help you to try to figure out the best approach and try again to see if we can get closer, however there are no guarantees.

Ms. Madrigal states ok and thank you.

Mr. Weeks clarifies that the commissioners do not want to appear un empathetic to the issue. They are empathetic. however, any time you are talking about the safety and well being that is something that is taken very seriously. It is for the protection of the owner, tenants and such, please don't take it as the commissioners being unsympathetic. There are some things they don't feel well about doing and wants to make sure things are done correctly. You may want to consult a contractor or surveyor to help ensure that it is done correctly.

Mr. Weeks asks Mr. Sanders to state the motion. Mr. Sanders states that he had and Mr. Joseph had seconded it.

Mr. McBride states he thinks the applicant is asking for April.

Mr. Weeks asks the applicant if she would like next month rather than waiting until May.

Ms. Rivera states Ms. Madrigal would like April.

Mr. Sanders makes a motion to defer to the April meeting. Mr. Joseph seconds it.

Mr. Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**PREFNL
25-06**

LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

APPLICANT: CHARVAIS COMPANY, LLC (CHARVAIS CROSSING)

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a 2.14-acre tract of land M/L into two (2) development tracts, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is the **Southeast section of Nelson Road @ Wolf Circle.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan reviews revealed the applicant is requesting to subdivide a 2.14 acre tract of land into two (2) development tracts, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. The subdivision request meets the minimum lot size for development, therefore staff finds the request reasonable.

Chairman Mr. Reginald Weeks asks applicant to state name and address for the record. Lewy Barbe, Representing Charvias Company, 1925 Barbe St. Lake Charles, LA

Mr. McBride asks if there is a building in mind for this site.

Mr. Barbe states they are either wanting to sell the 0.38 parcel to do a build to suit or do a ground lease. More than likely with that area it would probably be medical, or a slight modular retail.

Mr. McBride states his question is how would the parking be provided. On the existing site or will you share it with the neighbor.

Mr. Barbe states it would be on the 0.38 subdivision tract. We would push the building all the way back towards the school and have the parking up front towards Wolf Cir., that would be the way he would develop it.

Mr. Sanders asks if there are any current plans for development.

Mr. Babe states no, we just listed it for sale for ground lease or build to suit.

Mr. Sanders asks if this piece is being carved off of the larger piece.

Mr. Barbe states yes, where the concrete ends, the grass area, is where the subdivision would be for whatever future development happens.

Mr. Sanders states ok.

Mr. Weeks asks if there are any other questions.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

PREFNL-VA LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS**R 25-07****APPLICANT:** WILLIAM SCOTT MONTGOMERY (MONTGOMERY OAKS SUBDIVISION)**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to re-subdivide a .28-acre tract of land M/L into two (2) residential lots including a Variances for reduction of lot size requirement (Lot B - 5,608sq.ft. each vs. 6,000sq.ft.), within a Neighborhood Zoning District. Location of the request is **628A and 628B 15th Street**.**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to re-subdivide a .28-acre tract of land with existing residential homes, into two (2) residential lots including a Variances for reduction of lot size requirement for one of the created lots, in a Neighborhood Zoning District.*Chairman Mr. Weeks asks if they are prepared to make a vote.**Commissioners agree.**Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.***Chairman Weeks called for a vote. The motion carried by the following vote:****For:** 4 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.**Against:** 1 - David Berryhill**Absent:** 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete**PREFNL-M LAKE CHARLES SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS****AJ-VAR
25-08****APPLICANT:** LAKE CITY RENTALS (JAMES PLACE SUBDIVISION)**SUBJECT:** Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval (Sec. 2.3 & 2.4) in order to subdivide a 1.36-acre tract of land into ten (10) residential lots including a Major Conditional Use Permit for private drive access and Variances for 1) private drive to exceed 200ft. in length; and 2) reduction of lot size requirements for Lots 5-10, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **4201-4205 Alma Lane (and rear of)**.**STAFF FINDINGS:** The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to subdivide a 1.36 acre tract of land into ten (10) residential lots including a Major Conditional Use Permit for private drive access and Variances for 1) private drive to exceed 200ft in length; and 2) reduction of lot size requirements for Lots 5-10, within a Residential Zoning District. Staff's review found the lot configuration potentially challenging for access of future property owners. Therefore, staff cannot forward a position of support.*Chairman Weeks reads in PRENAL/MAJ/VAR 25-08.**Lauren Bynum states there is an accompanying variance VAR 25-13.**Chairman Weeks reads in VAR 25-13 as well.**Lauren Bynum states for clarification the first item the variances were very specific to the subdivision request and the second item the variances were not specific to the subdivision request that is why there are two of them.*

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

Tommy Eastman, 3221 Ryan St., Lake Charles, LA

As indicated on the site plan the developer would like to put ten single family homes ranging from twelve hundred square feet to fourteen hundred square feet depending on the lot. The homes will be for sale, the price point will be between 190,000 to 220,000. This is an attempt to provide affordable housing, currently on MLS between 175,000 and 220,000 there is one active residence that is under three years old. There are major issues right now when it comes to older homes, insurance costs. The developer will have fortified roofs, lowers insurance rates and will do EnergyStar for each home.

Mr. McBride asks the section that is not included in this, James Place, currently there are two foundations laid out and plumbed, that is not part of this.

Mr. Eastman states no it is not part of this.

Mr. McBride asks if it owned by the same parties.

Mr. Eastman asks for the GIS map to be pulled up. Indicating the two foundations Mr. McBride spoke of, said those two will be taken out and the lots that are at the top, ten, nine and eight would be the entrance.

Chairman Weeks states there is a card in support.

Kevin Snider, 3617 E. Banbury, Lake Charles, LA- In Support, doesn't wish to speak.

Chairman Weeks states there is some opposition that would like to speak.

Valery Lowin, 4213 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

This proposal will build five houses along my property and those of the neighbors. Concerns about flooding, being built on a higher elevation than the existing homes, was told that no sewer would be required, every time the previous owner built the existing homes retained more water. Expressed concerns about a decrease in property values as well as concerns for traffic and safety.

James Genius, 4202 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Lives directly across from where this is proposed, has lived in this neighborhood for fifty years, every time there is building there is no consideration to the drainage, already have a flooding problem. many years ago a new drainage system was put in and they did a good job but there are still water issues and they still flood. The water is able to dissipate pretty quickly because of the new drainage that was put in. There is minimal drainage to Sale Road, and out to Nelson Road which is a long distance, the drainage that is there is sub-par for what is needed right now. in 1981 when the east side of the town was under water our ditches were not even full, now when it rains for more than fifteen minutes there is standing water in the yard. This proposal takes up more area for water displacement, the ball field can not be played in for a day or so after it rains because there is so much standing water, the water would triple into that field. there is over developing and under engineering.

Chairman Weeks asks for a summation.

Mr. Genius states it is a poor plan.

Dana L. Hermann, 4210 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Also speaking on behalf of Stephanie Gold, 4217 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Concerns expressed about quality of the drainage, space and the type of housing that will be built. The area already struggles with drainage after a heavy rain. Space is already tight, squeezing in a subdivision will shrink what little breathing room they have left. Crowded developments strain the roads, increase traffic and over burden the utilities. There have already been adjustments due to the previous building in the neighborhood. The developer is prioritizing profit over practicality. Neighborhood is currently already a high traffic area with the ball park and the recycling center. Adding a subdivision and roads to this small space would be devastating to the area.

Dennis Hermann, 4210 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Mr. Hermann states that he has pictures of the tract of land that is being proposed to be developed. Asks if he can submit the pictures.

Chairman Weeks states yes.

Mr. Hermann expresses concerns about drainage, and traffic (already high traffic area). Invites any council member to visit and he will show them the issues.

Chairman Weeks asks for the date of the photos that were submitted.

Mr. Hermann states they were taken in May of 2021, after a 500 year flood. Mr. Hermann stated that he objected to the homes that were already there, but they put them there. The reason the two lots aren't there is because Brad Foreman died. he was the developer and when he built those homes he (Brad Foreman) told him they were homes that were going to be sold. There have been fourteen new homes built there in the last six years, three of them are homeowners and the rest are rental properties. Mr. Hermann states that the new proposal will be rentals.

Chairman Weeks states that the three minutes are up.

Valery Lowin, 4213 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Asked to make an additional statement. The original person that built her house, and sold her a little bitty lot, told her, when she asked about what would be behind her, in about ten years the builder would probably plant his garden. Ms. Lowin states she didn't know that the garden would consist of roads and ten more houses.

Chairman Weeks reminds everyone to be respectful and to keep the comments to a minimum, voices carry in the room when talking amongst themselves.

Rafe David, 4135 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Mr. David expresses concerns about drainage, the new build next to him at a higher elevation has already caused more water to come into his property. Mr. David expresses concerns about trash pick up and the location of the trash pick up, as well as parking concerns making traffic concerns worse. There are already ongoing problems and they will not be alleviated by adding ten more homes. Right now there is a two way intersection and a three way intersection and this would add a fourth right in the bottle neck. It is already challenging because the roads are offset. There are also no sidewalks so this is adding another hazard.

Chairman Weeks states there are no further cards.

Chairman Weeks addresses Mr. Eastman and asks if he has a retort.

Tommy Eastman, 3221 Ryan, Lake Charles, LA

Mr. Eastman states they will not be rentals, that is not the intention. It is to his understanding that the proposal would still have to go through engineering so ultimately it will be the city's decision on where the water goes. This is the preliminary plan.

Mr. McBride addresses Mr. Eastman, stating that there has been a lot of concern expressed about the drainage. The ten lots with the exception of one are all below the minimum lot size requirements for development, and not by a little bit but by a lot. It seems this proposal could have been drafted, even with the drainage problems, that respected the development standards of the development codes. Mr. McBride asks why that wasn't done.

Mr. Eastman states in order to hit the price points the density is needed. To make this an affordable product there is only so much that you can do and you have to get the density.

Mr. McBride asks if the lot size restrictions are a problem throughout the city, in terms of affordable housing.

Mr. Eastman states absolutely, it drives up cost. That is why every developer is coming in here and trying to hit price points, that can actually sell.

Mr. McBride states they are not all asking for lot reductions.

Mr. Eastman states from the stand point of this piece, that is what it has to be. At the end of the day you are looking at a \$130,000 home, your note is going to be \$1250 a month, it doesn't work. Mr. Eastman states he understands all of the concerns, but as a city and as a parish, have to address this problem. If we are not growing, we are dying. The point of the whole thing is that the numbers have to work.

Mr. Sanders states that trash pick up was brought up, this particular development, the way that it is drawn it doesn't look like a city trash truck can enter and exit, will the homeowners have to drag trash cans down to Alma Lane for trash collection.

Mr. Eastman states that is not something that he had talked to the developer about but he is assuming that yes it would have to be on the setback line of lot 10. Mr. Eastman asks Kevin Snider if he had any input. Mr. Snider agrees that would be the only place for trash pick up.

Mr. Sanders states he doesn't see anything drawn for a dumpster. There is also a historical oak tree on this property. Mr. Sanders asks what is the plan with respect to that tree.

Mr. Eastman states obviously it will probably have to be cut down.

Mr. Sanders asks staff after he did some rough calculations for the square footage of the drives, it is up over eleven thousand, anything over ten, a drainage study would need to be done.

Lauren Bynum states the engineering staff would review this for the drainage requirements.

Mr. Sanders asks if the ten thousand includes the slabs or just the roadway.

Lauren Bynum states that is an engineering question but typically it is the slabs and any

impervious.

Mr. Sanders addresses Mr. Eastman stating that he gave a figure of \$130,000 having a note of whatever dollars, but at the same time you stated that these homes were going to be in the \$190,000 to \$220,000 range.

Mr. Eastman states part of that note is because of the insurance. With a newer home, fortified roof, that will bring the insurance rates down.

Mr. Sanders asks if there was any thought put into trying to put in a development where you did not have to reduce lot size to the extent that you are proposing here.

Mr. Eastman states the numbers wouldn't work.

Chairman Weeks asks if there is anything that has not been previously mentioned that someone would like to add.

Valery Lowin, 4213 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition the developer stated that there would be no rentals, however prior to him, when Brad was alive, everything he has built after me has become rentals. In the new subdivision will there be a statement clarifying no rentals.

Lauren Bynum states the city of Lake Charles does not dictate whether or not a property is a rental. Whatever the decision is made it cannot be based on homeowner or rental.

Ms. Lowin states the property would have to be sold first but then the owner could choose to rent it out down the road.

Lauren Bynum states we have no jurisdiction over that.

Chairman Weeks asks if there any further questions from the commissioners.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on VAR 25-08.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on VAR 25-13.

Chairman weeks calls for a vote. The motion failed by the following vote:

For: 0

Against: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

**REZONE-M
AJ 25-02**

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: LARRY THOMAS

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting to amend the official zoning map (Sec 5-207) from a Residential Zoning District to a Mixed Use Zoning District companioned with a Major Conditional Use Permit (5-302(3)(b)) in order to convert an existing residential structure into an office building with an existing accessory shop and shed. Location of the request is **6706 Big Lake Road.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to amend the official zoning map from a Residential Zoning District to a Mixed

Use Zoning District companioned with a Major Conditional Use Permit in order to convert an existing residential structure into an office building with an existing accessory shop and shed for a commercial contracting office. The property will need to meet all development standards including, but not limited to, parking standards, landscaping, and fencing requirements as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance.

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

Larry Thomas, 5 River Lane, Lake Charles, LA

States he is the owner of the property 6706 Big Lake Road.

Big Lake Road is unique, one side of the road is all city and it is zoned mixed use and the other side it is everything from residential, agriculture light, industrial, heavy industrial, and the parish has not developed it. This address is across the street from the new Dollar General. It is one block away from where the LNG proposal is. There are seven residential homes from Cormies grocery all the way to Gautier Rd. 5204 Big Lake Rd for an office complex already has city approval. There are three or four developers that have plans to build on the east side to build commercial. This side is just getting developed and will do whatever needs to be done to build a nice facility.

Mr. Weeks asks if it will be turned into an office space.

Mr. Thomas states he has the permits to start on office space. He is dealing with the city because of the utilities available.

Mr. Weeks restates the question. Asks if Mr. Thomas is planning on building office space and anything else.

Mr. Thomas states he has a contractor's license that he got three months ago and he would like to put his office there and that is where he would like to build if he can.

Mr. Weeks states the question is are you planning to build office space.

Mr. Thomas states yes.

Mr. Weeks asks if anyone has any questions.

Mr. Sanders has a question. Mr. Weeks asks Mr. Thomas to come back up.

Mr. Sanders states there is an existing residence and shop on the property. Mr. Thomas agrees.

Mr. Sanders asks if it the plan to remodel the residence for your office as a general contractor.

Mr. Thomas states that when he started out he did it as an investment. He took the old house and redid the inside, made everything new and was going to rent it out, and then try to develop the two point something acres. The he got his contractor's license, and the location is great to have an office there, and have business cards out of there.

Mr. Sanders asks if what was formally the residence plans to be your office as a general contractor. Mr. Thomas agrees.

Mr. Sanders asks what is the plan for the existing shop if any.

Mr. Thomas states for storage.

Mr. Alvin Joseph states there is a request for opposition.

Mary Kennerson, 6820 N Banbury Rd., Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition States she is in opposition because Big Lake Road is unique. has lived there for twenty three years and there has been a lot of growth in that area. When she bought the property and they built it was a brand new subdivision. For a little more than one and half miles on the east side of Big Lake Road is all residential. We have seen a Dollar Store, a Chevron, we have seen a lot of businesses come, but that stretch is all residential and they just completed clearing the land for addition residential housing that will be upscale. The property in question borders the entire North side of her property, which is in the Buccaneer Acres Subdivision. As she sees it you are allowing a rezoning to allow a business in a subdivision. Concerns that it will drastically affect every resident in the subdivision. Expressed concerns about property values. Even if it meets all of the development requirements it will affect them.

Mr. Larry Thomas comes forward again.

Mr. Thomas states the subdivision has nice brick homes and he understands that. The two gentlemen next to him (the property in question) would also like to go commercial in the future, because we are on Big Lake Road and we are not in the back subdivision. States that he understands the needs of the people but there is already stuff happening on Big Lake Rd.

Mr. Weeks asks if anyone has any additional questions.

Mr. Weeks starts to call for a vote but a questions is voiced. Mr. Weeks asks if it something that hasn't been brought up prior.

Mary Kennerson, 6820 N Banbury, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition, additional comments.

With the rezoning, because it is in the subdivision, and we have restrictions, does that mean that one property will be rezoned or does that mean everyone will be rezoned. Asks for clarification as to how one lot in the subdivision is in the city limits but the rest are not.

Lauren Bynum states as long as it is contiguous, we annexed it, we typically annex in a contiguous fashion, across the street is where it is contiguous. Anyone can request an annex into the city.

Ms. Kennerson asks this rezoning he said was for electrical purposes but what about everyone that moves in to.

Mr. Weeks states what she is asking is if this is approved, will everyone else receive approval or would they have to come before the committee.

Ms. Kennerson agrees.

Lauren Bynum states that everything that is not colored gray (zoning shown on GIS map) is in the parish.

Ms. Kennerson says yes that is where the growth is on the west side. We are growing because there is a division between residential and the businesses, not in the middle of the residential area.

Mr. Weeks asks if anyone that would like to do a mixed use if they would have to come before the planning commission.

Lauren Bynum states if it is in city limits and right now not much around that is in city limits. If you recall when we did the city wide rezoning, we did rezone some properties as mixed use because of the work with the regional planning commission they have identified Big Lake Road to have future expansion. Due to that we have aligned our zoning patterns to match that. Anyone not in the city limits would have to go to the parish to rezone their property. Of course they could request an annex and then come before this commission. If a property were annexed in it would be zoned with the classification that most closely matches the parish. After a certain amount of time it can then be requested to be rezoned to a different classification, which is what is happening here.

Mr. Weeks asks if there any further questions or comments.

Mr. Weeks calls for the vote.

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

For: 3 - Adam McBride, David Berryhill and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 2 - Alvin Joseph and Reginald Weeks

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

MAJ 25-03

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: GUL AWAN

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Major Conditional Use Permit (Sec 5-302(3)(b)(ii)) in order to construct a drive thru restaurant, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **3760 Nelson Road**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a drive thru restaurant within a Mixed Use Zoning District. The proposal must meet all development standards including but not limited to providing 10 cars stacked within the property and adhere to all landscape requirements outlined in Sec 5-210 in the Zoning Ordinance. This proposal must get DOTD approvals.

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

Gul Awan, 5640 Monarch Way, Lake Charles, LA

Developing a chicken franchise. Have submitted for the DOTD permit. Big Chicken, a chicken franchise. Owned by Shaq O'Neal. Have submitted plans.

Mr. Weeks asks if that is all. Mr. Awan confirms.

Mr. Berryhill asks if the entrance is going to be off of Nelson.

Mr. Awan states no, the entrance will be on the side street.

Mr. Awan confirms that it is Sarah Lane.

Lauren Bynum states they do have DOTD, unsure if it is the final approval or a preliminary approval. Access management is why they probably put it off of Sarah Lane. and not direct Nelson access, that was probably a DOTD requirement.

Mr. Sanders asks when the plans were submitted to DOTD was the desire to access Nelson Rd.

Mr. Awan states yes, what ever they require.

Mr. Sanders states that DOTD said no so then you have to access Sarah Lane to build the development on this property.

Mr. Awan states his civil engineer worked with DOTD and they came up with this. They had several meetings and they decided this was the best way to not interfere with traffic.

Mr. Weeks asks if there any other questions at this time.

Mr. Weeks states there are several opposition cards.

Mary Hayes, 1937 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition, filled out card, doesn't wish to speak

David Abel, 1828 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition, filled out card, doesn't wish to speak

Toni Modisette, 1903 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition- filled out card, doesn't wish to speak

Michael Modisette, 1903 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition, filled out card, doesn't wish to speak

Marcus Graham, 1822 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition, filled out card, doesn't wish to speak

Anna Grace Eisen, 1946 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition, filled out card, doesn't wish to speak

Ronald D. Ellis, 1811 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition, filled out card, doesn't wish to speak

Mr. Weeks states those that would like to speak.

Michelle Mudd, 1907 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

This is a dead-end residential street that we live on, there is a great safety concern. Over twenty children that live on Sarah Lane. The children attend school at Prien Lake Elementary. The primary concern is the safety issue of having a drive thru coming off of Sarah Lane. As is exiting Sarah lane is already difficult. Did not buy there home to have chicken place at the beginning of the street. Expressed concerns about a decrease in property values.

Billie Roe, 1941 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Expressed concerns over what happens if the business is not successful, the safety and well being of the residents, the school directly across the street, concerns about traffic and safety issues, concerned about quality of life-lack of quiet, also expressed concerns about a decrease in property values.

Gabrielle Harbich, 1941 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Would like to reiterate everything that has been said. Expressed traffic concerns, one entrance and one exit for Sarah Lane, expressed safety concerns, children playing in the cul-de-sac at the end of the road, concerns about success or abandonment of property, concerns about the smell, waste and pest potential.

Derek Corkran, 1913 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

States everyone on Sarah Lane is opposed to the proposal. Traffic is already an issue, expressed concerns about a decrease in property values, no one wants a chicken place, it would be one thing if the entrance was off nelson Road but DOTD said no. Expressed the desire to not have this approved.

Johnathan Georgiades, 1937 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Primary concern is for the safety of his children and all the children that walk to and from Prien Lake Elementary. Already too much traffic as it is and this will only make it even more unsafe for the children of Prien Lake Elementary.

Chris Eisen, 1946 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Presents a safety hazard for school children crossing the street. The current plan only shows entry and exit onto Sarah Lane, Expressed concerns on an increase in traffic, safety concern for all children in the neighborhood. Concerned that if it is successful there will be huge lines (referenced Raising Cane's on Ryan) and they won't be able to get to their homes. School playground is right there and they will see a fast food chicken place every day, children are very impressionable, not good for making further healthy food choices. Concerned about an increase in litter, air pollution, and a decrease in property values.

Chairman Weeks calls the developer back up asks if he would like to address any of the concerns.

Gul Awan 5640 Monarch Way, Lake Charles, LA
Agrees he has concerns about the kids, but the restaurant opens at ten in the morning so school traffic would not be an issue. Another location is open in Houston, it is high end not just another chicken place.

Chairman Weeks asks if there any other questions.

Mr. McBride would like to observe that the concerns from the residents on Sarah Lane are all valid and stated well and he is sensitive to them. If this business is not allowed access off of Nelson by DOTD and the residents rightly don't want this traffic on Sarah Lane, this property owner can never develop this piece of property, that seems to be an unreasonable outcome. Questions if we can direct this applicant with our staff to work with DOTD and get access off Nelson. Otherwise we are preventing this property owner from ever developing anything on this property.

Lauren Bynum states that their concerns (DOTD), have seen it a lot with developments that have the option to not load and off load onto a major thoroughfare corridor, they are trying to minimize the amount of curb cuts on a street like this. DOTD is always going to err on the side of not allowing another curb cut when something else is an option.

Mr. McBride states they just orphaned this property by doing that.

Lauren Bynum states we can reach out to see if there is a traffic count threshold, but for the most part any commercial development of this property they are going to want have it enter and exit off of Sarah Lane.

Mr. McBride addresses Lauren Bynum stating that if the access was off Nelson Road he would be asking questions about the Raising Cane's example. Traffic backing up would be a concern. Concern for this property owner because they have an orphaned piece of property, because these residents are pretty clear.

Lauren Bynum states correct and will reach out to DOTD to see what if anything can be done and work towards a solution. Knows from past dealings that this is the way they (DOTD) likes to handle things.

Mr. Berryhill states another thing that has come up recently is that we had eliminated

access to a side road, this particular business did have access to Nelson Road but we did not allow access to the side road, specifically because the residents did not want the traffic. It was the same situation, on Nelson, a dead end street with homes and we respected those residents' wishes by not allowing an exit. Agrees with Mr. McBride, is torn that DOTD has put a great hardship on the property owner or the developer, at the expense of the residents of Sarah Lane.

Lauren Bynum states understood.

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any more questions.

Mr. Sanders states the Waffle House was a similar development onto a small side street although they do not have a drive thru so this creates a higher traffic count. It is asking a lot for a dead end road.

Chairman Weeks addresses a member of the public stating that he did fill out a card but has information that wasn't previously addressed. Chairman Weeks grants thirty seconds to speak.

*Derek Corkran, 1913 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
There has been a petition that has been sent around, not only to Sarah Lane, one hundred and forty six people have signed this petition stating that they do not want this. There are not that many houses on Sarah lane so there is more than just Sarah Lane that doesn't want this. in addition, when they bring in supplies in an eighteen wheeler how are they going to come down and turn around in the middle of the cul-de-sac.*

Chairman Weeks points out that the petition is not relevant because we do not have it.

Chairman Weeks asks if there is any other information that has not been previously addressed.

Mr. Sanders states that the cards of the people that did not wish to speak have been circulated and reviewed.

*Gabrielle Harbich, 1941 Sarah Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Expressed concerns about emergency vehicles if traffic is backed up.*

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 0

Against: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

SPC 25-01

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: L & M TRAFFIC

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Special Exception (Sec. 4-206) in order to convert an existing non-conforming multi-modal transportation facility into an aggregate off-loading exterior storage facility, within a Light Manufacturing Zoning District. Location of the request is **400 N. Kirkman Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to convert an existing non-conforming multi-modal transportation facility/warehouse into an aggregate off-loading facility within a Light Manufacturing Zoning District. The applicant is requesting to re-establish another non-conforming use for the light manufacturing property. This proposed use of an aggregate offloading, storage, and distribution facility is consistent with the intensity and impact of the previous facility.

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

Lincoln Richardson, 1444 Carney St. Lake Charles, LA

What he is asking for is not something new. It is something that has been done on the property prior to. JB James used the property to construct I-10 from Lake Charles to Iowa. Also he bought the property in 2001, it was rezoned later and he was grandfathered in as light industrial.

Mr. McBride asks if there is a barge dock on the property. Mr. Richardson confirms.

Mr. McBride asks what the depth of the water is along there.

Mr. Richardson states that outside the barge dock it is about 15 feet.

Mr. Sanders asks a question of staff, stating that the information states to convert an existing non-conforming structure. Asks why is it non-conforming.

Lauren Bynum states it is the non-conforming use, it was a multi model transportation warehouse within light manufacturing. It was a previously existing no-conforming use, it was grandfathered in and they are just changing from one non-conforming use to another.

Mr. Sanders asks it was light manufacturing before and will be light manufacturing after if approved.

Lauren Bynum states essentially yes.

Mr. Richardson states it was actually light industrial prior to them rezoning it.

Mr. Berryhill states it is a zoning classification that is why they are using the word manufacturing.

Mr. Weeks states there is a card. For informational purposes only not to speak.

Milton Bellard, 1857 Gerstner Memorial, Lake Charles, LA- Information only

Mr. Weeks reads the statement. Basically it is stating that it is a disabled veteran owned business for over twenty two years and his property provides warehousing, rail service and port service.

Mr. Bellard confirms the information.

Mr. Weeks asks Mr. Bellard to be clear is he in favor or in opposition.

Mr. Bellard states he is in favor.

Mr. Weeks asks if there are any further questions.

Mr. Weeks confirms there are no other cards.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-08

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: LI YU

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 24-4-205) in order to 1) establish a massage therapy business within 300ft. of a Residential Zoning District and 2) allow reduction of front and side landscape bufferyard areas in order to provide required parking, within a Mixed Use Zoning District. Location of the request is **4021 Nelson Road**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to establish a massage therapy business within 300ft of a Residential Zoning District. Staff's review revealed that the proposal is bordered to the North by a vacant building, to the East by residential property, and to the West and South by commercial properties. Ordinance #20031 states that no massage establishment shall be located less than 300ft from the nearest property line of any land located in a Residential Dwelling District or Neighborhood District unless a variance is granted. If approved applicant will have to meet all other development standards including meeting the parking and landscaping requirements.

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

Li Yu, 5900 Ranchester Apt 917, Houston TX

Mr. Weeks asks applicant to state a little about the proposal.

Li Yu states current success with her business on 1912 Southwood Dr. The lease will be up the end of this month. would like to move to a new location to expand her business.

Mr. Sanders asks where is the current business.

Li Yu states her current business is 1912 Southwood Dr. It is kind of off Nelson Rd.

Mr. Sanders asks if that is a massage therapy business. Li Yu confirms.

Mr. Weeks asks if she drives back and forth from Houston everyday for work.

Li Yu states no, actually lives on Ryan St. right now.

Mr. Weeks states applicant is going to vacant the present location and is trying to secure another location.

Li Yu states no, she left 3528 Center St.

Mr. Weeks clarifies, asks if the applicant is losing the space where she is now because the lease is up.

Li Yu states the lease will be up at the end of the month. Three years already.

Mr. Weeks states ok, so you are going to leave that building when the lease is up.

Li Yu states no she is going to try to finish that lease up and then move to a new location, because right now it is very small, the business she has when the lease is up she plans to move out.

Mr. Cann speaks for Li Yu. Mr. Weeks asks him to state his name and address for the record.

Cann, 4210 Maidstone, Lake Charles, LA

Mr. Weeks asks what is the relationship to the applicant.

Mr. Cann states he is a friend of the applicant, and she is relocating her business next to another massage shop, more visibility to the public, off Nelson Rd., it three hundred feet in on the south side of Nelson Rd.

Mr. Joseph asks Lauren Bynum that the ordinance says nothing less than three hundred. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Joseph asks what is the distance.

Lauren Bynum states it is to the property line so it abuts. Zero essentially.

Mr. Sanders references the GIS Map and states that everything in yellow is residential.

Lauren Bynum states correct.

Mr. Cann states there is a massage shop to the left. Then the second one was a massage shop but eventually went out of business, and the third was a doctor's office that was vacated and he wants to lease it to her (applicant).

Mr. Weeks asks if this is across from the carwash. Mr. Cann confirms.

Mr. Sanders states that the three hundred foot from a residential zoning means that they have to come here and seek a variance. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Sanders states that doesn't mean it cannot be done. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Sanders states as long as the business plan complies with landscaping, setbacks and all of the other things that they would have to comply with. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Sanders asks if the parking as drawn on the application is sufficient parking for this business. It looks there is a garage and a home, and then there is six designated parking spaces.

Lauren Bynum states that all of the parking would have to be in front and it is not drawn to scale, it would be relatively tight to get six parking spaces in front and get the required setback landscape buffer. If this approved and they move forward with the parking, it is possible they may need to come for another variance. The drawing is not to scale so it is hard to tell but they are showing the required number of parking spaces, but since it is not to scale it is hard to say if it will work in the field.

Mr. Sanders asks if they could achieve six parking places that would be sufficient for this size structure. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Sanders states that remains to be seen. Lauren Bynum confirms.

Mr. Weeks asks if anyone has any questions.

Mr. Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 1 - Reginald Weeks

Against: 4 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-11

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JIM SHAMBURGER

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 4-205) in order to construct a proposed church facility beyond the front property or easement line with parking area in front of building, within a TND Development District (Morganfield). Location of the request is the **Northside 3100 Blk. E. McNeese Street.**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a church facility beyond the front property or easement line with parking in front of the building. In the city wide rezoning effort at the end of 2023, a large area of surrounding properties in the Morganfield area were taken out of the TND overlay due to the general development pattern being more conventional in nature and not aligning with the TND development regulations. At the time, this parcel was not considered as part of that effort, however staff finds this request reasonable.

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

Jim Shamburger, 5737 First St., Lake Charles, LA

Speaking on behalf of First Baptist church. The property was purchased about a year ago, plan to build a new facility there. The new facility would face the south for traffic and the parking and will need some space between the building and the road, which is why they are requesting the variance.

Mr. McBride states that Mr. Shamburger stated that it needs to face the south. Why is that.

Mr. Shamburger states the design of the building, the entryway, is a forty foot by twenty five foot tall glass area. If it is facing the east you are looking at the existing homes there, if it is facing towards the north you are looking off into the field, if you face it to the west the west sun hits you, but if you face it to the south all the people parking will walk into the front grand entrance we have designed. We have tried to design it so the parking is in front of it so they all will walk in that particular entrance. That is a key item to one of the ways they have designed the building. It also faces McNeese street where we think all the traffic will be coming from.

Chairman Weeks asks if there are any additional questions.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote.

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

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-12 CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: JIM SHAMBURGER

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting a Variance (Sec. 4-205) in order to construct a temporary crushed stone aggregate surfaced parking area, within a TND Development District (Morganfield). Location of the request is the **Eastside 4300 Blk. Corbina Road**.

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct a temporary crushed stone aggregate surfaced parking area to support the temporary church location across the street at 3091 Advent Court. If approved staff requests that the temporary materials and curb cut be removed or a variance be obtained to allow three curb cuts on one property. Additionally staff recommends a concrete apron be installed from the street edge back a distance of no less than 20' to minimize aggregate migrating on to the street. Staff recommends approval on the condition that the temporary lot meet the landscape standards outlined in Sec 5-210 in the Zoning Ordinance.

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

Jeff Sampson, 2825 Hill St, Alexandria, LA

Mr. Sampson states he is the architect speaking on behalf of First Baptist Church. the temporary parking area is intended to supplement the existing parking across Corbina Rd. because the church has leased a building just across the street from this location for their worship space. The existing parking that is provided is not sufficient for the Sunday morning use. We are proposing to construct fifty parking spaces as a supplemental use on a temporary basis while the new building is being constructed. Would like to ask for the use of that for a period of two years.

Mr. Sanders states as it is drawn on the application the proposed temporary parking lot is almost to the north border of the property.

Mr. Sampson states yes, it is pretty close.

Mr. Sanders asks why is it not located further south, would put people closer to where they are trying to go.

Mr. Sampson states the temporary worship space is directly across Corbina from this parking area.

Mr. Sanders states that the parking is located as far away as you can to the north but if it were moved to the southern border it would then be directly across from the worship center.

Mr. Sampson reference the map, pointing out the temporary worship center.

Mr. Sanders confirms.

Stacey Peveto clarifies Mr. Sanders is asking why not move it a little to the south.

Mr. Sampson states that he understands now, and asks meaning to move it a little bit to the south of the panhandle.

Mr. McBride asks why not on the property directly across the street.

Mr. Sampson states there is an existing power pole in place and trying to avoid it. Doesn't think anything would keep them from doing that. Mr. Sampson asks Mr. Jim Shamburger for confirmation. He confirms and references the map showing the area that the church doesn't own. Mr. Sampson asks if Mr. Sanders is meaning come down to the edge of the panhandle rather than to the north.

Mr. Sanders confirms.

Mr. Sampson states he was just trying to encumber as little of the property as possible.

Mr. Sanders states he was wondering what the reason was because moving it to the south would get the people closer to where they need to be.

Mr. Sampson states if Mr. Shamburger doesn't have any objection, the position would be the same distance off the property line, to the south as they had it to the north.

Mr. Joseph asks if there is a timeline on completing construction.

Mr. Sampson asks for the permanent building. Mr. Joseph confirms.

Mr. Sampson states approximately two years, planning to bid in mid May, then about a fifteen month construction period, should fall within a two year bracket.

Mr. Sanders states that Mr. Sampson suggested this would be temporary, for two years to allow for permitting, construction, and get this going off the premises. Mr. Sampson confirms.

Mr. McBride makes a motion for approval to move the location further south towards the southern portion of the property and valid for two years.

Mr. Berryhill seconds the motion.

Mr. Sanders states the only thing that was also mentioned was the necessity of a concrete apron of twenty feet as we do not want aggregate migrating onto Corbina Road as best as it can be avoided. Mr. Sanders asks if that is acceptable.

Mr. Sampson confirms.

Mr. Sanders make a motion that there will be a twenty foot apron, that would be concrete or some hard surface to prevent the migration of the aggregate onto Corbina Road.

Mr. Berryhill seconds the motion.

Chairman Weeks clarifies that there are two amendments. Commissioners confirm.

Chairman Weeks asks for a vote on the first amendment, to make the parking lot closer and put the two year time limit on it.

Lauren Bynum states five in favor the amendment has been approved.

Chairman Weeks asks for a vote on the second amendment, the twenty foot concrete

apron.

Lauren Bynum states five in favor the amendment has been approved.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote as amended.

Chairman Weeks called for a vote. A motion was made that this item be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

For: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Against: 0

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

VAR 25-13

CHAPTER 24 - LAKE CHARLES ZONING ORDINANCE

APPLICANT: LAKE CITY RENTALS

SUBJECT: Applicant is requesting Variances (Sec. 4-205) in order to construct homes with reduced setbacks of 10' front setback vs. 30' front setback on all lots; 2) 5' street side setback vs. required 15' setback on Lot 10; 3) 5' front setback vs. required 30' setback on Lot 7; and 4) increase maximum lot coverage exceeding 40%, within a Residential Zoning District. Location of the request is **4201-4205 Alma Lane (and rear of) (James Place Subdivision).**

STAFF FINDINGS: The on-site and site plan review revealed that the applicant is requesting to construct homes with reduced setbacks of 10' front setback vs. 30' front setback on all lots; 2) 5' street side setback vs. required 15' setback on Lot 10; 3) 5' front setback vs. required 30' setback on Lot 7; and 4) increase maximum lot coverage exceeding 40%, within a Residential Zoning District. Any request to exceed 40% lot coverage cannot be greater than 50% per Sec 4-205(5)(a)(i). Staff's review found the lot configuration and requested variances potentially challenging for access of future property owners. Therefore, staff cannot forward a position of support.

Chairman Weeks reads in PREN/MAJ/VAR 25-08.

Lauren Bynum states there is an accompanying variance VAR 25-13.

Chairman Weeks reads in VAR 25-13 as well.

Lauren Bynum states for clarification the first item the variances were very specific to the subdivision request and the second item the variances were not specific to the subdivision request that is why there are two of them.

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

Tommy Eastman, 3221 Ryan St., Lake Charles, LA

As indicated on the site plan the developer would like to put ten single family homes ranging from twelve hundred square feet to fourteen hundred square feet depending on the lot. The homes will be for sale, the price point will be between 190,000 to 220,000. This is an attempt to provide affordable housing, currently on MLS between 175,000 and 220,000 there is one active residence that is under three years old. There are major issues right now when it comes to older homes, insurance costs. The developer will have fortified roofs, lowers insurance rates and will do EnergyStar for each home.

Mr. McBride asks the section that is not included in this, James Place, currently there are two foundations laid out and plumbed, that is not part of this.

Mr. Eastman states no it is not part of this.

Mr. McBride asks if it owned by the same parties.

Mr. Eastman asks for the GIS map to be pulled up. Indicating the two foundations Mr. McBride spoke of, said those two will be taken out and the lots that are at the top, ten, nine and eight would be the entrance.

Chairman Weeks states there is a card in support.

Kevin Snider, 3617 E. Banbury, Lake Charles, LA- In Support, doesn't wish to speak.

Chairman Weeks states there is some opposition that would like to speak.

Valery Lowin, 4213 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

This proposal will build five houses along my property and those of the neighbors. Concerns about flooding, being built on a higher elevation than the existing homes, was told that no sewer would be required, every time the previous owner built the existing homes retained more water. Expressed concerns about a decrease in property values as well as concerns for traffic and safety.

James Genius, 4202 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Lives directly across from where this is proposed, has lived in this neighborhood for fifty years, every time there is building there is no consideration to the drainage, already have a flooding problem. many years ago a new drainage system was put in and they did a good job but there are still water issues and they still flood. The water is able to dissipate pretty quickly because of the new drainage that was put in. There is minimal drainage to Sale Road, and out to Nelson Road which is a long distance, the drainage that is there is sub-par for what is needed right now. in 1981 when the east side of the town was under water our ditches were not even full, now when it rains for more than fifteen minutes there is standing water in the yard. This proposal takes up more area for water displacement, the ball field can not be played in for a day or so after it rains because there is so much standing water, the water would triple into that field. there is over developing and under engineering.

Chairman Weeks asks for a summation.

Mr. Genius states it is a poor plan.

Dana L. Hermann, 4210 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Also speaking on behalf of Stephanie Gold, 4217 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Concerns expressed about quality of the drainage, space and the type of housing that will be built. The area already struggles with drainage after a heavy rain. Space is already tight, squeezing in a subdivision will shrink what little breathing room they have left. Crowded developments strain the roads, increase traffic and over burden the utilities. There have already been adjustments due to the previous building in the neighborhood. The developer is prioritizing profit over practicality. Neighborhood is currently already a high traffic area with the ball park and the recycling center. Adding a subdivision and roads to this small space would be devastating to the area.

Dennis Hermann, 4210 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition

Mr. Hermann states that he has pictures of the tract of land that is being proposed to be developed. Asks if he can submit the pictures.

Chairman Weeks states yes.

Mr. Hermann expresses concerns about drainage, and traffic (already high traffic area). Invites any council member to visit and he will show them the issues.

Chairman Weeks asks for the date of the photos that were submitted.

Mr. Hermann states they were taken in May of 2021, after a 500 year flood. Mr. Hermann stated that he objected to the homes that were already there, but they put them there. The reason the two lots aren't there is because Brad Foreman died. he was the developer and when he built those homes he (Brad Foreman) told him they were homes that were going to be sold. There have been fourteen new homes built there in the last six years, three of them are homeowners and the rest are rental properties. Mr. Hermann states that the new proposal will be rentals.

Chairman Weeks states that the three minutes are up.

*Valery Lowin, 4213 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Asked to make an additional statement. The original person that built her house, and sold her a little bitty lot, told her, when she asked about what would be behind her, in about ten years the builder would probably plant his garden. Ms. Lowin states she didn't know that the garden would consist of roads and ten more houses.*

Chairman Weeks reminds everyone to be respectful and to keep the comments to a minimum, voices carry in the room when talking amongst themselves.

*Rafe David, 4135 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
Mr. David expresses concerns about drainage, the new build next to him at a higher elevation has already caused more water to come into his property. Mr. David expresses concerns about trash pick up and the location of the trash pick up, as well as parking concerns making traffic concerns worse. There are already ongoing problems and they will not be alleviated by adding ten more homes. Right now there is a two way intersection and a three way intersection and this would add a fourth right in the bottle neck. It is already challenging because the roads are offset. There are also no sidewalks so this is adding another hazard.*

Chairman Weeks states there are no further cards.

Chairman Weeks addresses Mr. Eastman and asks if he has a retort.

*Tommy Eastman, 3221 Ryan, Lake Charles, LA
Mr. Eastman states they will not be rentals, that is not the intention. It is to his understanding that the proposal would still have to go through engineering so ultimately it will be the city's decision on where the water goes. This is the preliminary plan.*

Mr. McBride addresses Mr. Eastman, stating that there has been a lot of concern expressed about the drainage. The ten lots with the exception of one are all below the minimum lot size requirements for development, and not by a little bit but by a lot. It seems this proposal could have been drafted, even with the drainage problems, that respected the development standards of the development codes. Mr. McBride asks why that wasn't done.

Mr. Eastman states in order to hit the price points the density is needed. To make this

an affordable product there is only so much that you can do and you have to get the density.

Mr. McBride asks if the lot size restrictions are a problem throughout the city, in terms of affordable housing.

Mr. Eastman states absolutely, it drives up cost. That is why every developer is coming in here and trying to hit price points, that can actually sell.

Mr. McBride states they are not all asking for lot reductions.

Mr. Eastman states from the stand point of this piece, that is what it has to be. At the end of the day you are looking at a \$130,000 home, your note is going to be \$1250 a month, it doesn't work. Mr. Eastman states he understands all of the concerns, but as a city and as a parish, have to address this problem. If we are not growing, we are dying. The point of the whole thing is that the numbers have to work.

Mr. Sanders states that trash pick up was brought up, this particular development, the way that it is drawn it doesn't look like a city trash truck can enter and exit, will the homeowners have to drag trash cans down to Alma Lane for trash collection.

Mr. Eastman states that is not something that he had talked to the developer about but he is assuming that yes it would have to be on the setback line of lot 10. Mr. Eastman asks Kevin Snider if he had any input. Mr. Snider agrees that would be the only place for trash pick up.

Mr. Sanders states he doesn't see anything drawn for a dumpster. There is also a historical oak tree on this property. Mr. Sanders asks what is the plan with respect to that tree.

Mr. Eastman states obviously it will probably have to be cut down.

Mr. Sanders asks staff after he did some rough calculations for the square footage of the drives, it is up over eleven thousand, anything over ten, a drainage study would need to be done.

Lauren Bynum states the engineering staff would review this for the drainage requirements.

Mr. Sanders asks if the ten thousand includes the slabs or just the roadway.

Lauren Bynum states that is an engineering question but typically it is the slabs and any impervious.

Mr. Sanders addresses Mr. Eastman stating that he gave a figure of \$130,000 having a note of whatever dollars, but at the same time you stated that these homes were going to be in the \$190,000 to \$220,000 range.

Mr. Eastman states part of that note is because of the insurance. With a newer home, fortified roof, that will bring the insurance rates down.

Mr. Sanders asks if there was any thought put into trying to put in a development where you did not have to reduce lot size to the extent that you are proposing here.

Mr. Eastman states the numbers wouldn't work.

Chairman Weeks asks if there is anything that has not been previously mentioned that someone would like to add.

*Valery Lowin, 4213 Alma Lane, Lake Charles, LA- In Opposition
the developer stated that there would be no rentals, however prior to him, when Brad was alive, everything he has built after me has become rentals. In the new subdivision will there be a statement clarifying no rentals.*

Lauren Bynum states the city of Lake Charles does not dictate whether or not a property is a rental. Whatever the decision is made it cannot be based on homeowner or rental.

Ms. Lowin states the property would have to be sold first but then the owner could choose to rent it out down the road.

Lauren Bynum states we have no jurisdiction over that.

Chairman Weeks asks if there any further questions from the commissioners.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on VAR 25-08.

Chairman Weeks calls for a vote on VAR 25-13.

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

For: 0

Against: 5 - Adam McBride, Alvin Joseph, David Berryhill, Reginald Weeks and Thomas Sanders Jr.

Absent: 2 - Gus Schram III and Mitchell Gregory Pete

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURN

MEETING ADJOURNED.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

*Reginald Weeks, Chairman
Lake Charles Planning and Zoning Commission*

*Doug Burguières, Director
Office of Zoning & Land Use*