

2025-2-R requested by Malcolm Darensbourg for M.A.D. III, LLC for a change of zoning from C-2 to R-2 on Lots 1A and 2A, Square B, St. Rose Subdivision, 117 St. Rose Avenue, St. Rose. Council District 5.

Mr. Albert – thank you Mr. Chairman. This request is to go from neighborhood commercial to 2 family zoning. It meets the second and third evaluation criteria per department review, the department recommends approval. Thank you.

The public hearing was open.

Commissioner Keen stated we received 4 emails regarding this case.

Johnny Rupert 121 St. Rose Ave. Broadband Communications, I'm the business that's right next door to this location. I'm strongly against it; you know a lot of times we work late, and the fire department is right next to us, and we make a lot of noise. I'm concerned that if we get residents there that's just more of a reason for them to complain or stop us and on top of that we have a, it's a congested area right there and it's always a lot of traffic and we're concerned about kids playing out in the yard, getting in a wreck possibly or somebody hitting them. There is no shoulder on that road and to me it's just a safety hazard for any family dwellings to live right there. And almost everybody I talked to around that area the businesses they don't want a residential you know building right there. The reason that they even have a residence they have a restaurant across the street and the guy he came to me and says look, I want to live behind my restaurant, and he put up a sign and nobody really opposed it, it's looks like he rented out the place. He did live there for about 3-4 years and the next thing you know he's renting it out and that's really the only you know residential they have and that's not even, it's across the street away from us they not going to complain because they would be complaining about the business that he owns so they really don't have a leg to stand on. That's my concern is the safety and us creating noise problems and look they have a bar that's next door they at least once a week I'm working late, and I don't have any problems with them they make noise. So, if you put residents right there it's going to be a catastrophe, you know the police over there every day. To me, I see where on your list it's commercial right now and in the future, you know the projected was to kind of expand the commercial not put residential into it. So, I strongly oppose it, and I even have a video of this past weekend, you know they would put a, this is right next to this lot if they would put residents there, there is no way, they would be complaining they would be crying and they would have to shut those businesses down. So, I'm strongly opposed to it. If y'all want to see that video.

Commission Keen – you would have to submit it.

Travis Cornwell 120 Bart St. St. Rose – thank you for hearing us out this afternoon. I'm opposed to it. Reading through the criteria for evaluation I believe you said 2 and 3.

Mr. Albert – I apologize I meant to say 1 and 3.

Mr. Cornwell – I think I'm strongly opposed to number 1 as far as it goes to the future land use, as Johnny said the current zoning here in the middle versus the future land use. I done some pretty extensive reading on the 2030 Comprehensive Plan for Land Use and my understanding is they want to expand the commercial area (inaudible) St. Rose Ave. and River Road including expanding into the residential area with some mix use maybe adding some business parks zoning and things like that but nothing in it that I read said we want to reduce the commercial use by taking this one of the last undeveloped commercial zoning and converting it into a residential. I think that would actually go backwards against the projected land use that's shown on this map and put into the comprehensive plan, um like I say when you look at this area that really is one of the last undeveloped commercial. I think currently there is another lot, it's about 30 feet wide which is really not feasible for development. Next to it on River Road, his business, all the additional businesses, there's a restaurant across the street with apartments like he said I think they want to say we already have rentals so that's a justification for similar use. I think it's starting to put more residential more apartments than commercial so it's not really expanding commercial.

Sure, you want residential to support commercial but you kind of in danger of becoming more residential than commercial. Also, the shopping center next door has a gas station, a daycare, a laundry mat etc. It has good occupancy I think we could probably use some more commercial in that area (inaudible). If we turn this commercial into a residential there really is no more commercial land to develop in that area. I think it will stop and go against the future land use. Number 2 which did not meet the request I like the way it's supported by saying the current zoning C-2 has uses that the surrounding residential neighborhood would benefit from I think that more supports the future land uses. The current zoning C-2 supports the neighborhood more than a multi-family residential would. For the third item, potential uses permitted by the zoning would be incompatible with the existing neighborhood character or over burden public facilities. I got no dispute about public facilities. But it would be incompatible with existing neighborhood character its kind of said this intersection is a mix of C-2, R-1, R-1AM and R-2 but it's really not a mix of R-2, yes there's one and they reference it one R-2 zone about 60 ft. behind it that's actually owned by the St. Rose Fire Department that's not a rental, it's unoccupied it's probably just used for staffing purposes for the public fire department so it's really not a mix of R-2. It's a mix of commercial and R-1 in this area. There is a multi-tenant building across the street but that is also zone C-2, I don't think converting this to R-2 is going to expand it and if they want to use the C-2 for residential then maybe they can apply for a special use permit and not a rezone. The neighborhood character and the surrounding areas are predominantly R-1 and C-2, this is more or less looking through a microscope but the more you zoom out there really are no R-2 in that area even going back for miles. So, um in short I read through the Comprehensive Plan for 2030 the future land use I strongly think it does not support number one that it conforms to the land development established by St. Charles Parish and I don't think it's compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. I think C-2 as is, is more compatible with future land use and supports the neighborhood. Thank you.

Johnny Rupert 22 Holster Lane St. Rose – my son and I own Broadband Communications, and I'm opposed to rezoning that property to R-2 because it's between two commercial buildings and both owners oppose rezoning this and I'll tell you the reason why. I don't want to do it, there are many reasons but there's the people who are going to move in them apartments you got good people, and you got bad people. Now the good people they may move in and they may have children they may not but they might have might be divorced and bring the children in when the children come in they bring their skateboards and they bring their bicycles and you know where their playground is, the parking lots of Broadband and the Cart n Carry. If one of these kids gets killed by a car backing over them or they break their arm or their leg they coming sue us, the owner. So, the next thing is the bank you could have a drug dealer in there or you could have a drug user, and the drug user will spend all day trying to figure out how to break, how to kill that alarm and break in the washeteria which is right out side his door or he could come to our place Broadband and break in our building or steal a truck or break in a truck so he can have money to support his habit. So, what I'm saying we been through this before years ago same thing different owner and it was denied. Now the only, right now the only people who can support us and keep this from happening is Planning and Zoning. Thank you.

Dalton Gautreaux 106 Bart St. – lifelong resident of St. Rose Subdivision. I'm in agreement with these gentlemen that just spoke and went over these details and areas and like Johnny had said, years ago different owner tried to do the same thing the people didn't want it then, don't want it now. I'm speaking for the homeowners, that's all I got to say.

The public hearing is closed.

Commissioner Frangella made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Price.

YEAS: PRICE, ROSS
NAYS: JAY, KEEN, FRANGELLA, FOLSE
ABSENT: PETIT
FAILED
