

Commissioner Booth: Next item on our agenda PZSPU-2019-01 requested by Bliss Davis for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) at 332 Apple St., Norco. Zoning District R-1A. Council District 6. Mr. Welker.

Mr. Welker: This is a special permit request for an accessory dwelling unit in an existing building at 332 Apple Street in Norco. This came about after the department received a complaint about what appeared to be some unpermitted work taking place on this structure at 332 Apple Street. Once they came in to make sure they got their necessary permits it was found that they were doing an accessory dwelling unit which needs the special permit approval so they then applied for the special permit to try to get that issue resolved as well. So they did cease work on the structure and they are waiting for this process to take place in order to begin again. It should be noted that the applicant says they purchased the property in August 2018 and the accessory building did have some component that it was used as a living space previously. It looks like an older structure, it goes back a long way but there are some elements that do indicate some sort of living space in the past, so they're looking to fix that up and use it as a living space again. The accessory dwelling unit will consist of 616 sf. It's shown as having one bedroom which is the maximum requirement by the zoning ordinance. The site development plan shows the building meets most of the site requirements for special permits and ADU's. The front setback for the R-1A zoning district is met and the existing structure is 5 inches short of complying with the side yard setback. There are some issues with the accessory dwelling unit application with requirements for accessory dwelling units themselves. One is the applicant's don't currently live at the site. In order to apply and get approved for an accessory dwelling unit, the zoning ordinance states that you have to, the owner has to be living in the primary residence in order to have the accessory dwelling unit, at this time the owner does not live at the residence, their plan is to renovate the accessory dwelling unit structure, move into that accessory dwelling unit structure, move into that then while they're living there renovate the primary living structure which is a regular single family house that fronts Apple Street, once that's done, move into there and the accessory dwelling unit kind of becomes the traditional accessory dwelling unit. That's their plan but right now that doesn't meet one of the main components for ADU's so that's pretty much the primary reason why we are recommending denial of this special permit. One of the other reasons is Norco, it's an older neighborhood, there are smaller lots, smaller developments which don't comply with the current requirements for single family zoning district. This particular site is under sized and adding the additional dwelling unit would put it beyond the density that is recommended by the low density designation that is on top of this property. So the density issue and the status of living there/not living there are two of the main components of why we're recommending denial of the application.

Commissioner Booth: Thank you Sir. Public hearing for PZSPU-2019-01, Bliss Davis for the accessory dwelling unit at 332 Apple Street, Norco. Anyone here to speak for or against? Step forward to the microphone and state your name and address please.

Bliss Davis, 23 Trepagnier, Destrehan.

Chris Borgason, Bliss' spouse, 23 Trepagnier, Destrehan.

Ms. Davis: So we did purchase this property in August that had both dwellings existing currently on the property and like he said our plan is to renovate the smaller dwelling and the put our house that's in Destrehan on the market, sell that house then move into the smaller dwelling while we renovate the main house. It will never be a rental property, it's going to be us living on the property. We're downsizing, our children are moving out, so we're moving from a big house into a smaller dwelling. We did talk to some neighbors, every neighbor that we have spoken to do support us renovating and getting the dwelling into living condition again. I have some people here. I also have from a single mom who works tonight, but she did send me a text message if I can read it to you. To whom it may concern my name is Tina Mayeux and I live at 337 Apple Street, my house is located diagonal across the street from Bliss' house. I have lived at this address for 20 years and from my front porch I can see Bliss' property. For as long as I've lived here, both structures existed on the property and I have no problem with their renovation plans.

Commissioner Booth: Thank you Ma'am.

Ms. Davis: I also was told another neighbor, the owner sent in a letter in support. That's what I was told.

Commissioner Booth: Ok. Anything else?

Mr. Borgason: I would like to address the Council. I would like to bring up a couple of points about this property – 1. We're the first owners since

Ms. Davis: It was in succession since 1920. We're the first ones to buy it out of the family.

Mr. Borgason: For nearly 100 years these properties have been at this residence, both of them, what appears to be the entire time and both buildings were livable, people lived in both buildings apparently the whole time that these people owned it, however I guess their children moved out at some point perhaps they lived in it. I don't know the arrangement they had prior to it, but they were definitely there and they were definitely both livable. They had all the appliances, bathroom the whole 9 to make it a dwelling. Secondly I'd like to address the fact that it was mentioned that we were doing work without a permit. So whenever we bought the house, the secondary dwelling, the additional dwelling unit, it was in disrepair to be honest it needed some attention. The homeowners were in their 90's, they couldn't afford it for one to make repairs to it. They had loose tin on the roof that as the wind blew it would flap up and down, every time it rained water got in etc. So we bought the property with both buildings. So whenever we devised our plan of action we said first thing we should do is because it had sheetrock in it, let's pull all the sheetrock out to see exactly what we got right? Let's see how bad it's rotten where the weather damage was, let's see if there's termite damage, whatever, right? Because I don't have x-ray vision and that's really the only way to get a good assessment on what the building is right? Come to find out the building is made with a lot of cypress and it's legitimate 2 x 4's, I mean it's a really cool building and I'm not an expert but it's obvious this thing was built in the '20's or '30's. So as we're going on, we didn't feel that the work that we were conducting at the time needed a permit, correct me if I'm wrong, because I really don't know, but I don't think you need a permit to remove sheetrock do you?

Mr. Albert: No.

Mr. Borgason: What about put a roof on?

Mr. Albert: Yes.

Mr. Borgason: You do need a permit for a roof? So we did remove the tin and install an asphalt shingle roof, so that's my fault on that but do you need a permit to put siding on a house?

Mr. Albert: No.

Ms. Davis: We'll just have to go and make a list of and go from there to see what we need a permit for the work that we have going forward.

Mr. Borgason: So that's the type of work we did, we didn't do anything significant to alter the structure or anything like that. We kind of gutted it, this is what we got, we replaced a few boards that needed to be repaired that we found. Some of them had a some termite damage which every house in south Louisiana got termites somewhere in it. We found a few boards that were weathered and needed to be replaced, quite a few actually. That's what we did, it's probably too much information but I'd rather be transparent and give yall the whole story.

Commissioner Booth: Thank you.

Ms. Davis: Would yall like to hear from the neighbors?

Commissioner Booth: That's up to them. Anyone else here care to speak?

Ms. Davis: Thank you.

Commissioner Booth: Yes Ma'am. State your name and address for the record please.

How are you doing, I'm Christian Pate, I'm actually the guy right on side of him, Tina is the neighbor the one that they had mentioned on the other side and we have no objections. We knew the lady that lived there and her husband built the structure it was at some point, either a mother in law or whatever they did with it, it was fully functional, they had a bathroom and all of that. We as the whole neighborhood has no objection to what they're doing because it seems like they are bettering it. I even asked the lady one time if she needed me to tear it down for no charge because of the tin that was flapping. The fact that they are just trying to make it something for their own kids, it doesn't matter, they're doing a lot more to this than what has been done so we're all happy about it. I'm speaking for the whole neighborhood even though they are not here. We're happy that they are taking it upon themselves to make it something nice.

Commissioner Booth: Thank you Sir. Anyone else here care to speak? Could you state your name and address please.

I'm David Gros, 344 St. Charles Street. I live right across the street from this property. What they are doing is fantastic. This street is filled with children and you can't keep your eyes on them all the time. I have an 11 year old little boy and everybody's that got little boys they are running with all their friends but this with the flopping tin as Andy had said you never knew with the wind or the weather we had if something is going to fly off and cut their head off or something. So what they are doing is actually improving the neighborhood. Look it goes both ways, my property taxes are going to go up, I'm going to pay a little bit more in taxes but that's going to help the parish too, so it kinda goes both ways with that.

Commissioner Booth: Alright

Mr. Gros: What I think they're doing is phenomenal. Thank you.

Commissioner Booth: Thank you Sir. Anyone else here to speak for or against this issue? Seeing none the public hearing is closed. Any comments?

Mr. Albert: Yes Mr. Chairman one of our primary issues really the only substantial issue is not residing in the primary dwelling and we would welcome a condition that requires them to move into the primary or meet the requirements within 2 or 3 years when the renovations are done, that would be perfectly acceptable because they have done a lot of improvements.

Commissioner Booth: Thank you Sir.

Commissioner Frangella: I'd like to say that I work with Chris, before the holidays he mentioned it to me about them coming and wanting a permit and asked me a little bit about it and I told him to get with Mr. Welker and Ms. Stein and work it out and so I know his intent is probably true, this is what he's planning on doing to move to Norco, he works right there in Norco so I would do it with the stipulation that as soon as the ADU is finished and they sell their house that they become the residents of it.

Commissioner Booth: We'll call for the vote with that stipulation.

YEAS: Gordon, Petit, Granier, Richard, Booth Frangella, Galliano
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

Commissioner Booth: That passes unanimous. Thank you.
