

2026-6-R requested by Robert Gilbert for a change of zoning from R-1A to O-L on Lots 1,2, and 3, South of Lagattuta Estates Subdivision, termini of Terri and Diane Drive, Luling. Council District 7.

Mr. Welker – yeah, the department recommends approval of this rezoning based on meeting the second and third rezoning criteria. To summarize each of those criteria, whether or not it meets the future land use designation. The designation here is wetlands, which is an extremely restrictive designation. It doesn't include any others recommended zoning other than the wetland zoning district, which is an extremely limited zoning district. So, for that reason, criteria one is not met because it doesn't fit the wetlands zoning district. Criteria two we found is met. Whether or not the land use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning no longer allows reasonable use. This area of land experienced significant residential subdivision development, which has more or less since kind of stalled out with the exception of Heather Oaks a couple of years ago. But no new subdivision development has occurred in quite a few decades. So, there's also the presence of wetlands on the site. And this would introduce environmental constraints, which limits the suitability for your typical R1A, a subdivision which allows for 6,000 square foot lots. The OL zoning district allows for larger lots, much lower density at 20,000 square feet so given the physical limitations that could exist on this site, the potential for fewer lots with the zoning district we find more reasonable. Additionally, the site has been rezoned previously from R1A to OL a small portion of up towards the Terri and Diane. And by making this change, it would address what is an existing split zoning. So, the request meets the second guideline. On the third guideline, which is also met. Whether or not use is permitted in the zoning district would be incompatible. There's some agricultural uses which can be permitted in OL, which in some situations could be seen as incompatible when next to R1A typical neighborhoods and what not. But as noted previously, previous rezoning did change a portion of this site to OL open land where those uses could be permitted. Now we find that by expanding the OL across the entire site, if for whatever reason, anyone were to develop agricultural uses back here, there's more space to spread it out, more room to add, keep the wooded buffer if necessary, separating it from the nearby residential neighborhood. But we find that mostly an OL zoning, we find there's development of single-family site-built homes on just larger lots. And with that typically being the case, when you see OL zoning or rezone OL, there wouldn't be incompatibility between what could be developed and then what would be, you know, next door. So, we find the criteria three is met and based on meeting two out of three, we recommend approval.

Julie Hebert with Civil and Sports Design Engineering. I'm representing the Gilbert family due to the change in dates of this meeting, there weren't able to be here because they had a conflict in their schedule and they're out of state. We have worked, our firm has worked with three generations of the Gilbert family. They are very well recognized family in St. Charles Parish. They not only have a well established business and very successful business, but they also saved the golf course back in Willowdale through their own blood, sweat and tears and money. We helped with some of those projects as well. Everything they say they are going to do, they do, and they do it well. And the children are now graduating from college.

So, the oldest son is an engineer, his wife is about to finish up veterinary school at LSU. They're horse people. They want to do two family country setting homes back there with an architect and very well done as you can imagine, like their homes are and like they've done with the club. And so it's basically taking what is now R1A and with the wetland issue, although it shows it as future use on the 30 year plan that it's wetlands. We've upgraded our pump stations and our drainage capacities tremendously. So, we're essentially draining that whole area. The preliminary determination on the wetland, the worst-case scenario is it's predominantly non wet. Just some perimeters are wet towards the canal, but it's showing that the biological the biologist with biological surveys went out there he thinks that in the end when the total JD is done it'll be non-jurisdictional or just non wet because it's been under pump. So, things that use to grow out there are now dying. And even some of the cypress trees are not healthy, things like that. So, it's connected to an adjacent wetland. There's a big canal between with pump stations. So, this is the density that they want to do is two homes. We have no impact on sewer, no impact on water, no impact on traffic issues, the school has no impact, John Rome's not here tonight but he'd love to hear that. So, no impact on the school system. We're looking at 2 to 4 children. Two of their boys, that's it. They have two children, two boys. They both want a wooded private area. They want to place their homes in the middle of the woods and then stables would be to the south for their horses and their little pasture of land back there. And it would be just a private drive going back. So, and then the other son, who is not a horse guy, he just wants his house to the left and he's younger. He has a starter home now. He probably that might be a seven, eight, ten-year plan. He's not married, so he's just starting out. But the older son who is an engineer, he will be coming back. Well, he's already back, rephrase that. He's back working in Pedal Valves. He's an engineer. He will be the one taking the company to the next level as well. And now they're living in between LSU and here so that she can finish up her vet school. So, they just want to come home. And it's nice to be able to have our children come home, have a compatible living arrangement. And everything they do, they do well. So, it'll do nothing but increase value. They won't even know they're back there. They want privacy. So, the reason that they want to put the open land to the back is they don't want their horses up against the fences on the residential side. They want that protected. So, that's kind of where we are with it and I hope we can get your support.

The public hearing is open.

Thomas Fauchaux 612 Diane Dr. Lagattua, the property boarder up against the Gilbert property. What they leaving out, they water, put the entrance on Diane Dr. which is a cul de sac that's been in existence since the beginning of the subdivision. There's an entrance on Terri Dr. that was designated to get to that property. When the Hooper's had it way back when that y'all probably don't know. And also on Wade St. there's a road also to get onto that property. But they want to take the cul de sac and it's a dead end street and use that as the entrance for what reason I'm not sure you know what the reason is for that when Planning and Zoning ok'd two entrances of that property years ago. And then we have problems with drainage already in the back of Lagattua. The last rain event we probably had a foot and half tow foot of water in the streets, which presently pumps out the front on Primrose to the front

of the front of the subdivision and also drains to the south end of Lagattua which goes into the canal on the Gilberts property. That goes all the way to what we used to call a second canal. I'm not sure the name of the canal is going to the pumping station, so that's an issue. Also, that would be hampered by making the entrance on Diane Dr. where we have drainage that we fought for years back to get put in there, that would be disturbed along with being a dead-end street. And I have no problem with them building two homes and that for their children. What they want the horses? Well, that remains to be seen. But I just don't understand the reason for, to take a cul de sac and make that the main entrance when you have an existing road on Terri and one on Wade St. going to the property already. Ok and that's pretty much all I got for it.

Steve Templet 616 Diane Dr. I'm two houses down from Mr. Fauchaux, and I'm at the extreme corner of the subdivision. And I will be the person most impacted by this, undoubtedly by everybody in the neighborhood. We've lived there 22 years, and we bought the house for the quiet character with a promise from a realtor that this was designated wetlands that could never be developed. And the parish's land use maps says that I understand the zoning but it says that. I'm an architect. I routinely go to other parishes, zoning meetings, and I never thought I'd have the issue in my life where I have to come defend the wetlands behind my house, in my own parish. But here we are. It's their property. I understand it's the American way to be able to do what you want with your property, but there are some things in this application that aren't very factual. It's passed the two out of three designation. We understand one. One didn't pass because the wetlands. The second one where it specifically says would not overburden public facilities and infrastructure. What Mr. Fauchaux didn't mention there's a subdivision levee around Lagattua, a small one from when it was develop, on Terri, there the street goes straight to their property or Wade there's no levee. But our back corner is the low corner, and we're the lowest part. All the water, the subdivision are part of the subdivision drains to us in the cul de sac and then gets pumped underground all the way to the front canal. So, we get all the water in the subdivision. If they pierce our levee at the back of the cul de sac, we're going to equalize just like Katrina in New Orleans. Whatever water is in the back area is going to flow through that cut, because they're going to have to cut a driveway through the subdivision levee right there. There is no doubt in my mind that this is going to cause me personal problems. Two weeks ago in the rain event, I had water this far from my porch. That's only happened once before and that was Katrina. Rain's getting worse, drainage is getting worse, and they about to exacerbate this. So, the idea that they won't overburden public facilities and infrastructure is factually incorrect, as far as I'm concerned. I understand you're an engineer and I also understand you can write this in such a way that it sounds like there's no impact. We're not even going to talk about the fact that this is it was labeled a win win for the community. There's going to be several hundred trucks coming through here for the next couple of years with concrete and dirt. Has anybody been to this site? It is low lying area. They will need so much soil to build back there. It's unbelievable. And that area drains to the back canal by itself. I don't want it to drain into our subdivision. I'm running out of time, so thank you for your support.

Mrs. Hebert – yes I can answer some of these questions. So, he kind of answered it at the end. He said that that drains to the back of the canal. He's exactly right. It doesn't drain towards the subdivision where they're levied. It drains to the back towards the canal. They would meet all of our municipal codes. When they're building back there, they're doing two homes. Currently, there are three lots in Lagattuta that are not built upon. So, if those people sold their lots again, same truck traffic, same building materials to build the homes back there, it's going to be two homes. They're keeping it in a natural setting. They're not clearing all the land. I would be more concerned if we kept it R1A. What we doing is taking it out of R1A. I'm telling you that the biologist is saying this is not wet, it is reverting to non-wet. And that is a developer's dream. They could put up to 130 homes back there. That would tax the infrastructure, that would tax your water, your sewer, your drainage, and they would have trucks for years and years. These are two homes. They're not going to take years and years and years to build the two homes. So that's a non-issue. Both of the, both Terri Dr. and Diane Dr. have the stub out barriers because when you build as you know, you can't box in property. So, they have the stub out streets for future development so that someone's property is not non developable. So, even though it's a cul de sac right now, it's a cul de sac with a stub out for future growth. So, it could be 130 homes, 150 homes, depending on how small they with the lots to meet the code. But you know, we've made a lot of subdivisions. These are two homes. This isn't going to impact drainage. So, thank you.

Commissioner Petit – thank you Mrs. Hebert. Any last questions or comments you only have, you can only come up once to talk. Sorry, thank you.

Inaudible chatter from the audience.

Commissioner Petit – she got to come up twice because she's the applicant. She's representing the applicant. You can't talk in the audience. You have to speak in the mic and you only get one. Sorry we will ask her to come back up and talk about the streets, but we don't have full plans for that yet. This is a rezoning request, so there's a sketch, but I would imagine that Planning and Zoning would have to work with the permit through the permitting department.

Mrs. Hebert – I can answer it because I'm not combative about it. So, those streets, a lot of times realtors will say a lot of things to sell property like that'll never be developed. We've heard that a million times. But unless you buy the land, right? So, what I'm trying to say is that the streets have stub outs and Planning and Zoning requires when you do any type of a subdivision, that a street that kind of a dead ends into another property, it is a stub out for future development. So, even though it may look okay, we can't, we can't miss the future. (inaudible chatter in the audience) But that's why. So, just so you know they're not trying to do something they shouldn't do. It is the straight shot into the subdivision to go down there least impactful. Instead of meandering all the way through the subdivision. (inaudible chatter from the audience) It's no it's least impact impactful. So I'm not going to do that, but thank you.

Commissioner Petit – Mr. Fauchaux if you could please either exit or sit down and listen. We can't dialog from the audience.

Commissioner Price – Yeah. My question. So basically, I guess what this guy's question is, if Terri is already accessible to that neighborhood, why won't they just use Terri to the property?

Mrs. Hebert – I believe both streets are accessible. So, it's either going to be the man who is on Dianne Dr who's upset, or maybe the person who's on Terri Dr., who's upset. So the property, it kind of divides the property at Diane Dr. so that you go each way. So, they would come in with their private drive. It's not a street; it's a private driveway. It's going to go in with a private drive. And why off one house to the left. One house to the right. I think that you have the plan before you.

Commissioner Petit – I don't know if they have it on, put it on the screen.

Mrs. Hebert – it's not, I asked earlier, but it's not. But yeah, it just make sense to go straight in and then y off one house to the left and one house to the right to give privacy for the neighborhood. And this is just for rezoning. I mean construction plans will come and to be approved by all the departments as well. Thank you.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Folse made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Keen.

YEAS: FOLSE, PETIT, KEEN, FRANGELLA, ROSS, PRICE

NAYS: NONE

ABSENT: DORAND

PASSED
