

**Mr. Welker** – yea this item let's meet 2 to 3 rezoning guidelines in order to receive approval recommendation from department. With our review, we found it does not meet either of the or any of the rezoning guidelines and receives a recommendation of denial. To summarize those items, criteria one whether or not it meets the future land use map designation of the comp plan or is a spot zoning that is incompatible with surrounding neighborhood. The property is designated low to moderate residential future land use map which recommends zoning districts of R1-A, R1-B, and R1-A(M). The M-1 zoning district does not conform to those designations and while the property adjacent to existing M-1 zoning, the proposed rezoning would extend industrial zoning further into a residential area without the support of the comprehensive plan. So, while not having the appearance of a spot zone, it does not meet the guideline due to not furthering the comp. plan. Whether or not the land use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning no longer allows reasonable use, and the proposed zoning does the R1-A(M) zoning remains reasonable. There are manufactured homes and single-family dwellings present on adjacent lots. It is not apparent that the permitting of a residence is no longer feasible on lot G itself. While several M-1 rezonings have been approved along Almedia Road, they occurred exclusively across from portions already zoned M-1 and where no residential development is present. Rezoning to M-1 on lot G will allow industrial encroachment into an area which has maintained residential and commercial character, and which is supported by the future land use designation. Item three, whether or not potential use is permitted by the proposed rezoning will not be incompatible with the existing neighborhood character and overburden public facilities. Lot G is located on Almedia Road, which is developed with a mix of residential and neighborhood commercial uses towards River Road, and light industrial uses towards Airline Drive. The subject site is in a particular location where Almedia Road transitions from residential, commercial to the industrial corridor towards Airline. Despite what appears to be a mix of uses and zoning around lot G, the department must give weight to the residential and commercial character of the area when evaluating this request, especially given the presence of either residential homes or neighborhood commercial located to three sides of the property. So, this conclusion is supported by the future land use designations in the area, which establish a clear line for where industrial development should begin and end and the department does recommend denial.

**Commissioner Petit**- is the applicant present? Do you wish to speak? A note it's that the Commission, the Planning and Zoning Department recommends denial. But we will have a public hearing, and we will decide after. Do you have any questions or anything to add? If you wouldn't mind, you need to step up to the podium and speak into the microphone

**Applicant** – Karen Abate 10784 River Road St. Rose, I don't have anything different than what I've already provided. Why is it denied? I mean, I don't because it's supposed to be residential there.

**Commissioner Petit** – at the moment, the Planning and Zoning Department is recommending denial because it doesn't meet the criteria for rezoning.

**Ms. Abate** – I’m asking is that the reason? Because it’s classified as a residential in the overall plan. Is that the reason?

**Commissioner Petit**- yes, correct.

**Ms. Abate** – because there is so much commercial right there. Right next door to me there is a auto repair shop. That’s why it’s so hard for me to understand why I can’t use it for commercial. It’s already been approved, it’s approved for a mobile home, so I guess that’s all I can use it for.

**Commissioner Petit** – at the moment it’s zoned for R-1A(M) yes. And we will vote and we will have a hearing and vote, but at the moment the department recommends denial.

**Mr. Welker** – I also want to add we’re issuing a recommendation; their vote will be a recommendation as well. This will go to the parish council, they will make the final decision on it. So it could be worth reaching out to your council person to see if you know, they might lend their support.

**Ms. Abate** – I don’t think it’s going to be approved because it’s in the overall plan residential so I guess they are going to leave it at that.

**Commissioner Petit** – as Chris mentioned it would be good for you to reach out to your council person. Speak to them. Thank you.

**Ms. Abate** – okay, thank you.

The public hearing was opened and closed after no one spoke for or against.

**Commissioner Frangella** – I got one for Chris. If it was a C-1, C-2 that would be still since it’s across the street, it would be equal kind of right, or no? Because it’s all commercial across the street.

**Mr. Welker** – yeah it would still wouldn’t meet the FLUM designation, but there might be a little bit more room for other considerations if it was a lesser what they wanted to use it for.

**Commissioner Petit** – any other questions? We don’t have any letters are anything from neighbors or either for or against.

Commissioner Ross made a motion to approve, seconded by Commissioner Keen.

YEAS: NONE  
NAYS: FRANGELLA, FOLSE, ROSS, PETIT, KEEN  
ABSENT: PRICE

**PASSED**

---