

Commissioner Petit: 2021-1-SPU requested by S-One Properties, LLC for a for an R-3 use in a C-2 zoning district, Lot 2010, Ormond Country Club Estates-Commercial Area, 15 Storehouse Lane, Destrehan. Council District 3.

Mr. Welker: The applicant requests a special permit for an R-3 use in a C-2 zoning district, specifically a 3-unit multi-family development. The original report you received was detailed a 4-unit development, we've since worked with the applicant to actually get this scaled down to 3 in order to prevent the lot from being overbuilt, required more parking and really didn't have good traffic circulation and parking arrangement so we worked with them, they worked with us to try to reduce the burden by reducing the amount of units and the parking requirement. So now we have one for 3 units, the site address at 15 Storehouse Lane is currently vacant and cleared. The applicant purchased the property in September 2020. The revised plan meets the majority of the criteria for the special permit use. The first 2 criteria which address use and compatibility, we found are still not necessarily met as this is a distinctly residential development in both use and design but in a developed commercial corridor. It abuts commercial uses on each side and would place a potential burden on those uses in particular buffering requirements in the event that those sites are significantly redeveloped as then they would be next to a residential use. As far as the other criteria which pretty much addresses site design type stuff, parking, landscaping what not we find that this revised site plan does meet the majority of those, all of those which would make for the majority of the special permit use criteria. As I said this pretty much addresses site design requirements for parking, landscaping what not, as far as parking the revised site plan now shows 3 units requiring 8 parking spaces including 1 accessible space which is required. Each of these spaces can be accepted and the overall parking requirement is now met. For vehicular circulation the revised site plan allows for a parking area which could be more conveniently and safely navigated. Initial concerns regarding maneuverability and traffic flow through this site we find have been alleviated. I also went over this with the parish engineer in Public Works who expressed initial opinions regarding traffic flow throughout the site when it was initially the 4 units, he had those concerns initially. Upon seeing the revised plan for 3 units he said his concerns had been addressed as well. As far as landscaping, the plan shows 1,443 sq. ft. of space for designed landscaping which meets the requirements which called for 1,335 sq. ft. The plan also shows 3 trees when 2 were required. All this designed landscaped area would be located in a way that it is visible from the street so we would know that it's being maintained and serving its purpose of trying to beautify the area. So with all that being said the department does recommend approval after finding the special permit does meet the majority of the special criteria.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you. Would the applicant please state your name and address for the record.

Navdeed Singh, 15 Storehouse Lane in Destrehan.

Commissioner Petit: Anything to add?

Mr. Singh: I think he covered most of it but I just wanted to add there's a handful of other properties in Council District 3, I live in Council District 3 and I'm very invested in my area. I worked with their guidelines and seem to have it all covered, I've complied with all parish regulations with everything I've ever done and they recommended approval and wish yall do as well.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you. We're going to open the public hearing now for 2021-1-SPU for S-One Properties LLC, anyone here to speak for or against please approach the podium. Also state your name and address for the record please.

Good evening, my name is Abby Mack, I live at 4616 Avron Boulevard in Metairie. I work at Crescent Title which is at 12 Storehouse Lane in Destrehan and I also have membership interest in that property and I have the authority to speak for the owners on behalf of my request that this be opposed. I'm asking that it be opposed given the nature of the location is entirely a commercial street and it only has commercial

buildings on it. There was only 1 lot left on the street which was this one and it's at the end of the cul de sac and S-One is asking for a special use permit to have it be allowed to put multi-family dwellings, it's not built for that, it's not a good use for that to have residences in a commercial location. It's going to provide difficulties for the surrounding businesses. So currently Storehouse Lane is occupied by commercial businesses and zoned C-2. Zoning laws are created for the simple purpose of protecting the health, safety and general welfare of the people as it relates to land use. Zoning regulations are used as a permitting system to prevent new development from harming existing residences or businesses. S-One is singling out a small parcel of land for use totally different than that of the surrounding area, an island of land singled out for commercial district for residential use has the appearance of spot zoning to me. Our street as I said is totally commercial, it does not conform to residential use, we don't have sidewalks for pedestrians to safely use getting to parking areas, walking paths or bike paths. As a commercial street, Storehouse Lane is bustling with delivery trucks, service vehicles and other commercial vehicles. This existing business operation and vehicles are not compatible with residential dwellings. Not only is there a safety concern for Storehouse Lane, it's already congested with commercial traffic and adding more residential traffic is going to lead to a problem with more congestion and there's no light at the intersection of Storehouse Lane and Ormond Boulevard, which is going to cause further congestion. Additionally, S-One didn't consider the impact it would create on the surrounding businesses and the residents who will reside at that site. When I look at other multi-family sites I see overflow parking on the streets, this does not have that at all, there's no place for overflow parking in the cul de sac. The residents, guests, and invitees are going to be forced to park in the surrounding businesses parking lots and I object to that. Not only does it make it difficult for the businesses, it makes it difficult for the businesses patrons and invitees and being able to access and it creates a liability if the children are parking or playing in our area and are injured it's going to be a liability for us. There is no additional room as I said for children to play outside or for family's to host gatherings except for the street and surrounding parking lots. The lack of street sidewalks or areas for children I think present a safety hazard for those children. The Commission needs to consider the negative impacts for surrounding businesses and the safety risks for potential residents. Earlier this year, S-One submitted a request to rezone this parcel for residential use and that application was withdrawn and he submitted a special permit and requested that 4 units be built and just as recently as 3 days ago they changed that and submitted another site plan revision for what you see today, 3 units. My question is does this late site plan revision meet the time frame requirements for proper public advertisements. I only found out this afternoon that the Planning & Zoning was recommending this after the initial denial of the rezoning and the initial denial of the 4 unit. I want to also point out to you, I have a copy of the survey of S-One and I'm on the, if you look to the left I'm on that side. Where they are, where I think they are suggesting to put a parking lot is a servitude so they are going to be building on top of a servitude and parking on top of a servitude, I have an issue with that, I think you would have an issue with that. I think that's a problem. Spot zoning occurs when a single parcel is zoned differently than surrounding uses for the sole benefit of the landowner, although property may lawfully be zoned differently than surrounding uses pursuant to guiding planning documents like the Comprehensive Plan and the policies and the Zoning Ordinances, such varying uses are typically permitted only because they serve a public benefit, this does not serve public benefit. The department is currently working on a new Comprehensive Plan and does this special use really fit in that Comprehensive Plan? When Planning & Zoning denied recommending approval to rezone, they said 3 things and I think these 3 things still apply to our current situation. The proposed R-3 zoning does not conform to the neighborhood commercial land development pattern shown on the Future Lane Use Map it creates a spot zoning that is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, they were saying it's incompatible, it's a spot zoning. The commercial land use pattern was established in the 1980's by the developer and approved by the parish for commercial land use only, this pattern use is still the same today and the existing C-2 zoning allows for reasonable use of property. We're not a street that was commercial but is turning residential, we are a street that is all commercial and is vibrantly commercial and staying commercial. It doesn't fit I think within the guidelines. Also approving this request to build a multi-family residence on the last vacant lot would

create an incompatible views that is inconsistent with the existing neighborhood character where most businesses are occupied during regular business hours, I think that presents a problem. These were their words not mine and I agree with all of those statements. I also have and it's hard to see but I've made copies and I don't know if I can give you these copies to look at, these are pictures

Commissioner Petit: You can hand them to Marny and if you can wrap it up Ms. Mack because typically we only give 3 minutes.

Ms. Mack: I appreciate the time the time that you've given me and the fact that you're listening to me I do appreciate that. There is a retaining wall in the front that runs the length partially on my property and partially on the property of S-One and I have not heard anything in regard to whether they are going to cut into that wall because if they cut into that wall it's going to cause erosion and they are 30-year-old trees that probably will not survive. So I'm curious to know what they are going to do in that relation, if that wall is going to be cut in half or more. I also want to remind you when Marny was reading that there are still things that do not comply even though they are recommending approval. The compliance with the current St. Charles Parish Comprehensive Plan and compatibility does not apply. If a special permit is approved and the site is developed with multi-family residents, a legally non-conforming site condition will be created by the abutting commercial uses. Neither the abutting daycare nor office building have the required 10 ft. buffer which would cause problems and undue burdens on those 2 businesses. I've been a business owner, I've been on this street for approximately 30 years, I moved to that street because it was commercially zoned, I want it to stay commercially zoned. I'm not objecting to development of a commercial nature which fits in with that property. I'm not objecting to that at all, I'm objecting to a special permit use for a residence or for multi-family residences. I respectfully ask that you deny this request on the grounds of protecting the people and the commercial integrity and I do appreciate your time.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you Ms. Mack. This is the public hearing for 2021-1-SPU anyone else here to speak for or against? Please approach the podium and state your name and address for the record.

My name is John Campo, I reside at 105 Ducayet Drive, Destrehan. That is directly across the railroad tracks from this property. Yes I do have a special interest in it because I am Mr. Singh's architect so I have some control over the look of it. The house across the street from me has been purchased by the parish to improve the drainage and it will be torn down very shortly. So standing in my front door on my front porch, that is what I'm going to see. I don't understand Ms. Mack's not agreeing with what's being put in there because times have changed, this is not the only property Mr. Singh owns on this street, he owns other commercial property but he has trouble leasing it, this covid pandemic has changed the business environment and he's not able to lease some of that other property but he does own property that could have additional parking overflows if that was an event that would come up in this multi-family development. You have Hill Heights as the back yard of this, very nice looking property that's not developed and it's a swim club. The other rear property is a soccer field. Then the other next door neighbor is a daycare center full of kids, lively, playing out in the yard. This is a perfect area to be putting in multi-family. I see this as more of an upscale development as my client has requested and I think it's going to blend in very nicely on a very quiet street. Yes it is the last property but I'm excited that something is being developed and business moves on here in this neighborhood, so I hope you consider those factors that we've been working very closely with Planning & Zoning to get the right fit for this property and the 3 separate developments or the 3 separate properties are residential areas that seem to conform with everything they require. It has the 10 ft. setback from either side which is what is normally required of a business that's next to a residential and this is the other way around and why I don't understand the objection, because it would be generally the other way around. It's going to be a nice property, it really will be for 3 lucky families and if they have kids they can walk next door for daycare services. Thank you.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you Mr. Campo. Anyone else here to speak for or against?

Good evening my name is Michael Weinberg, I live at 17 Elms Court in Destrehan. I am a neighbor of the Singh's. I am proud of the other properties that they own on that street on the corner of Ormond Boulevard and Storehouse Lane as well as a strip between that corner and the subject property in question. In the unlikely event that the overabundance of parking on the site plan as designed is inadequate for some special function, Mr. Singh will make the parking lots of both of those other properties available after hours for any overflow parking should the need arise. Additionally, I'd like to point out to the Commissioners that the property has fenced in back yards in each unit for the children to play, much like the area where the daycare children can play. If left as C-2 this would involve a more intense use of public services and traffic and that's why I think it's an appropriate use of this property and ask for your consent. Thank you.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you Mr. Weinberg. Anyone else here to speak for or against? This is a public hearing for 2021-1-SPU, please state your name and address for the record.

Good evening my name is Michael Kinler, I live at 901 Gassen St., Luling. I'm one of the owners of Small World Daycare and Learning Center. We oppose this rezoning in this area because all of this property is commercial, we want to keep it commercial because if we have a residential building built there we have school busses 4 times in the morning, 4 times in the evening that bring kids to our daycare and pick them up and bring them to school. So that whole corner is used for school busses to turn around. So any parking they might have on the street in front of their property could affect some traffic issues that we have. Like I said we want to keep it commercial and our family has been there for over 30 years. Thank you.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you Mr. Kinler. Anyone else here to speak for or against?

Michael Kinler Jr., I'm the grandson and son to partial owners of Small World Daycare and Learning Center. I just wanted to point out based on a few things they said on the overflow parking, I think transportation from the overflow parking, as she pointed out, there's no sidewalks, they'd be walking through the street. Also, the commercial vehicles, kids walking up and down the street to do that, I think things are changing on the street but overall I think as of right now I think it should stay commercial. Hill Heights is there and the baseball fields are there but those are all things that would have to be accessed going around the street, kids would get tempted to walk and it's putting kids in a bad position right now and I would hate to see them get hit by a car or something because there's not that proper access for them to get there. Thank you.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you Mr. Kinler. Anyone else here to speak for or against? You can come forward Mr. Singh.

Mr. Singh: So we do have the overflow parking. The commercial use would be more intensive for traffic, people parking, that's why we downsized to 3 units. There are double car garages more than accommodating spaces for parking. I'm not sure about the sidewalk, there isn't any other street in Ormond that has sidewalks except for Ormond itself. There's the park at fire station and soccer fields for kids to play. Kids aren't going to play in the street. I'm not sure if any of yall have been down Storehouse Lane, it's a very quiet street, it's not a bunch of bustling businesses, it's a very quiet street, quaint, I would love to build commercial but like I've said I have other commercial that's not renting, that's not doing well. Covid hit us, so I think this is very viable, I think it's going to be a nice development and I don't think it's going to be very intrusive on the neighborhood, it would create privacy. There's 10 ft. that they're requesting as a buffer zone, I'm going to absorb all that and abide to everything that Planning and Zoning recommended.

Commissioner Petit: Thank you, we appreciate it. Anyone else to speak for or against, if not we'll close the public hearing for 2021-1-SPU. Any questions or comments from Commissioners for Mr. Singh? Seeing none, motion to approve 2021-1-SPU.

YEAS: Ross, Schexnaydre, Keen, Galliano
NAYS: Petit, Dunn
ABSENT: Frangella

This will go to the Council which will be placed on an upcoming agenda at the Council. If you wish speak again either in favor or opposition, you'll have a chance to at the Council.