

CALL TO ORDER
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jack Keen, Marilyn Ross, Ryant Price, Randy Petit, Jr.
Richard Folse, Jr., James Krajcer, Jr.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carmine Frangella

ALSO PRESENT: Michael Albert, Chris Welker, Brett Badgerow, Zoe Vittur
Donya Hebert, and Toriel Flot the Planning Department.

Commissioner Petit had a request to move 2024-1-R to the end of the agenda due to large turnout.

Commissioner Price made a motion to move the case till the end, seconded by Krajcer, Jr.

Motion-passed

2024-1-HOP requested by Emily Price Brennan for a home occupation – “Magnolia Roots Notary LLC” – at 336 Evelyn Drive, Luling. Council District 2.

Ms. Vittur – read the land use report and the department recommends approval.

Applicant wishes not to speak.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Keen made a motion to approve, second by Price.

YEAS: Price, Keen, Ross, Petit, Folse, Jr., Krajcer, Jr.
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: Frangella
PASSED

2024-2-HOP requested by Troy Matherne for a home occupation – “Bayou2U” – at 330 Luke Drive, Des Allemands. Council District 4.

Ms. Vittur – read the land use report and the department recommends approval.

Applicant wishes not to speak.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Krajcer, Jr. made a motion to approve, seconded by Folse, Jr.

YEAS: Price, Keen, Ross, Petit, Folse, Jr., Krajcer, Jr.
 NAYS: None
 ABSENT: Frangella
PASSED

2023-18-MIN requested by Kathleen LeBlanc for a resubdivision of one lot into two, 10577 River Road, Ama. Zoning Districts B-1, C-2, R-1A(M), O-L, and W. Council District 2.

Ms. Vittur – read the land use report and the department recommends approval.

Applicant wishes not to speak.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

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

YEAS: Price, Keen, Ross, Petit, Folse, Jr., Krajcer, Jr.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Frangella

PASSED

2023-17-R requested by Troy Bailey for a change of zoning from R-1A(M) to R-3 on Lots D-1 and D-2, Square 14, Village of Hahnville, 212 Hwy 3160 and 315-317 Smith Street, Hahnville. Council District 1.

Mr. Welker - The proposed rezoning conforms to the land development pattern established by the St. Charles Parish Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and does not create a spot zoning that is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The subject site is within an area designated Low-to-Moderate Residential, which anticipates development of those residential uses typically permitted in the R-1A, R-1B, and R-1A(M) zoning districts. The designation does recommend for residential development at moderately higher densities in the form of duplexes, patio/zero-lot line homes, townhomes, and accessory units. But those examples are more closely related to and more easily integrated with the housing types typically permitted in the single-family districts. The typical multi-family development permitted under the proposed R-3 district does not conform to this designation. The limited extent of this request coupled with the lack of significant R-3 districts in the area also makes this a spot zone. The request does not meet the first guideline.

The Land-use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning no longer allows reasonable use of the applicant's property and the proposed zoning does.

The most significant changes affecting the land-use pattern/character of the area occurred in the 1980s, when approval of two large area rezonings established nearly all of the R-1A(M) that exists in Hahnville (PZR-1982-17A, Ord. No. 82-12-4; Ord. No. 84-7-6). These districts were focused primarily along Smith Street, and Sycamore Street between Smith Street and Lincoln Street. The portion of the subject site resubdivided into Lot D-1 was part of the 1982 change. Lot D-2 was rezoned to R-1A(M) with an individual rezoning request in 2007 (PZR-2007-05, Ord. No. 07-5-10).

Currently the most notable development in this area of Hahnville has come in the form of infill development of new site-built single-family homes. Department permit data shows 16 permits for new site-built single-family since 2013, with 11 of those permits dating from 2020-2023. This reinforces the established land-use pattern/character of the area and indicates the existing zoning on the subject site is reasonable, as R-1A(M) supports the potential for similar infill development. The request does not meet the second guideline.

Potential uses permitted by the proposed rezoning will not be incompatible with existing neighborhood character nor will they overburden public facilities and infrastructure.

Multi-family development in the vicinity is limited to the St. Charles Parish Housing Authority site on Sunset Court which is currently zoned R-1A (a non-conforming use). Other instances of multi-family sites are limited, and the single-family neighborhood character of the area is predominant.

Adjacency to Highway 3160 and the potential for traffic movement from the highway, into, and around the site via Smith St. and Sycamore St. provide potentially favorable access to a multi-family site at the edges of the neighborhood and would not be strictly incompatible with the area.

Parish representatives stated existing water and wastewater infrastructure would not be overburdened by those uses permitted under R-3 zoning. Drainage impact would not be determined until a proposed plan is submitted following a rezone approval. The request meets the third guideline.

The department recommends denial, due to not meeting two of the three rezoning criteria.

Commissioner Petit- thank you Chris, I have a question before the applicant. Have we done any work on analysis on the square footage and what would be the maximum number of units? Do we know that? Or is that not looked at?

Mr. Welker – there is a limitation on the maximum number of units, I believe it's 2500 sq. ft. per family, so the size of the site is 21,000 sq. ft. so each lot remains its own space or whether it's combined your looking at 8.

Applicant – Troy Bailey 115 Pine St. Hahnville. First, I would like to say good evening. I'd like to thank God and the parish for this opportunity to speak. I used to work for St. Charles Parish, I'm proud to say I was a plant operator at the waster water treatment facility in Hahnville. In 2011 I was electrocuted with 13,800 volts of electricity at work. I have severe nerve damage in my body, the worse being in my hands and my feet I cannot even button the shirt I'm wearing. I thank God for my wife and my kids that gives 110 percent helping with the things I cannot do. I also suffer with traumatic stress disorder from high voltage. They carved the skin off my legs with razor blades to put on my body. I suffered beyond one's imagination, it took strength and faith God was with me. I realized it would be difficult for me to work and I would not be able to perform the duties of my job on a high level, being fearful of high voltage I decided to retire. I was really going through a lot, so I hired an attorney the attorney brought to my attention that St. Charles Parish held some liability, and he helped me to understand that if we followed the recommended guidelines in laws we would win in court, my response to him was sir, St. Charles Parish provided me a job and an opportunity to provide for my family that is something I'm not going to do. I made a decision not to follow the recommendations and guidelines of the attorney, only by the grace of God I stand before you today and I ask for your support and not to follow the recommendations and guidelines of the Planning and Zoning Department. In 2005, I purchased this property as an investment, it was full of trees, I cleaned it up and the parish allowed me to put 2 mobile homes on Smith St. and 1 on 3160. My family moved to St. Charles Parish when I was 5 years old, growing up in Flagville on a one way street me and my cousins use to ride our bikes to Hahnville, it was a big deal to us as little kids it was like going to a big city to us because it had many streets to ride our bikes, our first stop was Smith's grocery for snacks, Smith St. was always the only street in Hahnville where commerce was it had brick apartments which was an 8 plex, Mr. Stein Byrd had a bar, Mr. Clayton Byrd had a bar and a small grocery and a 6 plex apartment. At the end of Smith St. still standing today is government housing. At the very beginning of Smith St. is Birdie's Food Mart and Smith's grocery store still there today. As I stand before you today some might say you have to follow the recommendations and guidelines of the Planning and Zoning Department and the laws to make your decision. I'm asking you to do as I did and not follow the recommendation and guidelines of the Planning and Zoning Department. I'm asking you to follow your heart, this property has a graveyard on the south side, it's less than 500 ft. Byrd's apartments, and less than 500 ft. from government housing, it has a double wide mobile home on the north side that's rental property. I spoke to the property owner on the west, she does not oppose. It has LA 3160 on the east side and all the property north and south of it is commercial. The numerous of mobile homes for rent on Smith St. and some land being rented. I rent to St. Charles Parish Housing Department, I spoke with Ms. Johnson about trying to build a building to add more units with one bedroom, maybe two, her response to me was Mr. Bailey that would truly be appreciated especially for the elders. I also research the 2030 St. Charle Parish Comprehensive Plan that states this is the St. Charles Parish 2030 Comprehensive Plan, this is page 33 it states multi family housing has continued to be concentrated in Luling, Destrehan, and Boutte since 2010 as previously mention the construction on multi family housing significantly lags behind single family homes although the 2023 Comprehensive Plan underscored the importance of parish accommodating more multi family housing as population shifts preference continue to favor it. The St. Charles Parish begun revitalization and investment efforts for some of it's older and declining communities in 2014. If Smith St. is not a good place to follow the revitalization and investment efforts and to continue the legacy and foundation of the Smith and Byrd families there is no better place than Hahnville that I can think of, thanks again for the opportunity for me to speak.

Commissioner Petit- one question before you leave. Can you talk a little bit about your plan? Do you have an idea yet of how many units you potentially planning to put?

Mr. Bailey – I was thinking about putting 3 on the 3160 and 3 on Smith St.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Price – so unless I’m missing something, tell me exactly what will be the composition of your properties, would it be triplexes.

Mr. Bailey – yes, triplexes on east side. It’s 2 adjacent lots, one is adjacent to 3160 and the other is adjacent to Smith St. I don’t have a um, I didn’t invest in a blue print yet because I’m not sure what’s going to happen, right now it’s rental property I have 3 mobile homes on it, 2 on Smith St. 1 on 3160 and it’s rental property right now. I didn’t invest in a plan because I’m not sure if it’s gonna pass I’m hoping that it does but it’s not up to me.

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

YEAS: Keen, Ross, Petit, Folse, Jr., Krajcer, Jr.

NAYS: Price

ABSENT: Frangella

PASSED

2024-2-R requested by Alvin Gordon, III for a change of zoning from R-1A(M) to R-2 on Lots 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52, Oak Ridge Park Subdivision, 1014-1028 Paul Frederick Drive, Luling, Council District 1.

Mr. Welker - The proposed rezoning conforms to the land development pattern established by the St. Charles Parish Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and does not create a spot zoning that is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The subject site is within an area designated Low-to-Moderate Residential, which primarily anticipates development of those residential uses typically permitted in the R-1A, R-1B, and R-1A(M) zoning districts. However, the designation does consider alternative housing types with a moderately higher density that are not typically permitted, or permitted by right, in those districts. This includes duplexes, patio/zero-lot line homes, townhomes, and accessory units. The R-2 zoning district is not explicitly recommended under the Low-to-Moderate Residential designation, but duplexes are considered in the description as an appropriate residential development type. Since duplexes are permitted by right starting in the R-2 district, it is appropriate to consider it in conformance with the Low-to-Moderate Residential designation and the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map. There is no R-2 zoning in the area, and while consisting of six lots the site is still less than an acre, so it is appropriate to consider this a spot zone affecting a small area. But conformance with the comprehensive plan takes precedence over being a spot zone as part of the Department’s analysis. The request meets the first guideline.

The Land-use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning no longer allows reasonable use of the applicant’s property and the proposed zoning does.

The existing R-1A(M) zoning district was established in 1981 and this block of Paul Frederick Street has been developed with a mix of manufactured and site-built homes for decades.

The subject site consists of 6 individual lots measuring 70 ft. wide and approximately 5,300 sq. ft. Under current zoning each lot can be developed by right with either a new manufactured or site-built home. By rezoning to R-2, new lot size requirements would apply. The minimum lot width would increase from 50 ft. to 60 ft., and the minimum lot area from 5,000 sq. ft. to 6,000 sq. ft. If the rezoning is approved a resubdivision consolidating into five lots would be required to meet the minimum lot area for the R-2 district (this would also be the case if zoned R-1A). Despite losing one lot, the ability to permit duplexes would allow for ten total dwellings compared to the six that can be permitted today. But while an additional four dwellings is beneficial, the ability to develop the six existing lots under the current zoning is far from unreasonable, especially considering the reduced lot sizes, setbacks, and lower cost housing options permitted in the district. And this has not been impacted by any substantial changes in the land-use pattern or character of the neighborhood. The request does not meet the second guideline.

Potential uses permitted by the proposed rezoning will not be incompatible with existing neighborhood character nor will they overburden public facilities and infrastructure.

Despite being an upzoning permitting housing at a higher density, the R-2 district is more in-line with the development standards of the R-1A zoning district compared to the reduced standards of the existing R-1A(M). This includes:

- Site-built construction
- Same lot area (6,000 sq. ft. / 60 ft. wide)
 - R-1A(M) allows lots of 5,000 sq. ft. / 50 ft. wide
- Same setbacks (20 ft. front / 5 ft. sides / 20 ft. rear)
 - R-1A(M) permits 15 ft. front and 5 ft. rear setbacks
- Same rear yard coverage requirement (25%)
 - No such requirement under R-1A(M)

The more stringent development requirements of the R-2 zoning district, both in terms of construction type and lot size requirements, would actually allow for development more in character with the site-built houses on Paul Frederick Street and abutting to the rear on Kinler Street, and not adversely impact neighborhood character.

The site is located in a developed area where Parish water, sanitary sewer, and drainage facilities are available and will not be overburdened by the four additional units that may be permitted. But as referenced under the Utilities section of this report, coordination between the property owner and the Department of Public Works must occur regarding a potential drainage servitude within the subject site in order to facilitate a larger drainage project. This does not directly affect the rezoning request, but would impact any subsequent subdivision and permitting. The request meets the third guideline.

The department recommends approval, based on meeting the first and third rezoning criteria.

I also want to mention that the applicant has been in touch with and is working with the Department of Public Works, there looking to arrange a meeting with them I believe next week to kind of go over that whole drainage servitude issue so that's being worked out.

Applicant – Alvin Gordon, III, I stay at 9512 Linden Loop in Waggaman.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

Commissioner Krajcer, Jr. made a motion to approve, seconded by Folse, Jr.

YEAS: Price, Keen, Ross, Petit, Folse, Jr., Krajcer, Jr.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Frangella

PASSED

2024-3-R requested by Anna Nelson for DNA Real Estate, LLC for a change of zoning from O-L to R-1M and M-1 on an approximately 8.5 acre portion of Lot 19, Pecan Grove Plantation, 12320 River Road, Destrehan. Council District 2.

Mr. Welker - The proposed rezoning conforms to the land development pattern established by the St. Charles Parish Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and does not create a spot zoning that is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The subject site is designated Low-to-Moderate Residential, which anticipates development of those residential uses typically permitted in the R-1A, R-1B, and R-1A(M) zoning districts. The proposed R-1M district is considered under the High-Density Residential FLUM designation, and the proposed M-1 district is considered under the Industrial FLUM designation. Neither district conforms to the land development pattern established by the comprehensive plan. The proposed zoning would not be considered a spot zone as it covers a large area (8.34 acres) and would expand adjacent R-1M and M-1 districts. But conformance with the comprehensive plan takes precedence over not being a spot zone as part of the Department's analysis. The request does not meet the first guideline.

The Land-use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning no longer allows reasonable use of the applicant's property and the proposed zoning does.

The existing O-L zoning has been in place since the St. Charles Parish Zoning Ordinance of 1981. While able to be used primarily for agricultural or low-density residential purposes, the policy statement of the Open Land zoning district states "It is intended that land in these districts will be reclassified to its appropriate residential, commercial or industrial category in accordance with the amendment procedure set forth in the St. Charles Parish Code."

The subject site is located on a stretch of River Road bookended by the IMTT and Bunge facilities. Development within this stretch is limited, with the most notable improvements being dedication of the Oaklawn Ridge Subdivision in 2000 (Ord. 00-12-8), and permitting of the Nelson RV Park in 2016 (Permit No. 29955). The Nelson RV Park was developed upon approval of a similar rezoning to R-1M and M-1 approved in 2015 (PZR-2015-04; Ord. 15-3-5). This development, along with the corresponding M-1, is representative of a shifting land-use pattern/character within an area that has limited development options given the proximity to major industrial developments. A smaller and older RV park is also located nearby on Christina Lane. The proposed R-1M and M-1 districts is a reasonable and appropriate change for the area as per the O-L policy statement. The request meets the second guideline. Potential uses permitted by the proposed rezoning will not be incompatible with existing neighborhood character nor will they overburden public facilities and infrastructure.

The R-1M zoning district is specific to the permitting of Manufactured Home Parks and RV Parks. This is consistent with the neighborhood character which includes the Nelson RV Park immediately adjacent to the subject site and the Christina Mobile Home Park less than 200 ft. downriver. The proposed M-1 zoning would be located next to the existing M-1 district and industrial use established in 2015, and would also be compatible with the neighborhood character established by the adjacent property.

Regarding infrastructure, as per the Utilities section of this report the Director of Wastewater stated existing sewer facilities in this area could not handle the development potential permitted with this zoning change (possibly 121 RV slots as per a preliminary site plan). Upgrades to the downstream lift station would be required. While this means current wastewater infrastructure would be "overburdened", if the rezoning is approved an RV Park could not be placed without going through the full development review/permitting process. As part of that process the developer must work with the Department of Wastewater regarding necessary improvements to ensure infrastructure can handle the increased impact prior to starting development. Because the issues are known and there are processes in place to address them prior to development, the Department can consider this item met. The request meets the third guideline.

Approval, based on meeting the first and third rezoning criteria.

Applicant – Glen Nelson 12246 River Road St. Rose. Yes as far as the first guideline we only have one permanent resident in this area the left of us has been bought out by Bunge except for a few lots, there's us with the RV Park, then we purchased the property in the middle, then there is Christina RV Park and Mr. Randy is the only resident, then on the other side of that is 2 gas lines and a pipeline so the chances for future development there slim to none. The M1 part is just my yard where we park our equipment behind our shop we are just adding on to the back of that if anyone had a question about that and the, as far as the waste water when we built this section the first section they collected, they told me that had to change a pump in the lift station they would have to upgrade it so I'm negotiable with that but I just want to say the first section we built we spent I think it was over 40,000 in sewage impact fees and with this section I'm sure it's went up you talking 80 to 100 grand they collected just from us so upgrading a pump in a lift station is going to be a big deal, in my opinion.

Commissioner Petit – you are prepared to work with wastewater to sort that out before you would be issued a permit.

Mr. Nelson – yes, but I'm just bringing that out I'll already be giving them a 100 grand just from that first time and this time if the prices were the same from when we built the first place, so and that's just from one person, that's from me, so and we don't have any wastewater problems I don't know where that's coming but I don't know what else it feeds

but we don't have any issues we have our own lift station there force main to the front but I've never heard of a problem there I don't know where that's coming from but we are willing to work with them.

Commissioner Petit - Thank you and that's something we wouldn't be able to answer, but that's part of the process but you would have to sit down with them.

Mr. Nelson – Thank you.

The public hearing was open and closed, no one spoke for or against.

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

YEAS: Price, Keen, Ross, Petit, Folse, Jr., Krajcer, Jr.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Frangella

PASSED

2024-1-R requested by Denver Perilloux, Terry & Dana Perilloux, Robert Oubre, and Chris M. Trepagnier for OT Properties, LLC & Three 4 Three, LLC for a change of zoning from O-L & R-1A(M) to R-1A on Lots P-1, 1B-1-A, 1A-1, and those properties designated as the Roussel Tract and Lot 3605A, approximately 42.5 acres between Dixieland and Country Cottage Subdivisions, 17956 & 17962 River Road, Montz. Council District 6.

Mr. Welker - The proposed rezoning conforms to the land development pattern established by the St. Charles Parish Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map and does not create a spot zoning that is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

The subject site is within an area designated Low-Moderate Residential, which anticipates development of those residential uses typically permitted in the R-1A, R-1B, and R-1A(M) zoning districts. The request would not be considered a spot zone since it covers a large area and expands on an adjacent R-1A district. The proposed R-1A zoning does conform to the land development pattern established by the Future Land Use Map and furthers the goal of the Comprehensive Plan. The request meets the first guideline.

The Land-use pattern or character has changed to the extent that the existing zoning no longer allows reasonable use of the applicant's property and the proposed zoning does.

Montz has been the subject of five large-scale rezonings to R-1A causing significant shifts in the land-use pattern/character:

- PZR-1990-04; Ordinance No. 90-3-1 – Evangeline Road from River Road to the CN Railroad
- PZR-1990-08; Ordinance No. 90-5-6 – Evangeline Road to from the CN Railroad to Airline Drive
- PZR-2001-03; Ordinance No. 01-2-5 – Evangeline Estates Subdivision
- PZR-2002-06; Ordinance No. 02-5-1 – Country Cottage Estates Subdivision
- PZR-2003-06; Ordinance No. 03-5-15 – Country Cottage Estates Subdivision

Large-scale, planned residential subdivision development in Montz had long been limited to Evangeline Road (Evangeline City, 1927) and Thoroughbred Avenue (Dixieland, 1977 & 1979). Development in the remaining area was sparse and consisted of either heavily wooded undeveloped land, agricultural uses, or individually developed residences along River Road. The early 2000s marked a significant shift in the land use pattern of Montz. The above referenced rezonings in 2001, 2002, and 2003 allowed for the introduction of typical suburban single family subdivisions with the development of Country Cottage Estates (263 lots, 2002-2006) and Evangeline Estates (70 lots, 2002-2004).

The existing zoning is not necessarily unreasonable. Those uses permitted in the R-1A district can be permitted in the R-1A(M) and O-L districts. But the proposed R-1A zoning would be more reasonable as it would permit the type of development that is more in line with the

current land-use pattern and character of Montz as detailed above. The request meets the second guideline.

Potential uses permitted by the proposed rezoning will not be incompatible with existing neighborhood character nor will they overburden public facilities and infrastructure.

The proposed R-1A zoning would be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood character consisting primarily of single family residential homes, most of which within typical residential subdivisions (Dixieland, Country Cottage Estates, Evangeline Estates). R-1A zoning would allow for residential development at a higher density compared to what could be permitted under the primarily O-L zoning (6,000 sq. ft. lot minimum vs. 20,000 sq. ft. lot minimum), so increased impact to public facilities could be expected and must be accounted for as part of any resulting development. At this time the Department of Waterworks stated no additional burden to their system would occur. The Director of the Department of Wastewater stated that while down-stream sewer improvements may be necessary, there is no objection to the proposed zoning change. Any significant subdivision development resulting from this request would go through the Major Subdivision process. As part of this process, detailed plans are reviewed to ensure new water, sewer, and drainage infrastructure will be built to Parish standards, and any adverse impact to existing facilities identified and mitigated. The request meets the third guideline. The department recommends approval.

Representative - David Moyer 13551 River Road Luling, attorney for the applicants. As the commission knows this is the first of about half a dozen steps the planning board has recommended approval it complies with the 20-30 plan with the parish. I didn't realize there would be this much excitement here tonight, but this is just an application for re-zone. Does anyone have any questions?

Commissioner Petit - The public hearing is open. Anyone that speaks will have about 3 minutes, we will have a timer, we will let you know when your time is up, and you can only speak once and you cannot return to the podium. If you are speaking for a group if you would let us know up front, we will allow 6 minutes and we would ask the group to stand, whoever you are representing. Again, this takes 4 votes to pass, this is a recommendation and will be forwarded to the Council tonight we are just looking at the rezoning request. Just a reminder if you are up at the podium you are talking to us we are recording this it is being broadcasted to the public at this time so in order for them to hear we need the person that is speaking into the mic to speak very clearly and we need silence in the audience. Also, just a reminder we do need everyone's name and address for the record, that's the first thing we need when you approach the podium.

Robert Gonsoulin 140 Thoroughbred Montz – Been living there about 40 years, until the parish put 3 pumping stations on Airline Hwy. we never flooded, well since then it's been nothing but flooding. If you take 42.5 acres and you put houses in there we will flood it's suppose to be done after the pumps are in, well there's no pumps you cannot allow them to start this process when a pump is not in place and we will flood. I live on Thoroughbred, Thoroughbred is a dead-end street and we want it to remain a dead end street, we don't want to connect to another subdivision. The last time this happen we all came in and did the same exact thing and stopped it, and we trying to do it again and I have pictures of the said property underwater with 4 ½ inches of rain and we've had a lot more than that and I'd like ya'll to look at these pictures there are River Road and this is some of the stuff we've been going through in Montz, in that area cause I'm right there by it. (photos were given to Mr. Badgerow to pass to commission members)

Melanie Schexnayder 155 Thoroughbred Ave. – I'm here tonight to oppose the rezoning of the property because the attempted rezoning is for the purpose of the development of a major subdivision. It is my understanding that a major subdivision is described as a development that contains over 5 lots of houses this proposed subdivision would literally be in our backyard as our yard butts up against the strip that is owned by Denver Perrilloux and I

have concerns. My biggest concern is drainage, drainage, drainage. I lived in the community of Montz for over 50 years, first as a resident of Evangeline Road then as the owner of the property on Thoroughbred I've never seen Montz fill up with as much water as I've seen lately. Last month we had 2 major rain events, the first one the River Road in front of Thoroughbred along with the neighbors backyards and Ms. Joyce's house that faces River Road full of water. The second rain event later in the month put water in the same places Evangeline Road between the tracks had to be barricaded it was still barricaded the next morning as I saw the bus drivers asking if it was still closed, transportation for St. Charles Parish Public Schools had indicated that it was this is unacceptable the water that is filling and standing in Montz is unacceptable. It is my understanding that the community of Montz will be getting an improved drainage with pumps, etc. it's my understanding from speaking with Mr. Bob Fisher that the project while the money has been allocated for the project it won't even break ground until the third quarter of 2024, when I asked him how long the project is expected to be completed I was told about 12 months, we all know that major projects such as this usually takes longer than that so the community could be potentially looking at 20-24 months for the completion of the pumps, in turn you get situations like this with the water and drainage issues and I feel the parish should not even consider allowing a major subdivision to be built in an area until these issues have been resolved, as the property stands right now if a subdivision is allowed to be developed it will flood out the residents who already live here it is important to recognize that before we allow the development of a major subdivision that we keep the residents who have already invested in the community a priority. We have built homes that are most people's major investments, we built relationships and a community atmosphere, we live here because we want to. Please don't let a few developers, 3 of the 4 property owners asking for this rezoning don't even live in Montz come in and destroy come in what everyone has worked hard flooding will decrease our property value making our homes unsellable even if we wanted to move and drive up our already extremely high insurance premiums perhaps to the point we won't be able to have flood insurance please protect our current residents first.

Commissioner Petit – time is up.

Ms. Schexnayder – this is my mom can I have her 3 minutes.

Commissioner Petit – yes.

Ms. Schexnayder – I also have issues with the potential development of a major subdivision because we have no idea what the plans for the subdivision are, rezoning should be taken off the table for that reason while I understand that you don't have to submit an application for the subdivision in order to get rezoning done that's a problem this rezoning application today is for the purpose of developing a major subdivision that is described over 4 or 5 lots. So what are they looking to build 6 houses, 60 houses, 160 houses, what will be the size of the lots, the size of the houses, approximate value of the houses upon completion. Can anyone here tell us what low to moderate residential means, what does that entail? An application that was posted on a community forum states future land use recommendations, this included duplexes, townhouses, I'm under the impression that a new subdivision would have to fit in with the already existing homes I'm not aware of any duplexes or townhouses in the other neighborhoods I was told by my councilman that rezoning will only be for single family residences and will be able to be put there, so some clarification on this would be helpful. Would the subdivision be developed in phases? How long will it take to complete? How much noise and inconvenience will the residents who already reside there will be subjected to? Where will the ingress and egress for the development be? Will it only be off of River Road or will the intent be to stub into the existing neighborhoods of Dixieland Subdivision and Country Cottage Subdivision to meet new subdivision requirements that I was told now has to have two points of entry and exit. If this is done you will literally turn Thoroughbred Ave. cause you tried to do this last time, um they can't handle any more traffic Thoroughbred Ave. is a complete and total mess you will be putting children's, pets, residents of becoming

victims of high traffic, high speeds down the street with no sidewalks and a speed limit 15 mph. I have neighbors who have young children and I want them to have the same protection with traffic that I had when I was raising young children there we bought a property down a dead end street we want it to stay that way, transparency is going to be the key to resolving this matter and I feel that we don't have that there is nothing on paper for the subdivision proposal that we can see at this time we been down this road before with Mr. Oubre, Mr. Trepagnier they attempted to put a subdivision here with no access to River Road at that time and the intent to stubbing into the existing neighborhoods and pour their traffic to our neighborhoods, drainage, probably flooding, traffic, schools, busses, teachers, all of this needs to be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Petit- Ms. Schexnayder unfortunately a lot of your second part of your questions around the number of houses the size, we don't have answers to that, that's not something that has been shared with us we don't access to that, this is a rezoning request.

Ms. Schexnayder – that's why we asking yall not to send it to the council until we have some more information.

Commissioner Petit – I do understand that. Just to let everyone know yourself as anyone else that will come, they will be, if a subdivision is finally proposed and we do recognize on the application that is the intent, we have an idea of what the applicant has in mind but as far as the size of the lots, number there are requirements in the zoning that restrict the sizes but we don't know entrances, we don't know number of lots the drainage study, the traffic impact analysis all of that would come if required as part of that subdivision, but thank you for your concerns I appreciate you stepping up.

John Bonnette 114 Thoroughbred – I'm gonna keep it short and sweet. I agree with everything Ms. Schexnayder said, I think my only thing is I agree that we should let the master drainage plan take place in Montz before we consider anything. If you do vote on this tonight, um I think you should go heavily with zoning's recommendation of sticking with R-1A, no R1AM if that's part of the vote tonight I don't know if that is please correct me if I'm wrong that R1AM will be part of the rezoning then I strongly object to that.

Commissioner Petit – just to clarify that, so it currently has a piece that is R1AM, the request is to convert that piece as well to R1A. Is that correct Chris?

Mr. Welker – yes.

Mr. Bonnette – ok even with that being said I agree with my neighbors that we should not rezone any property until we have carried out the master drainage plan for Montz and see how Montz and surrounding neighborhoods handle water as everyone said right now, water is an issue I don't know how many roads in this parish require for parish workers to come out and put barricades in the middle of the night to keep people off roads to keep people safe and that currently happens is a very low threshold, doesn't take very much rain for that to happen and it has happened multiple times in the short time I have been in Montz. I just think that until we insure the people that are in Montz right now and live there are safe, our homes are safe, and our roads are safe we should not consider any rezoning at this time.

Jared Burford – 133 Thoroughbred Ave. – Just moved to Montz about a year ago, got away from Destrehan because the traffic just got insane out there, nice quiet street if yall plan on making Thoroughbred an inlet and outlet, I definitely oppose it. I think this agenda was submitted January 3rd and I probably wouldn't have had a problem with the drainage, like I said I'm fresh to the area but on January 8th, I watched I live right next to the Coulee canal on Thoroughbred Ave. it's a big canal 5-6 ft. deep, I watched that water come up 5-6ft. over the top of the canal I watched that come into my property, I watched that thing, 4 more inches it would have been in my garage, it would have been in my neighbor's property, it would have been flowing down the street to everybody else at the back of the neighborhood. I completely

agree if you do this you will flood us out there's no doubt, there's too much water. I don't even think what you have not can handle what you have. I think when you upgrade the pumps you will be getting it where it should be it's not adding more (inaudible) 42 ½ acres soaking up water is now gonna flow to the Coulee canal which is in that thing notable canal so that means the drainage is pretty much going to be going there flowing right next to my house, eroding my property and a possible flood my house and I heavily oppose this. Thank you.

Karen Bivona – 153 Thoroughbred Ave. – I'm here today to oppose the rezoning like everyone else said it floods Thoroughbred, the beginning of Thoroughbred to the curve, floods on a regular rain they had our street torn up for months trying to fix it, it still not fixed yet Evangeline Road that continues to flood numerous times blocked off people can't get out of their houses, kids can't get to school so we forced to go down CC Road, CC Road is horrible, it floods the drainage is not correct on CC Road either and that's the point I wanted to make also that that needs to be addressed because when you can't go down Evangeline we have to go down Thoroughbred and my other concern is if it's subdivision our voting facility isn't not capable of holding the people we have now in Montz and its unsafe and we need that addressed as well and I opposed this rezoning today.

Marcia Culver – 163 Thoroughbred Ave. – The rezoning they were talking about tipping the boxes for drainage impact, the drainage plan that's in effect right now is designed for what's in place now so any added housing is going to impact that when you had, when you take land out of drainage and put more concrete you're going to have more run off, the more run off is gonna be not going to be addressed than the plan that's in present. The other thing is, let's see the utility impact all it takes is when the fire department would go around doing the fire hydrants all they had to do was open a fire hydrant and our water pressure caved, we have nothing, and they want to had more houses they need to address the utilities. Let's see, one of the most important things is when you have Evangeline Road that floods you also have the possibilities when Spill Way Road closes due to flooding then we have Evangeline Road closed the Spill Way Road closed, all the emergency equipment has to come from LaPlace or go to Bayou Steel Road so then you going to add all this new traffic there's no light at Evangeline Road, there's no light at CC Road so when you add the traffic impact I haven't heard anything about that so that has to be a consideration that your adding 2 cars per house then you talking about I don't know how many houses, but who does the traffic impact, when all these studies are done the engineering studies that have to be done, who does that is that the owner's or the people doing the subdivision is that their responsibility.

Commissioner Petit – to answer your question it's a combination of both depending some of the feedback on some of the utilities like the water works, the wastewater would come from those departments in the parish if they required studies those would need to be done by a licensed company, but I believe a traffic study would be required depending on the size of the resubdivision. Correct Michael?

Michael Albert - at the developer's expense.

Commissioner Petit- at the developer's expense and it would require to be a third party.

Ms. Culver – ok and the traffic, they have to keep in mind that were land locked, when Spill Way Roads closed and Evangeline's flooded.

Commissioner Petit – and that would all go into that traffic that plan, at that point the study would include how many potential lots how much traffic increase there would be so that would be fed into that stuff.

Ms. Culver – Alright, that's all I have right now.

Keri Burford – 133 Thoroughbred Ave. – I just want to bring to your attention that this land that is going to be developed the parish is using it as a flood plain ok, I see the Coulee overflow many times in this property I'm not talking about my street, I'm talking about the property

behind my house where the rezoning is taking place. A flood plain ok, it looks like a lake back there if you would like I can give you some pictures, whether the parish realizes it or not the fields that are in Montz right now are helping it keep the water from coming into our houses so it might be a good idea to come take a look at the fields you know when it's raining because it is a regular occurrence and I also agree with everything my neighbors said and my husband has said so far. Thank you.

Paul Guidry – 100 Gretchen Court Montz, Country Cottage Estates representing. I live on that Coulee and every time it rains or has a major rain event my backyard is close to getting flooded out now if you haven't been to our subdivision it's built up so my concern is when they develop this land they gonna bring fill in, what's going to happen the fill, it's going to push the water into our houses and we just got through Ida and for all those who actually did flood for Ida there insurance rates went up so it's two fold. You have all this land that's pretty much surround by other subdivisions that's actually keeping us from getting flooded and really you have 3 pumps on Airline Hwy. pumping all of the water out of Montz and we can't keep the water low enough in line for comfort to anyone here. So, until you really get a master flood plan that actually is effective to keep the water out of our yard, garages I highly recommend that you do not let this pass tonight. Thank you.

Justin Naquin – 525 Evangeline Road Montz. – Alright so, they said that this would meet all the surrounding areas so he said 6,000 sq. feet per house that's over 6 houses per acre there ain't but maybe a handful that's got a lot that small around us you said that met that requirement, it doesn't meet that requirement, you said that was low to medium value houses, medium in our eye but not really low I mean my property taxes are 4,000 dollars a year what I pay and the flooding is ridiculous so I pay this amount of money and I cant even get out of my road cause it's flooded y'all said y'all was gonna put the culvert by Airline Hwy. that was gonna fix it well one week later it flooded the whole area again so y'all say y'all know what the water is gonna do but y'all ain't got a clue. So how when you put 1 foot of fill which is the minimum requirement per house, 42 acres of 1 foot higher how is that not going to flood everybody else. This is absurd, absurd and who is going to be responsible if it floods our house. I'm looking at all y'all I'm looking at the builder, I'm looking at everybody because it would be y'all's fault. This should not even be entertained; it does not meet these requirements of your own paperwork and the low value houses could that mean section 8.

Commissioner Petit – no not based on the zoning that's being proposed, no and just to clarify, Michael you want to clarify the 6,000 foot is not structural requirements it's actual lot size. Correct?

Mr. Naquin – lot size.

Mr. Albert – for one I'd like to request that the comments be directed to the chair, the staff is just presenting the report, and second there needs to be a distinction and it's difficult but the talk about the low to moderate is talking about housing density there are categories that zoning falls within it has nothing to do with low income or anything else related to that, it's a density category, multiple zoning districts fall within it, R1A is one of those eligible districts so it does meet the criteria.

Mr. Naquin – so wouldn't most of it be R1B with a 10,000 sq. foot minimum lot? So how is R1A with 6,000, how would that be equal to the surrounding area.

Commissioner Petit – this proposal is to rezone this to the same designation as the 2 adjacent neighborhoods, alright so same requirements for lot size nothing different it's the R1A, no R1B, no duplexes, it's whatever's required in R1A. So it's again it's the same zoning as the 2 adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. Naquin – alright well on Evangeline Road there's no sidewalks so I have 2 small kids where people are speeding down my road already, if you put 250 more houses that's 500 cars that's 500 more people that my kids got a chance of getting hit by, and it's just not set up for a

major subdivision in there, it's not set up for it with 1 foot higher, 42 acres that floodings going somewhere and it's coming in all our houses. Thank you.

Curtis Hanna – 177 Thoroughbred Montz – Pretty much all of my neighbors have said what we want to say um I don't know who got paid off but everybody here is voted in so whoever gets paid off we just vote them out. We gonna appeal this if it goes through so y'all, y'all see do what y'all see fit but there is enough of us to appeal it, that's all I got to say.

Cliff Bleakley – 136 Thoroughbred Montz – First off just a question, what does it take for y'all not to vote for it, I mean to vote against it? Cause it seems like everything you say, well it's just for rezoning and it goes to the Council. What does it take to stop it here?

Commissioner Keen – if we vote no, it still goes to the Council.

Mr. Bleakley– either way, even if it's majority, no.

Commissioner Keen – correct.

Mr. Bleakley– so what's the point of this meeting?

Commissioner Keen – this is the preliminary to be able to put it on record everything you stated here, things been documented all goes up to the Council meeting when they have that, when this is all (inaudible)

Mr. Bleakley – ok I understand the process.

Commissioner Petit – you are also welcome to attend that there will be a public hearing. Lots of the comments and questions are about the proposed or a proposed subdivision when that happens, if that happens at this point were here to consider the rezoning request, does it fit within the character of the existing zoning next to it, again we don't know a lot of those plans are for the size or density, drainage studies that would be part of the development once it happens. That would be permitted, requested, that would come back to us there would be a second hearing on that type of request.

Mr. Bleakley – ok, and my only other question is, I understand why Bob Oubre and Trepagnier are requesting this cause they tried it before the property that he's trying but I don't understand why the Perrilloux's are on it, cause their a separate property. Does that mean there asking to rezone to be included in the subdivision proposal?

Commissioner Petit – yes, that is correct this includes.

Mr. Bleakly – they already have a house there, and I'm just wondering why do they need, and I'm friends with the Perrilloux's, been lifelong friends with them. I just want an explanation.

Commissioner Petit – that's not a question we can answer.

Mr. Bleakly – I'm just looking for an answer.

Commissioner Petit – That's not something we have information on at this point.

Mr. Bleakly – But it is included.

Commissioner Petit – It is included. I don't know if you could bring the map back up but it does include from River Road it's lots P1 and 1B-1A and 1A -1 which include that, if the audience could please not talk, open land and R1AM would be switched.

Julie Naquin – 111 Gretchen Ct. Country Cottage Estates – I just wanted to say that I totally oppose it for every reason that everybody said for our neighbors, our friends, our houses, just want to be on record that I oppose it.

Stephanie Kropog – 103 Arline Ct. Montz - Good evening. I come very close to flooding also. I have a question to ask you. According to this map amend that was done by the Planning and Zoning staff report on the second page it says recommended zoning district R1A, R1B, R1AM. Does that mean they're going to attempt to put R1AM um on that property?

Commissioner Petit – No that, that’s basically a recommendation based on the comprehensive future of land use, so there’s a study done that’s refreshed every 10 years you want to talk a little bit, Michael.

Mr. Albert – yes, like I don’t know if you heard me mention earlier there’s certain land use categories in each of those categories has 3 to 5 different zonings in them , so no they not asking for that, that’s not even part of the consideration for this entire land use category here including what they have those are also eligible zoning districts but there not asking for those.

Ms. Kropog – they’re not asking, they’re asking for R1A. Ok. So my next question is, on, are you attempting to resub divide our subdivision?

Commissioner Petit – I’m not familiar with any request.

Ms. Kropog – because, well according to St. Charles Parish Appendix C in your St. Charles Parish subdivision regulations of 1981 under General Section I, under definitions, it says resubdivision any change to an approved or recorded subdivision which Country Cottage Estate is that’s where I live plat that effects any lot line, street layout which would affect our street lay out because in order to access this proposed subdivision you have to go into Country Cottage and build a road over the ditch so that would affect the street lay out or area reserved for public use or that effects any survey, map, plan, deed, or property transfer an legally recorded prior to the adoption of the subdivision ordinance of 1981. So, putting that street in on Country Cottage Estates in Country Cottage Estates you would resubdividing. Is that not correct?

Commissioner Petit – at this point.

Ms. Kropog – How could that not be?

Commissioner Petit – at this point we have no resubdivision request, we have no proposal for a street, this is simply to rezone the property. There’s no proposal tonight for a subdivision.

Ms. Kropog – but, but in this

Commissioner Petit – that would come again if that is submitted to us that would come before the commission for consideration and approval separately which would likely address everything you pointed out in that piece of the charter.

Ms. Kropog – But in this document it said that proposals would be to be going through Thoroughbred and Country Cottage Estates. Is that not, correct?

Commissioner Petit – That’s in? I’m not sure what you have a copy of mam.

Ms. Kropog – The streets, the access to the subdivision would be on Thoroughbred and Country Cottage Estates. Is that not, correct? And my question is why would that be when there is 450 feet on River Road that could be accessed to get to that new subdivision, proposed subdivision.

Commissioner Keen – Again none of this, this is just for the changing of the zoning, and so none of this is talked about, roads, number of houses, none of that, it’s just to take it from open land and currently there is mobile homes permit on River Road.

Ms. Kropog – There is what?

Commissioner Keen - On River Road right now the front of this section is already zoned R1M, it’s already zoned that way so we trying to change that to R1A, that’s what they’re asking, that’s what they’re requesting. Nothing about building houses yet, nothing about building roads, the ability to plan to do that is all their requesting, that’s all that really is at this point.

Ms. Kropog – Ok. At what point in time we find out where they going to access that subdivision?

Commissioner Keen – At some point down the road once they develop a plan that will come forward at that time some months from now.

Commissioner Petit – it would be required to submit those plans.

Ms. Kropog – And we would be able to attend that meeting?

Commissioner Keen – That’s correct. Again, all that gets approved by the parish Council, or disapproved. That’s how all of this decides. This is just a change of zoning.

Ms. Kropog – Well ok, this is just a change of zoning then that case I agree with everyone who just spoke because I live on Arline Ct. and my backyard floods these last 2 times rains that we had and my street also got up to the garage, so there a problem with the flooding and adding more homes there would only make it even worse. Thank you.

Christy Hanna – 177 Thoroughbred Ave.– I opposed this rezoning, I’m not going to talk about the flooding or the other issues that were concerned about I’m going to talk about there is no need, we feel there is no need to rezone, to change the character of a small town like Montz. We are comfortable with the setting that we live in now and we would prefer not changing the zoning. We live in a country setting and it would take away the unique qualities that we currently have in Montz, therefore I oppose this request of rezoning.

Robert Thompson – 119 Arline Ct. – I want to oppose this rezoning it’s across the street from my house where the only dead end street connect and we have very narrow streets where we can’t even park in the street on anything else in case of emergency, fire equipment cannot get through there is a lot of you know small areas and I’m just going on record saying that’s the only entrance and that would only put our street for the exit to this. So, once again I oppose.

Victoria Vicknair – 102 Liza Ct. Montz, Country Cottage – Good evening. I just want to be on record that I oppose this because an inlet and an outlet would have to be placed somewhere and I live on the last street in Country Cottage believe it or not it is a closed outlet subdivision but it already has a lot of traffic flowing through there if you just sat in y front yard and watched cause I live on last street and if you open it up to another subdivision I can’t even imagine the traffic that’s gonna be coming around there, this subdivision has so many buses in there because we have so many children that live in Country Cottage subdivision that actually my street and only 2 other ones they have to put one bus for that many kids right there. So I think there’s like elementary has like 3 buses just for Country Cottage subdivision and if you open up the outlet on Liza Ct. for another subdivision you just bringing so many cars and so many potential for accidents to happen to the children and I’m just asking yall not to do this.

Cindy Meyers – 204 Linda Diane Ct. in Country Cottage – I live right on the ditch right in back of the, right where they want to build and this last rain event the water that came up, came up to my back patio and it was just, it was bad. So I was just watching the water come up the last few days cause I was afraid it was going to come into the house, we cant have that.

Ray Richard – 18092 River Road Montz – Yall heard from plenty of residents and I’m sure there is plenty more that will come up here and stand and talk to y’all. About an hour ago Mr. Bailey came up here and asked y’all after the recommendation not meeting all 3 criteria, he asked y’all to vote from your heart, I think there’s 100 people back here that want y’all to do the same thing. They can say all they want it meets the criteria but we have pictures and video it does not, wait for the pumps to go in, then consider this, alright. Thank y’all.

Angelle LeBlanc – 117 Gloria Ct. – Thank you, I just want to say I’m opposed to this we have too many kids in our subdivision, I personally witnessed kids falling off of bikes in the middle of the street, my son, one of my sons is half deaf he’s almost gotten hit by cars and if we do this it’s just gonna increase the traffic and the safety of our kids. That’s it.

Mr. Moyer – This is the first of multiple steps, this is just a request for rezoning, changing the rezoning does not build a street, does not do anything, it’s just a request to rezone property.

The public hearing was closed.

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

YEAS: Price, Keen, Ross, Folse, Jr., Krajcer, Jr.

NAYS: Petit

ABSENT: Frangella

PASSED

Unfinished/Old Business-

New Business- Commissioner Petit requested more information on the flood study.

Mr. Albert stated he will bring that up again and see what can be done.

Minutes- APPROVED (January 11, 2024)

Adjourn