

HOUMA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Official Proceedings
of
May 18, 2020

Online Via Zoom and Facebook

1. The Chairman, Pete Konos, called the May 18, 2020 meeting of the Houma Board of Adjustments to order at 3:35 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance led by Mr. Joe Harris.
2. Upon Roll Call, those members present were Mrs. Trudy Hebert, Mr. Joe Harris, Mr. Pete Konos, and Mr. David Tauzin. Also present was Mr. Christopher Pulaski, TPCG Planning Director. Assisting with the Parish Online Facebook publishing was Mr. Brian Rodrigue. Absent were Mr. Willie Newton and Mr. Matt Chatagnier.
3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:** Stay healthy and safe and follow CDC guidelines for CV-19.
4. Approval of Minutes of April 20, 2020: **MOTION** was made by Mrs. Trudy Hebert; seconded by Mr. Joe Harris, to approve the minutes of April 20, 2020.

THERE BEING NO OPPOSITION, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

OLD BUSINESS:

- a. **Special Exception:** Proposed 100' monopole cell tower and associated 40' X 40' fence enclosure on rear of property located at 1280 Saint Charles Street, Monopole address assigned as 1276 Saint Charles St; (Council District 6; City of Houma Fire District); Verizon Wireless, applicant.

Motion was made by Mrs. Trudy Hebert, seconded by Mr. Joe Harris to TABLE the application at written request of the applicant.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

YEAS: Hebert, Harris, Tauzin

NAYS: NONE

ABSTAINED: None

NOT VOTING: Chair

CHAIR DECLARED THE APPLICATION TABLED and the MOTION APPROVED.

- b. **Structure Variance: Side setback from required 5' to 2' for new carport construction located at 1607 Chantilly Drive; (Council District 6; City of Houma Fire District); John S. Welch, applicant. Chair recognized Mr. John Welch who stated that he is asking for a variance in order to allow him room to build a carport for his antique car. He stated that he will have gutters and downspouts to keep run off from going onto his neighbors property.**

Chair recognized Mr. James Bascle who stated that he is against this exception because it will box him in.

Chair recognized Mr. Christopher Pulaski who stated that the applicant is requesting a side yard Structure Variance from 5' to 2' for construction of a new 25' X 35

Detached garage and storage shed located in an R-1 zoned district.

Applicant had previously requested that the item be tabled to allow time for him to clarify setbacks and other project details. The portion of the proposed structure that falls within the required rear yard is 500 sq. ft. which is less than the 30% maximum coverage allowance. The applicant has indicated that they intend to install gutters and downspouts to direct rainwater towards the street. The proposed height is less than the existing main structure. It is the structure mass that is of concern. The ninecriteria set forth for the approval of variances includes not altering the essential character of the district and not substantially injuring the conforming use of the adjacent property in the same district. While there are a number of other properties in the area with similar structures that have similar setbacks, in this instance there is already a large shed to the same rear corner of the property located at 1609 Chantilly so the placement of this shed would essentially pen in the view and encroach on the rear yard. The adjacent property owner has expressed a concern about the impact on their property.

Since the request is for an allowance of 3', it would seem possible to reduce the overall size of the proposed structure to allow for it to be placed without a variance. I the primary reason is to provide a garage for a classic car, a 22' width would seem ample for that purpose.

All public notice requirements have been met. Staff received three calls of no objection regarding the request. Staff received one email in objection and one phone call requesting more information.

Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the variance due to the request not meeting all of the conditions for approval- specifically:

d) That the variance will not substantially or permanently injure the appropriate use of adjacent conforming property in the same district.

After a brief discussion. Motion was made by Mrs. Trudy Hebert, seconded by Mr. Joe Harris to **TABLE** the Application.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

YEAS: Hebert, Harris, Tauzin

NAYS: NONE

ABSTAINED: None

NOT VOTING: Chair

CHAIR DECLARED THE MOTION APPROVED and APPLICATION TABLED

NEW BUSINESS:

c. Structure Variance: Placement of a 3rd driveway associated with a new commercial development in the Overlay District.

Chair recognized Mr. Jason Kennedy who stated that he is building a professional commercial building at 631 S. Hollywood Road and he wishes to have a driveway that will be easily accessible to his customers, rather than they having to go all the way down to Valhi Blvd. and making a u-turn to get to his business.

Chair recognized Mr. Christopher Pulaski who stated that the applicant is requesting a variance to allow for a third driveway associated with a new commercial development in the Overlay District.

Applicant is building a new 6,305 square foot office building (TPCG Permit # 2020-88490) and is requesting an additional 12' wide, entrance only, driveway on Bridgeport Way approximately 28' from the South Hollywood Road Intersection. Section 28-76 (c)(1) of the Zoning Code allows for up to two access ways per establishment. The purpose of this request is to allow visiting traffic traveling south on South Hollywood Road (from Hwy. 311 towards Valhi) to enter the visitor's parking area which is located in the front of the office without having to travel down to Valhi Blvd. and make a u-turn to enter that area. There are currently no curb-cuts through the median in South Hollywood Road between Bridgeport Way and Valhi. TPCG Public Works has concerns about the placement of the driveway and objects to the request. The applicant has expressed a desire to work with Parish Engineering and Public Works to develop a suitable alternative, but due to recent schedule constraints this discussion has not taken place. There is a second driveway at the rear of the property, but the applicant has planned to utilize this ingress/egress for their employees and the large number of trucks, boats and other survey and engineering related equipment and keep it separate from their client and other visitor traffic.

All public notice requirements have been met. Staff received one call of no objection regarding the request.

Staff recommends to **TABLE** the item to allow time for the applicant to speak to TPCG Public Works and Engineering.

A MOTION to **TABLE** was made by Mrs. Trudy Hebert, seconded by Joe Harris.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

YEAS: Hebert, Harris, Tauzin

NAYS: NONE

ABSTAINED: None

NOT VOTING: Chair

CHAIR DECLARED THE MOTION APPROVED and the application TABLED.

b. Structure Variance: Rear yard setback variance from the required 25' to 10' for a new commercial building in a C-3 zoned district.

(Matt Chatagnier joined the meeting)

Chair recognized Mr. Milford who stated that they are building a new commercial facility and wish to better provide parking and green space. In order to accomplish this they will need approval from the BOA.

Chair recognized Mr. Christopher Pulaski who stated that the applicant is requesting a rear yard setback variance from the required 25' to 10' for a new commercial building in a C-3 zoned district.

Zoning regulations require that the setback for commercial development adjacent to residential be the same as the residential district which is 25'. The buffer fence already exists. This commercial subdivision was approved in 1984. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow for room to park the required number of vehicles (presuming 1 space/200 sq. ft). At this time, staff is unaware as to the proposed uses, but all proposed uses would have to meet zoning requirements including parking. The lot depth is approximately 122' and other commercial developments have operated in the area without the need for variances. The applicant has indicated that the proposed structure will have gutters and downspouts to direct the water away from adjacent properties. Based upon the proposed site plan, it would seem that the development will result in more than 10,000 sq. ft. of impervious surfaces which will require a drainage plan to be submitted to TPCG Engineering for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. Any drainage concerns as it pertains to the proposed development and its impact on adjacent properties will be addressed thru that review and approval process.

All public notice requirements have been met. Staff received three calls of no objection regarding the request.

Staff recommends **TABLING** the item to allow time for the applicant to speak to TPCG Engineering and/or the Councilman and/or neighbors to address drainage concerns.

Mrs. Trudy Hebert made the **MOTION** to **TABLE**, seconded by Mr. Joe Harris.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

YEAS: Hebert, Harris, Tauzin, Chattagnier

NAYS: NONE

ABSTAINED: None

NOT VOTING: Chair

CHAIR DECLARED THE MOTION APPROVED and the application TABLED.

6. Next Meeting Date: June 15, 2020

7. Board of Adjustment Member Comment: Trudy Hebert asked everyone to stay safe.

8. Public Comment: NONE

9. There being no further business, Mr. Joe Harris made the MOTION to ADJOURN, seconded by Mrs. Trudy Hebert
There being **NO OPPOSITION, MOTION CARRIED; Chairman declared MOTION ADOPTED and the meeting ADJOURNED.**


Mr. Willie Newton, Secretary

