

The below minutes and written decisions are taken from the meeting to represent items addressed and actions taken by this board. All meetings are recorded with video and audio for our records. In the event these minutes and written decisions are ever in question or controversy, the audio/video archive shall be used to determine the actual item or action taken by individuals present at this meeting.

MINUTES AND WRITTEN DECISIONS
PLANNING COMMISSION
June 9, 2021

The Planning Commission of the Parish of Ascension held a Public Meeting on Wednesday, June 9, 2021 at 6:00 p.m. at the Ascension Parish Courthouse, 607 East Worthey Street, Council Chambers - 1st Floor, Gonzales, LA in a regular session convened.

I. Meeting was Called to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Matthew Pryor.

II. Roll Call of Members

The following members were present:

Robert Hodgson, Ken Firmin, Julio Dumas, Matthew Pryor, Shannon Hutchings, Todd Varnado, Aaron Chaisson

The following members were absent:

None

III. Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Introduction of Staff

Stacie Webb – Recording Secretary, Planning Commission

Spencer Long – Legal Counsel

Jerome Fournier – Director, Planning and Development

Eric Poche – Sr. Planner, Planning and Development

Shaun Sherrow, Engineering Review Agent

V. Chairman's Comments

Chair had no comments.

VI. Public Comment on any Agenda Item

Moved by Ms. Shannon Hutchings, seconded by Mr. Ken Firmin and unanimously adopted, to move the public comments for Riverton Subdivision and Windermere Crossing to Agenda Item 13, "Old Business".

VII. Staff Report

a. Subdivision Status – June 2021

Mr. Eric Poche presented and explained the attached report on subdivisions.
(ATTACHEMENT A)

VIII. Engineering Staff Report

No report.

IX. Minutes

a. Approval or Denial of the Minutes and Written Decisions of the May 12, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Julio Dumas, seconded by Mr. Aaron Chaisson and unanimously adopted, to approve the minutes and written decisions of the May 12, 2021 Planning Commission meeting as presented.

X. Consent Agenda

a. Affidavit of Mortgage Declaration

James G. and Renee M. Bourgeois – Lot B-2-A (13121 Seles Point Rd, St. Amant, LA)

b. Affidavit of Mortgage Declaration

Calvin and BeBe Landry, Jr. – Lot at 45384 N Hwy 936, St. Amant, LA

c. Affidavit of Mortgage Declaration

Nikki Noel Landry – Lot 4 (45368 N Hwy 936, St. Amant, LA)

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Aaron Chaisson, seconded by Mr. Ken Firmin and unanimously adopted, to approve the consent agenda as presented.

XI. Public Hearing to Approve or Deny the Following Family Partitions:

a. Zachary King Property – Lots A-2-A-2-A-1 and A-2-A-2-A-2

The subject property is located on the north side, and at the end of Stevens Road approximately 1,140' west of LA Hwy. 431 in Council District 6 and is zoned Medium Intensity Residential (RM). The application is on behalf of Zachary King by Earles and Associates, LLC.

The Applicant is proposing a family partition of Lot A-2-A-2-A (6.874 acres) into Lot A-2-A-2-A-1 (3.451 acres) and Lot A-2-A-2-A-2 (3.423 acres). Lot A-2-A-2-A-1 is being retained by the applicant and Lot A-2-A-2-A-2 is being donated to the applicant's father.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

Comments sent to Earles and Associates, LLC on 5/7/2021.

1. Add instrument no. 942510 to reference map no. 1.
2. Add 'Existing' to 12' Utility Servitude along Stevens Rd.
3. A 12' Utility Servitude must be added along the 30' Servitude of Passage as required to service the rear lot.
4. Add adjacent lot information on map for lot to west of new lot A-2-A-2-A-2 (Lot 3-A).
5. This property also lies within FEMA panel, "...0045E".

6. Add bearing and distances for existing ditch centerline, as required.
7. Submit final plat in CAD prior to final plat being signed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property division currently meets the requirements of the family partition section of the subdivision regulations. The owner has owned the property for at least three years or prior to January 1, 2015 as required by Paragraph 17-4026.B. Should the commission approve this family partition, staff will have the Chairman sign the plat when all comments have been addressed on the final map as listed above and the required conveyance documents completed and recorded according to Paragraph 17-4026.F of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Brian Aguiard with B. M. Aguiard & Associates, LLC presented this family partition.

Public hearing was opened.

The following was NOT in support but did not wish to speak:

1 – Jaise Templet

Public hearing was closed.

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Ken Firmin, seconded by Mr. Julio Dumas and unanimously adopted, to approve this family partition as presented.

b. Heather Ward Bare Property – Lots B-2-A and B-2-B

The subject property is located on the south side of Butch Gore Road approximately 1,300' east of L Keller Road in Council District 6 and is zoned Conservation (C). The application is on behalf of Heather Ficklin by Earles and Associates, LLC.

The Applicant is proposing a family partition of Lot B-2 (6.555 acres) into Lot B-2-A (5.555 acres) and Lot B-2-B (1.00 acres). Lot B-2-A is being retained by the applicant and Lot B-2-B is being donated to a daughter.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

Comments sent to Earles and Associates, LLC on 5/6/2021.

1. Show routing and discharge point of individual sewer treatment systems to parish maintained ditch with public drainage servitude and/or to 'blue line stream'. It is the responsibility of the Owner to consult with the Ascension Parish Board of Health to confirm routing for permitting purposes and show/make statement of such on final plat. Plat will not be signed and recorded without this information.
2. There is an existing 15' servitude shown on reference map no. 1 that must be shown unless revoked.
3. Submit final plat in CAD prior to final plat being signed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property division currently meets the requirements of the family partition section of the subdivision regulations. The owner has owned the property for at least three years or prior to January 1, 2015 as required by Paragraph 17-4026.B. Should the commission approve this family partition, staff will have the Chairman sign the plat when all comments have been addressed on the final map as listed above and the

required conveyance documents completed and recorded according to Paragraph 17-4026.F of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. James Falgout with Earles and Associates, LLC presented this family partition.

Public hearing was opened.

No comments.

Public hearing was closed.

Commission Action: Moved by Ms. Shannon Hutchings, seconded by Mr. Julio Dumas and unanimously adopted, to approve this family partition as presented.

c. Jeanette Bortner Property – Lots 3-A-1 and 3-A-2

The subject property is located on the south side of Merritt Evans Road approximately 660' west of Joe Sevario Road in Council District 5 and is zoned Medium Intensity Residential (RM). The application is on behalf of Larry Joiner by Earles and Associates, LLC.

The Applicant is proposing a family partition of Lot 3-A (2.223 acres) into Lot 3-A-1 (1.111 acres) and Lot 3-A-2 (1.112 acres). Lot 3-A-1 is being donated to a grandson and Lot 3-A-2 is being donated to a son.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

Comments sent to Earles and Associates, LLC on 5/6/2021.

1. Include graphic scale, as required.
2. Merritt Evans is a parish road so the front setback would be 55' from centerline of street and not 75'.
3. Include, 'source of water supply' note, as required.
4. Merritt Evans Road is missing a 't'.
5. There is adjacent property, 'Lot 2' off of the southeast side of the proposed lots.
6. Submit final plat in CAD prior to final plat being signed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property division currently meets the requirements of the family partition section of the subdivision regulations. The owner has owned the property for at least three years or prior to January 1, 2015 as required by Paragraph 17-4026.B. Should the commission approve this family partition, staff will have the Chairman sign the plat when all comments have been addressed on the final map as listed above and the required conveyance documents completed and recorded according to Paragraph 17-4026.F of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. James Falgout with Earles and Associates, LLC presented this family partition.

Public hearing was opened.

The following was NOT in support but did not wish to speak:

1 – Jaise Templet

Public hearing was closed.

Commission Action: Moved by Ms. Shannon Hutchings, seconded by Mr. Julio Dumas and unanimously adopted, to approve this family partition as presented.

d. Charles D. Fridge Property – Lots 7-C-1 and 7-C-2

The subject property is located on the north side of Brittany Road approximately ½ mile east of LA Hwy. 941 in Council District 2 and is zoned Rural (R). The application is on behalf of James Fridge by Earles and Associates, LLC.

The Applicant is proposing a family partition of Lot 7-C (2.779 acres) into Lot 7-C-1 (2.044 acres) and Lot 7-C-2 (0.735 acres). Lot 7-C-1 is being retained by the applicant and Lot 7-C-2 is being donated a son.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

Comments sent to Earles and Associates, LLC on 5/10/2021.

1. Add note to map, “Owner of Lot 7-C-1 acknowledges that by placing a 12’ utility servitude along an existing asphalt drive, he is responsible for any damages to said drive should any utility need to exercise their right to install or maintain underground utility lines.
2. Submit final plat in CAD prior to final plat being signed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property division currently meets the requirements of the family partition section of the subdivision regulations. The owner has owned the property for at least three years or prior to January 1, 2015 as required by Paragraph 17-4026.B. Should the commission approve this family partition, staff will have the Chairman sign the plat when all comments have been addressed on the final map as listed above and the required conveyance documents completed and recorded according to Paragraph 17-4026.F of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. James Falgout with Earles and Associates, LLC presented this family partition.

Public hearing was opened.

No comments.

Public hearing was closed.

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Ken Firmin, seconded by Mr. Julio Dumas and unanimously adopted, to approve this family partition as presented.

e. Melvin Gautreau Property – Lots MG-1 and MG-2

The subject property is located on the south side of Mel Lane approximately 625’ east of LA Hwy. 44 in Council District 9 and is zoned Medium Intensity Residential (RM). The application is on behalf of Ricky Gautreau by Earles and Associates, LLC.

The Applicant is proposing a family partition of an Unnamed Lot (1.493 acres) into Lot MG-1 (0.750 acres) and Lot MG-2 (0.743 acres). Lot MG-1 is being retained by the applicant and Lot MG-2 is being donated a son.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

Comments sent to Earles and Associates, LLC on 5/10/2021.

1. NO COMMENTS.
2. Submit final plat in CAD prior to final plat being signed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property division currently meets the requirements of the family partition section of the subdivision regulations. The owner has owned the property for at least three years or prior to January 1, 2015 as required by Paragraph 17-4026.B. Should the commission approve this family partition, staff will have the Chairman sign the plat when all comments have been addressed on the final map as listed above and the required conveyance documents completed and recorded according to Paragraph 17-4026.F of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. James Falgout with Earles and Associates, LLC presented this family partition.

Public hearing was opened.

The following spoke NOT in support:

- 1 – Joshua Tregre

Public hearing was closed.

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Julio Dumas, seconded by Mr. Ken Firmin and unanimously adopted, to approve this family partition as presented.

f. Kenneth P. Landry Property – Lots A-2-B-1 and A-2-B-2

The subject property is located on the east side of LA Hwy. 44 approximately 575' south of Bertville Road in Council District 5 and is zoned Mixed Use - 2 (MU-2). The application is on behalf of The Estate of Kenneth P. Landry by Earles and Associates, LLC.

The Applicant is proposing a family partition of Lot A-2-B (1.765 acres) into Lot A-2-B-1 (0.882 acres) and Lot A-2-B-2 (0.883 acres). Lot A-2-B-1 is being donated to a daughter (heir) and Lot A-2-B-2 is being donated to another daughter (heir) by the Estate of Kenneth P. Landry.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

Comments sent to Earles and Associates, LLC on 5/6/2021.

1. It appears that the instrument no. for reference map no. 1 is in fact 896555.
2. Revise the 'Dedication of Rights of Way' note to add: "The rights-of-way of streets shown heron, unless specifically designated as private and, if not previously dedicated,..."
3. Add note, "This project is subject to sewer development and traffic impact fees in accordance with Ascension Parish Ordinances."
4. Include, 'source of water supply' note, as required.
5. Submit final plat in CAD prior to final plat being signed.

STAFF ANALYSIS

This property division currently meets the requirements of the family partition section of the subdivision regulations. The owner has owned the property for at least three years or prior to January 1, 2015 as required by Paragraph 17-4026.B. Should the commission approve this family partition, staff will have the Chairman sign the plat

when all comments have been addressed on the final map as listed above and the required conveyance documents completed and recorded according to Paragraph 17-4026.F of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. James Falgout with Earles and Associates, LLC presented this family partition.

Public hearing was opened.

No comments.

Public hearing was closed.

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Aaron Chaisson, seconded by Ms. Shannon Hutchings and unanimously adopted, to approve this family partition as presented.

XII. Public Hearing to Approve or Deny the Following Preliminary Plats:

a. Lakes at Henderson Bayou

The subject property is located on the west side of LA Hwy. 44 approximately 850 feet south of LA Hwy 42 in Council District 7 and is zoned Mixed Use-2 Corridors (MU-2) which allows townhome development. The application is on behalf of Sura Family, LLC by MR Engineering & Surveying, LLC.

The property consists of +/-5.11 acres. The applicant is proposing a townhouse subdivision containing 35 lots with a minimum size of 2,142 square feet. The proposed subdivision will require 7,000 square feet of park space and 18 guest parking spaces. This complies with the townhouse regulations. The entire property is within the X zone and out of the 100-year flood plain. The project drains to Henderson Bayou which runs through the site and beyond to the south. The applicant is proposing to send sewer influent to a new community sewer treatment plant to be constructed within the project site. At this time, the collection system and customers are to be dedicated to Ascension Parish. However, if the sale of parish owned sewer infrastructure is approved by the Public Service Commission, the system will be dedicated to, and operated by a private third party. All sewer discharge permitting is subject to approval from LDH.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

All elements of the subdivision as per ordinance have been provided and addressed on the plat along with the required notes, labels, setbacks and servitudes as per Paragraph 17-406 of the Subdivision Regulations.

All other comments have been addressed by the consultant as noted in ERA Review Letter.

ENGINEER REVIEW COMMENTS

Preliminary Plat:

The Preliminary Plat has been reviewed by Staff and the Engineer Review Agent (ERA) Comments are attached. (**ATTACHMENT B**)

Drainage impact study:

The drainage impact study has been reviewed by the Engineer Review Agent (ERA) Comments are attached. (**ATTACHMENT B**)

Traffic impact study:

The traffic impact study has been reviewed by the Engineer Review Agent (ERA)
Comments are attached. (**ATTACHMENT B**)

STAFF ANALYSIS

This application conforms to all required elements of the Subdivision Regulations for a townhouse subdivision per current ordinance. Pursuant to the Traffic Study Policy guidelines, the applicant has provided all required information for a threshold 1 traffic impact study. Should the commission approve this subdivision preliminary plat, staff will ensure any comments and/or conditions are noted.

Mr. Chad Stevens with MR Engineering & Surveying, LLC presented this preliminary subdivision plat.

Mr. Stevens stated they are asking for a sidewalk waiver due to the location within the Parish right of way.

Public hearing was opened.

The following spoke NOT IN SUPPORT

1 – W. F. Carter

2 – Lynn Witmer

The following were NOT IN SUPPORT but did not wish to speak:

1 – Jaise Templet

2 – Lauren McGrew

3 – Anna Cole

4 – Theresa Robert

5 – Amy Tabor

6 – Patricia Cook

7 – Denise Emmons

8 – Tricia Peno

9 – Stacey Villeneuve

10 – Rhonda R. McGrew

11 – Kelly Couture

12 – Erin Bennett

13 – Hannah Fork

14 – Tina Sergeant

15 – Nicole Wireman

16 – Billy Wireman

17 – Willie LeBouef III

18 – Lisa LeBouef

19 – Benny Drago

20 – Denise Drago

21 – Javier Pallais

22 – Pamela G Tennyson

23 – Cindy Sharrer

Public hearing was closed.

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Julio Dumas, seconded by Mr. Ken Firmin, to approve this preliminary subdivision plat with the sidewalk waiver. Motion was FAILED by the following roll call vote:

YEAS: Ken Firmin, Julio Dumas, Matthew Pryor

NAYS: Aaron Chaisson, Todd Varnado, Shannon Hutchings, Robert Hodgson

ABSENT: None

(3) YEAS; (4) NAYS; (0) ABSENT and motion FAILED.

R.Hodgeson – Said he is concerned with the flooding in the area increasing and thinks it will continue to flood. Stated it is his primary reason – will add more flooding to the area.

K.Firmin(Yea) – Thinks it is a good project. Not in the flood zone that has had problems before. It is a small impact on that area.

J.Dumas(Yea) – Stated he voted yes, no reason to deny it.

S.Hutchings – Said ten small impacts end up making one big impact. She stated the Master Plan was to benefit the Parish and its residences; maybe they did not see how fast this parish was going to grow and how big it was going to grow. She expressed even though they are charged with following the Master Plan, they are also charged with doing what is best for the Parish. She said in good conscience she just cannot, it is irresponsible to keep letting our residences flood over and over.

T.Varnado – Said he could not vote yes in good faith simply because of the surrounding areas. Said parts of the code state that the surrounding areas are part of your development, large or small. He also expressed he voted to deny because of the flooding conditions of the Parish and the Master Plan.

A.Chaisson – He said the request for approval requested a waiver from a provision in the code and/or variance. He stated there is no right to a waiver or a variance under the code therefore, the plat as submitted did not meet the requirements of the code. He said what was being voted on with the waiver request did not meet the code. He expressed if a variance is a waiver then the requirements of Section 17-4093, in which you are entitled to a variance, was not satisfied. Therefore, the request does not meet the code. Additionally, the Council already denied a similar project at this location and he stated let the Council decide whether they will allow the development or not. He said as submitted with the waiver request for the sidewalk is why he voted no.

M.Pryor(Yea) – He stated he is not worried about the sidewalks as much as he is about the traffic and drainage. He said there are certain standards that the Commission does not set, the elected officials set those. He said someone buys property and they get these hoops they have to jump through and they jump through the hoops. He said they should be allowed to rely upon the law that is passed by the elected officials moving forward, as should everyone. He expressed the rule of law should be applied equally to everybody. He stated this development met all the legal requirements with the exception of the sidewalk, which was not very big of a deal. From a traffic and drainage standpoint, we can have all the anecdotal evidence that we want but the engineers went out there, studied it, and met the requirements. He said the Commission is bound by the rule of law and the rule of the law should be preeminent. Chairman Pryor expressed he voted for this under that premise. He thinks that will reoccur on the next two developments. He said sometimes it will favor the development, sometimes it will not. He stated they are not there to make the law, they are there to interpret the law.

b. Belle Savanne Townhomes

~~Quality Engineering & Surveying, LLC
(Council District 8)~~

This item was pulled from the agenda prior to the meeting by the applicant.

c. Longleaf Townhomes

The subject property is located on the east side of LA Hwy. 73 approximately 2,800 feet North of Hwy 74 in Council District 8 and is zoned Mixed Use 2 Corridors (MU-2) which allows townhome development. The application is on behalf of Dantin Bruce Development, LLC by Quality Engineering & Surveying, LLC.

The property consists of +/-13.6 acres. The applicant is proposing a townhouse subdivision containing 100 lots with a minimum size of 2,835 square feet. The proposed subdivision will require 20,000 square feet of park space and 50 guest

parking spaces. This complies with the townhouse regulations. All of the property is within the X flood zone out of the 100-year flood plain. The project drains through a tributary and into Johnson Bayou thence to Jim Bayou and into the Bluff Swamp to the west. The applicant is proposing to send sewer influent south to an existing, privately owned sewer treatment plant in Cobblestone Parc Subdivision. Under current Parish sewer ordinance, a waiver approved by Parish Council will be needed to allow dedication of the sewer collection system to a private entity. A letter will also be needed from the current sewer treatment plant owner allowing connection and confirming available capacity. All sewer discharge permitting is subject to approval from LDH.

STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS

All elements of the subdivision as per ordinance have been provided and addressed on the plat along with the required notes, labels, setbacks and servitudes as per Paragraph 17-406 of the Subdivision Regulations.

All other comments have been addressed by the consultant as noted in ERA Review Letter.

ENGINEER REVIEW COMMENTS

Preliminary Plat:

The Preliminary Plat has been reviewed by Staff and the Engineer Review Agent (ERA) Comments are attached. (*ATTACHMENT C*)

Drainage impact study:

The drainage impact study has been reviewed by the Engineer Review Agent (ERA) Comments are attached. (*ATTACHMENT C*)

Traffic impact study:

The traffic impact study has been reviewed by the Engineer Review Agent (ERA) Comments are attached. (*ATTACHMENT C*)

STAFF ANALYSIS

Roadway segment Level of Service for Highway 73 prevents this project from meeting all guidelines for a major subdivision per current ordinance. Pursuant to the Traffic Study Policy guidelines, the applicant states that a solution is to add additional northbound and southbound lanes to improve LA Highway 73. Should the commission approve this subdivision preliminary plat, staff will ensure any comments and/or conditions are noted.

Mr. Ross Bruce with Dantin-Bruce Development, LLC, developer of this project, presented this preliminary plat.

Chairman Pryor said when he looks at the Traffic Impact Analysis and the Traffic Impact Policy pertaining to mitigation it says that a proposed development, which is subject to the Traffic Impact Analysis requirements of this policy, may be disapprove (and may is an operable term) when the results of the required Traffic Impact Analysis demonstrate that the proposed project will either, a) over burden the existing roadway system by causing a reduction in service of effective roadways; b) negatively impact the safety of the roadway; or c) is below the adoptive level of service D. He expressed the Commission has the digression to deny on one of those three (3) items.

Chairman Pryor stated per the Traffic Impact Analysis, where the level of service is D or below it says “in the case where the existing level of service is below a D the required mitigating improvement shall improve the level of service to a D or better.” He stated they do not have digression on allowing no mitigation.

Mr. Bruce stated the traffic policy specifically says that they are required to look at the overall level of service (LOS) of intersections. Nowhere in the traffic policy does it say roadway section. He stated that is their position and thinks it is very clear in the traffic policy. Mr. Bruce expressed this Commission had just approved a project, a major subdivision, in January 2021, that had a roadway section of a level of service (LOS) E. He said the level of service (LOS) E on Hwy 73 is a pre-existing condition and the traffic policy clearly leaves out that test. It only talks about intersections.

Chairman Pryor requested legal to address this matter.

Legal Counsel Spencer Long stated some of the requirements in the policy could be changed or added to in the traffic scope meeting. He also stated there are some provisions in the traffic policy that speak about the proposed driveways that enter onto the highway roads and there is no way to know what the level of service (LOS) will be at that driveway unless you do a study of the actual highway, not necessarily the intersection. It is Legal’s position that not only do you have to look at the intersections, but also the existing road system in its entirety, which would include areas outside the intersection.

Mr. Erik Piazza, on behalf of Dantin Bruce Development, LLC, presented an interpretation of the Ascension Parish Traffic Impact Analysis Policy as it relates to this project.

Public hearing was opened.

The following spoke NOT IN SUPPORT

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 – Theresa Robert | 2 – Lauren McGrew |
| 3 – Chris Oubre | 4 – Jason Bordelon |
| 5 – Ronald J Allen | 6 – Matthew Boudreaux |
| 7 – Tina R Sergent | 8 – Kelly Couture |
| 9 – Chris Hebert | 10 – Nicole Wireman |
| 11 – Eric Gulotta | 12 – Davit Mougeot |
| 13 – Lisa R LeBouef | 14 – Denise Drago |
| 15 – Dennis Emmons | |

The following were NOT IN SUPPORT but did not wish to speak:

- | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 – Pamela G Tennyson | 2 – Benny Drago | 3 – Willie LeBouef III |
| 4 – Billy Wireman | 5 – Bettina Gulotta | 6 – Hannah Fork |
| 7 – Erin Bennett | 8 – Sarah Jimenez | 9 – James Jimenez |
| 10 – Alicia Braud | 11 – Amy Tabor | 12 – Patricia Cook |
| 13 – Andree Sumlen | 14 – Demond R Jones | 15 – Tricia Peno |
| 16 – Stacey Villenurve | 17 – Grant Haydel | 18 – D’Anna Moore |
| 19 – Anna Cole | 20 – Alexa Little | 21 – Jeff Cook |
| 22 – Jennie Allen | 23 – Mary Bordelon | 24 – Kasey Braud |
| 25 – Layken Hebert | 26 – Sherri Caro | 25 – Rhonda R McGrew |

There was a lengthy discussion between Mr. Aaron Chaisson and Mr. Shaun Sherrow, ERA, regarding the traffic modules used for traffic studies.

Mr. Piazza stated if you take the position that the roadway segment LOS E prevents this development, which is within the existing zoning, which is just a plat and is a use by right, then what you are really saying is that nothing along this entire area should have been approved in the past and nothing else can be approved in this entire corridor because this has been going on for years. He said if that interpretation is correct, which they do not believe it is, then that same standard would be applied throughout the Parish and you would have numerous segments that cannot be developed whatsoever, no matter what your zoning, no matter what you are proposing. Mr. Piazza expressed, that is a moratorium. He stated that is not what is going on here. That cannot be a logical interpretation of the code.

Mr. Bruce stated they are not denying there are existing issues in the area. He said it is the responsibility of the Planning Commission to apply the law as it is currently. He expressed what he is proposing is allowed by the code.

Public hearing was closed

Commission Action: Moved by Ms. Shannon Hutchings, seconded by Mr. Aaron Chaisson, to deny this preliminary subdivision plat. Motion was approved by the following roll call vote:

YEAS: Aaron Chaisson, Todd Varnado, Shannon Hutchings, Matthew Pryor, Julio Dumas

NAYS: Ken Firmin, Robert Hodgson

ABSENT: None

(5) YEAS; (2) NAYS; (0) ABSENT and motion CARRIED.

R.Hodgson(Nay) – He said it is a problem with the parish. If not townhomes, then what? He stated until the parish expands every single road, we might as well close the doors and tell the developers to home. He expressed that will stagnate growth, people will lose jobs. He said people who say they don't care, maybe they don't work for a developer or a contractor. Thinks we could put it on the developers to improve the smaller/shorter roads, but Hwy 73 is a state highway. The developer cannot improve that. He said people need to call their Councilmen and State Representatives and demand that Hwy 73 be improved. But to the point that no development on Hwy 73 here on out, he does not agree with.

K.Firmin(Nay) – Stated he reiterates what Mr. Hodgson said. He also agrees with Mr. Ross Bruce, if the developer meets all the requirements, why would we turn down a project. He understands people do not want others moving next to them but he feels he does not have the right to close the back door to them saying, "I'm in but no one else can come in".

J.Dumas – He said first and foremost he would encourage the neighbors to put as much pressure as possible on the school board to get all the school traffic off of Hwy 73. Mr. Dumas said he has spent quite a bit of time looking at it and said he travels through it quite a bit and sees the kids walking up and down Hwy 73 on the road or next to the ditch. He expressed he can only fathom one of these days someone is going to be hit. Mr. Dumas stated once Claire Lane (Carrie Lane) is improved, the

sooner the school board can move on getting the traffic off Hwy 73, the money has been in the books for a while. He said that the way the traffic is being controlled currently when school is in session is pretty bazar. He stated it only takes one or two cars on a driveway for law enforcement to stop traffic. He expressed unfortunately this hurts the developer because he has to count that traffic today.

S.Hutchings – She said she cannot figure out how these traffic studies are being done because she spends an hour and forty-five minutes every morning carpooling to and from Dutchtown and an hour and a half every afternoon and she lives just a half mile on the other side of I-10. Ms. Hutchings expressed she has a problem with relying on something that says this is not going to affect the traffic. She said her second grader can look at that and can tell that, yes it is. If you are adding more people, you are adding more cars. She said it is a big problem right now. Ms. Hutchings also stated she does not see how a cut-through to Bluff Road is going to help because Bluff Road is under water. She stated the problems are not being addressed, requirements are not being met.

T.Varnado – He stated in the packet there is not a solution for the LOS for a D or better and for that reason, he voted no. In addition, the traffic impact study discussed how these studies are conducted, how they are calculated. He expressed that even in the packet itself it says if you do certain models that it can come up with different results. He said there needs to be some sort of metric to where all of these are measured by.

A.Chaisson – The developer said as long as they meet the code they should be approved. However, they do not meet the code, specifically the Traffic Impact Policy. As far as what differentiates this from the developments that came before it like Belle Savanne and some others is that the Traffic Impact Policy did not exist when Belle Savanne was approved, it does now. Mr. Chaisson stated this development does not meet the requirements of the Traffic Impact Study. He said the Traffic Impact Study specifically says in the case where existing level of service (LOS) is below D required mitigating improvements shall improve it to a D or better. He expressed it goes on to state applicant will be responsible for the cost and implementation of the identified improvement to mitigate the traffic of their proposed development. Mr. Chaisson said this development failed in two respects. The intersection of C Braud Road, which has a peak time of an E. To show consistency in precedence, he stated Antebellum Pointe, now Delaune Estates, was denied based on the analysis at certain peak times, which were less than a D. He expressed no proposed mitigation, as required under the policy. With regard to the segment analysis, the only thing that was said was to add a north and southbound lane. There was no discussion as to where, Cornerview to Airline? Hwy 74 to I-10? How far do we have to add these lanes in order to clear up and bring it up to the required D or better? In addition to that, there was no suggestion that the applicant was going to be responsible for the cost and implementation as required under the policy. Mr. Chaisson said there was discussion regarding Claire Road (Carrie Lane). He said Claire Road (Carrie Lane) is not going to fix it. He stated people coming from Airline and the other side of I-10 would not be using Carrie Lane. This would not alleviate the issue. If it does, run another traffic impact study after and bring the development back before the Commission. And for those reasons he voted to deny.

M.Pryor – Mr. Pryor said no one has ever accused him of being anti-development but he stated Mr. Bruce made several key points. He said he respects everyone's opinion but he hears lots of people saying, for example, they have been living in this parish for two years and they moved here for this and now all this development is

creating around us. He expressed that is part of the problem they are complaining about. He said Mr. Bruce is correct, the way the Traffic Impact Study is written it creates a de facto moratorium on Hwy 73, no one can build there because the level of service is not up to par. He stated he has to be consistent, that is what the rule of law says, that is the way he reads it. He knows Mr. Bruce has a different interpretation and encourages the Council to look at areas and to change the level of service requirement depending on the corridors that you are looking at. The reason he voted no was because of the level of service on the traffic impact study.

d. Buzzard Roost (Industrial Park) 1st Filing – Major Revision

This preliminary plat was approved with conditions at the January 13, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting with the following conditions as contained in the minutes of that meeting:

a) the Conservation zone being boldly labeled as “Conservation Zoning” on the plat; b) Industriplex Ave. being a temporary access until other means of ingress and egress are in place at which time the access has to be severed; c) supplying a conceptual master plan for the overall circulation or the total parcel of land prior to final plat approval of this particular area; d) no open ditches, they need curb and gutter e) have a sewer treatment facility and they should encourage them to get the waiver from the Parish Council so that they can enter into a private agreement with a private company; and f) have alleys along the rear of these commercial parcels to enhance circulation. Conditions also included were, 3) Applicant provide a transportation plan for the major streets within the entire development including future phases, industrial and residential, showing the relationship to the proposed Louisiana DOTD corridor connecting LA Hwy 30 and the future I-10 interchange, and 4) Require applicant designate approximate location for a future possible Sewer Treatment Plant so if and when this occurs, he will not be required to apply for a major revision to the preliminary plat.

NOTE: Staff has not received a revised preliminary plat based on the conditions placed on the project at the January 13, 2021 Planning Commission meeting.

COMMUNICATION WITH APPLICANT ON ORIGINAL PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL

On January 21, 2021 a meeting was held between Mr. Grady Melancon, Mr. Jerome Fournier and Mr. Eric Poche to discuss the conditions placed on the preliminary plat and a possible path forward. Included below is staff's response to that meeting via email:

From: Jerome Fournier

Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:41 AM

To: Grady Melancon; Deric Murphy

Cc: Dwight Poirrier ; Eric Poche ; Lance Brock ; Ruth Phillips ; Clint Cointment ; John Diez ; Shaun Sherrow

Subject: Buzzard Roost -- Ascension Parish

As discussed in a meeting with Mr. Grady Melancon January 21, 2021 and in an effort to satisfy certain conditions set by the Planning Commission in their approval of Buzzard Roost-1st Filing, planning staff listened to Mr. Melancon's

concerns and developed a path forward for the development of the project with the following modifications to the conditions placed by the Planning Commission. Any changes to the conditions placed by the Planning Commission will require a new public hearing and approval by the Commission at the new hearing.

Since the project was not denied, there is no legal path to an appeal as per Section 17-4092 of Appendix IV-Subdivision Regulations. Since the Preliminary Plat was approved, a new application must be submitted, and this would be for a major change to the Preliminary Plat. If the application is received by February 13th, it could be placed on the April 14, 2021 Planning Commission agenda. The following conditions present a problem for Mr. Melancon and he requests modification or removal of the condition:

1. There be no open ditches, with the street section containing curb and gutter. Mr. Melancon has expressed his refusal to comply with this requirement and that he be allowed to proceed with the variance for the open ditch street section submitted.
2. The developer shall have alleys along the rear of these commercial parcels to enhance circulation, denying the waiver request. Mr. Melancon has expressed his refusal to comply with this requirement and that he be allowed to proceed with the variance for the open ditch street section submitted.

The following conditions are not a problem for the project but were discussed and comments are noted:

1. The Conservation zone being boldly labeled as, "Conservation Zoning" on the plat. Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement.
2. Industripex Ave. being a temporary access until other means of ingress and egress are in place at which time the access has to be severed. Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement.
3. Suppling a conceptual master plan for the overall circulation or the total parcel of land prior to final plat approval of this particular area. Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement.
4. The developer install a sewer treatment facility and they should encourage them to get the waiver from the Parish Council so that they can enter into a private agreement with a private company. Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement.
5. Require applicant designate approximate location for a future possible Sewer Treatment Plant so if and when this occurs, he will not be required to apply for a major revision to the preliminary plat. Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement.
6. Applicant provide a transportation/development plan for the major streets and land uses within the entire development including future phases, proposed industrial, commercial and residential land uses and their relationship to the proposed Louisiana DOTD corridor connecting LA Hwy 30 and the future I-10 interchange (this requirement ties in with item no. 3 above). Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement as long as any future required changes to the overall street layout be allowed while working with any changes to the major routes for the thruway(s) both north and south and east and west without having to come before the Planning Commission for a major change unless that change is within a previously approved Preliminary Plat for a particular filing.

Ascension Parish is coordinating this important project with La DOTD and they have indicated that it is important that the corridor be preserved as a major truck path from the chemical industry along the river to a future I-10 interchange and that the corridor not hinder the quality of life of residential homeowners. It is therefore important that the Parish review the plan with DOTD and determine that the proposed land uses along the corridor be compatible with major truck traffic. As such, a review of the plan with DOTD will be coordinated prior to modification of the Buzzard Roost preliminary plat.

Any application to modify the preliminary plat and the approved conditions should include the above items along with any required revisions to the traffic study, limitations on square footage prior to any recommended improvements and/or limitations on building permits for future filings. The revised traffic study and limitations will be analyzed and discussed with staff and the ERA during the review period for this application so that meaningful discussion can be had at the Planning Commission meeting. Also, as part of this application, the applicant should specifically request that, should the Planning Commission not agree to Mr. Melancon's stance on the above named conditions, that the application be denied so he may proceed with an appeal to the Planning Commission Board of Appeals according to Parish Ordinances.

STAFF COMMENTS AND CONSULTANT RESPONSE TO PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED FOR MAJOR REVISION

A revised preliminary plat was submitted with this application, as included in this packet, and staff comments were sent to the consultant on May 27, 2021. Responses to the comments were received from the consultant on June 1, 2021 as noted below.

STAFF COMMENTS- MAY 13TH 2021

1. Conservation Zoning label must be BOLD as per Planning Commission Request.
2. Development Information currently still refers to Individual Treatment Units (does not comply with condition).
3. STP site has not been delineated (does not comply with condition).
4. Current submission does not include conceptual master plan for the entire development (does not comply with condition). This requirement was to be completed before the final plat for the 1st filing. However, another condition required a transportation/development plan for major streets and land uses, including future phases. This was a condition that ties in with the previously noted item. This would need to be submitted now.

CONSULTANT RESPONSES TO COMMENTS – JUNE 1ST 2021

Please see the responses **in blue bold** below to your questions.

1. There be no open ditches, with the street section containing curb and gutter. *Mr. Melancon has expressed his refusal to comply with this requirement and that he be allowed to proceed with the variance for the open ditch street section submitted.*

This is correct.

2. The developer shall have alleys along the rear of these commercial parcels to enhance circulation, denying the waiver request. *Mr. Melancon has expressed his refusal to comply with this requirement and that he be allowed to proceed with the variance for the open ditch street section submitted.*

This is correct.

- 3.The Conservation zone being boldly labeled as, “Conservation Zoning” on the plat. *Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement.*

This was added to the plat

- 4.Industriplex Ave. being a temporary access until other means of ingress and egress are in place at which time the access has to be severed. *Mr. Melancon has expressed his willingness to comply with this requirement.*

This is correct and was added to the plat as note #15.

- 5.Supplying a conceptual master plan for the overall circulation or the total parcel of land prior to final plat approval of this particular area.

The developer is willing to provide this requests once further along in the overall planning process. There are ongoing meetings between the Developer and Parish. Additional meetings between parish officials, state officials and other entities are also ongoing.

- 6.The developer install a sewer treatment facility and they should encourage them to get the waiver from the Parish Council so that they can enter into a private agreement with a private company.

The developer is not willing to install the sewer treatment facility. The UDC does not require this at this time.

- 7.Require applicant designate approximate location for a future possible Sewer Treatment Plant so if and when this occurs, he will not be required to apply for a major revision to the preliminary plat.

It was stated that provided that the entity responsible for sewer within the parish would install the sewer treatment facility the developer would explore a location option to provide at that time.

- 8.Applicant provide a transportation/development plan for the major streets and land uses within the entire development including future phases, proposed industrial, commercial and residential land uses and their relationship to the proposed Louisiana DOTD corridor connecting LA Hwy 30 and the future I-10 interchange (this requirement ties in with item no. 3 above).

The developer is willing to provide this request once further along in the overall planning process. There are ongoing meetings between the Developer and Parish. Additional meetings between parish officials, state officials and other entities are also ongoing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

No additional engineering analysis is required for this submission as no additional traffic or drainage information was submitted with the application. The engineer’s original letter is contained in this packet.

Staff has no additional comments beyond what was contained in the original staff report from January 13, 2021, contained in this packet. This also contains the original preliminary plat submitted for that meeting.

Mr. Grady Melancon, developer, and Mr. Deric Murphy with Quality Engineering & Surveying, LLC presented this major revision to preliminary plat.

Public hearing was opened.

The following spoke NOT IN SUPPORT

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 – Theresa Robert | 2 – Kelly Anderson |
| 3 – Marla Montoya | 4 – Norbert L. |

The following were NOT IN SUPPORT but did not wish to speak:

1 – Benny Drago 2 – Denise Drago 3 – Josh Montoya
4 – Nicole Gray 5 – Larry Anderson 6 – Kervin Winfield
7 – Patricia Cook 8 – Krisy Rice 9 – Lawrence Rice

Public hearing was closed

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Ken Firmin, seconded by Ms. Shannon Hutchings, to deny this major revision to preliminary plat. Motion carried by the following roll call vote:

YEAS: Aaron Chaisson, Todd Varnado, Shannon Hutchings, Matthew Pryor, Julio Dumas, Ken Firmin, Robert Hodgson

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

(7)YEAS; (0)NAYS; (0) ABSENT and motion CARRIED.

R.Hodgson – Said it was already addressed at the January meeting and will stick with that decision.

K.Firmin – Said he feels they need to stick with the code.

J. Dumas – Said there is no change in circumstance.

S.Hutching - Said there hasn't been a change to warrant a variance

T.Varnado – Stated “same”

A.Chaisson – Article 17-4093 states that in order to grant a variance there must be a showing of unique circumstance and a showing of unnecessary hardship and that must be fully described. He said there was no assertion of a unique circumstance or a necessary hardship and it certainly was not fully described. For that reason, the request does not meet 17-4093 and therefore he voted to deny the waivers.

M.Pryor – stated he would just reiterate what everyone else has said, they made their vote in January and does not see any reason to change that at this time.

XIII. Old Business

a. Riverton Subdivision – Preliminary Plat

Planning Commission Discussion – Review of Preliminary Plat Conditions

Mr. Jerome Fournier explained to the Planning Commission what conditions were being reviewed regarding this preliminary plat. He stated back in March 2016 the Riverton Subdivision project was approved consisting of 780 lots. He said in that approval, the Planning Commission at that time stipulated that there would be a roundabout at the entrance of Riverton Subdivision onto Hwy 22 at some stage of the development process.

Chairman Pryor questioned if there was a specific roundabout called for after the first phase, 95 lots, which was in the preliminary plat. Mr. Fournier stated that is what is being questioned tonight.

Mr. Eric Poche stated it was one of the comments that was in the staff report, under item 10 at the March 2016 meeting. A question was asked, when is the roundabout

at the entrance to be constructed. The consultant responded, once 95 lots are constructed and occupied.

Mr. Fournier expressed it was in the minutes of the meeting but was not in the motion that was made to actually approve the project. He said Mr. Melancon, the developer, has a permit from DOTD that states the roundabout be placed at Hwy 22 at the entrance of the project, but the roundabout from DOTD permit is at 478 lots. Therefore, after 478 lots he has to put in the roundabout according to DOTD. Mr. Fournier pointed out that Hwy 22 is a DOTD highway.

Mr. Julio Dumas said to be clear, it says prior to the completion of 478 lots.

Mr. Fournier stated the second issue is when the developer is required to do another traffic study and what are the implications of the traffic study once that traffic study is complete.

The following spoke NOT IN SUPPORT

- 1 – Christina Guidry
- 2 – Denise Drago
- 3 – Theresa Robert

The following were NOT IN SUPPORT but did not wish to speak:

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 1- Kelly Couture | 5 – Lisa LeBouef |
| 2- Rhonda R McGrew | 6 – Patrica Cook |
| 3- Amy Tabor | 7 – Tricai Peno |
| 4- Willie LeBouef III | 8 – Benny Drago |

Mr. Aaron Chaisson stated in the March 2016 meeting regarding phases vs. filings, it was said that Filing 1 has 77 lots, Filing 2 has 91 lots and it was said that at 168 lots is when they were going to start. He said the engineer at the time stated he didn't have a problem with the first filing but once you got to about 100 lots, that is where you started to have issues where you would need additional traffic study performed. He expressed when the motion was made, the first filing clearly means the 168 lots.

Mr. Chaisson said with regards to the roundabout, when approving the plat and the packet and everything submitted with it, the roundabout is in the packet. He went on to say it says in the packet that the roundabout is to be constructed once 95 lots are constructed and occupied. He expressed it was said multiple times in the meeting.

Mr. Chaisson stated both the traffic study and roundabout issue in question should not have to be a condition because it was part of the original submission by the developer.

Chairman Pryor said when the second filing comes up for final plat approval, it should be for consideration off the consent agenda and consideration can be taken at that time knowing what was heard on the meeting video.

Chairman Pryor stated when the second filing comes back for final plat approval they should have before them a traffic impact study; the issue of the roundabout, and if it is not there why it is not there; and whatever else there is, before they can approve the second filing final plat.

Director Jerome Fournier questioned whether the roundabout should be in place or not be in place before the second filing plat approval. Chairman Pryor expressed it will be something they will have to debate at the second filing final plat approval. He feels they would only be speculating as to things about it unless they have a new traffic study done. Mr. Pryor went on to say the developer's engineer at the March 2016 meeting was asking for approval contingent upon the concerns raised by a traffic study. Chairman Pryor said he thinks they were all under the impression that they need to do a traffic study after second filing and address those concerns at that time.

Mr. Fournier questioned the Chairman as to which traffic study were they contemplating to be performed, under the current traffic study policy or would it revert to the traffic study policy that was in place when the preliminary plat was approved. Chairman Pryor deferred the question to Legal Counsel. Mr. Long stated he would refer to a later date.

b. Windermere Crossing – Approved Preliminary Plat
Applicant's Request to Provide Six (6) Months Extension for Preparation of Construction Plans

Mr. Ross Bruce, developer for this project, stated for the past several months they have been in discussion with Parish Administration about doing off-site road improvements to help traffic in the area of the proposed development. He said if this were successful and they would have the support of the Council and the Administration, they would be back before the Planning Commission for revised plat approval. Mr. Bruce stated he is asking for the additional time to work with the Parish.

Mr. Jerome Fournier concurred that Mr. Bruce had been in discussion with the Parish about widening Cannon Road, an extended length from what the Planning Commission previously approved.

The following were IN SUPPORT but did not wish to speak:

1 – Trisha Peno	4 – Denise Drago	7 – Rhonda R McGrew
2 – Theresa Robert	5 – Benny Drago	8 – Willie LeBouef III
3 – Patricia Cook	6 – Christina Guidry	9 – Lisa Roussell LeBouef

Commission Action: Moved by Mr. Julio Dumas, seconded by Ms. Shannon Hutchings and unanimously adopted to approve the six (6) months extension for preparation of construction plans as requested by the applicant.

XIV. Adjourn

A motion was made by Mr. Julio Dumas, meeting was adjourned at 9:01p.m.

Matthew Pryor, Chairman

ATTACHMENT A

<i>June, 2021</i> Subdivision Name	Location	Number of Lots	Prelim. Plat Approved	CD Submitted	CDs Approved	Current Status	PP Conditions	Subject to I.D.D.
Belle Savanne-Ph. 3	LA Hwy 73 just north of Dutchtown High	96	12/9/2015 11/18/2020	7/10/2020	4/22/2021	In Construction	No Conditions	Yes
Belle Savanne Townhomes*	LA Hwy 73 just north of Dutchtown High	41				Prelim. Plat applied for 3/17/2021		No/Private
Black Bayou Estates	Black Bayou Rd. between Lobell Ln. & Hilbert Young Rd.	20	1/11/2017	2/7/2018	11/26/2018	Pre-Con meeting held 12/20/2018	No Conditions	No
Buzzard Roost-1st Filing*	LA Hwy. 30 at Industriplex Dr.	48	1/13/2021			PP Approved 1/13/2021-Applied Major REV 5/5/2021	As noted in 1/13/2021 minutes	No
Christy Place	LA Hwy. 929 between Daigle and Aikens Road	48	5/9/2018	5/6/2019	10/16/2019	In Construction	No Conditions	Yes
Clare Court	Cornerview between Oak Run Dr. & Dutchtown Meadows Way	37	1/13/2021	3/21/2021		CDs Submitted 3/21/2021	No Conditions	Yes
Delaune Estates (fka Antebellum Pointe)*	West Side of LA Hwy 73 at Duplessis Road	237				Prelim. Plat Submitted 5/19/2021		Yes
Forestwood	S. St. Landry Road across from Lamar Dixon	95	2/14/2018	5/6/2019	12/18/2019	Final Plat Submitted 3/1/2021	Change T-Turnaround to Cul-de-Sac	Yes
Hidden Lakes	LA Hwy 931 at Tommy King Road	89	6/10/2020	9/22/2020	12/9/2020	In Construction	As noted in 6/10/20 minutes	No/Private
Jamestown Crossing	LA Hwy 930 and Parker Road	172	5/5/2018	12/20/2018	1st F-6/3/19 2nd F-6/24/19	1st-Final Plat Applied for 4/12/2021 2nd-Final Plat Signed 4/9/2020	1st Filing-No Conditions	Yes
Lakes at Henderson Bayou Townhomes*	LA Hwy 44 +/-850' south of LA Hwy 42	36				Prelim. Plat Submitted 4/14/2021		Yes
Longleaf Townhomes*	LA Hwy 73 across from Belle Savanne	100				Prelim. Plat applied for 3/17/2021		No/Private
Pelican Crossing 6th Filing*	LA Hwy 44, 1/2 mile north of LA Hwy. 22	66	5/13/2015			Pplat Maj Rev-Approved 3/10/2021	All Prior to Recording Final Plat-Pay \$750/Lot in TIF	Yes
Pelican Point-14th F-Phases 1 & 2 Plantation Commons*	LA Hwy 44, 1/2 mile north of LA Hwy. 22 off end of Green Tree Ave.	77	2/10/2021	1st-5/13/21		CDs Submitted 5/13/2021	No Conditions	Yes
Riverton Estates-2nd Filing	LA Hwy 22-1 mile west of LA Hwy 44	91	3/9/2016	2/16/18 2/28/18	9/4/2018	In Construction	As stated in Planning Commission Meeting Minutes	Yes
Riverton Estates-3rd-5th Filings*	LA Hwy 22-1 mile west of LA Hwy 44	220	3/9/2016	12/23/2020		In Plan Review	As stated in Planning Commission Meeting Minutes	Yes
PPGC-Victoria Court*	LA Hwy 44, 1/2 mile north of LA Hwy. 22 off end of Beau Douglas.	13	5/8/2019	6/1/2020	10/14/2020	Final Plat applied for 3/12/2021	No Conditions	Yes
Windsor Park*	S. Side of LA Hwy 42 east of John Broussard Rd.	92	11/18/2020	3/18/2021		CDs Submitted 3/18/2021	Const. streets to Wrenwood-Reserve at Willow Lake-no tie-in.	Yes
Windermere Crossing*-Asking for Extension for Submittal of CDs	Roddy Road about 1,500' north of Cannon Rd.	103	1/13/2021			Prelim. Plat Approved 1/13/2021	Add entrance to Cannon, widening to 18' from Roddy to O'Neal	Yes

An asterisk (*) denotes a status change from last month's report

June 1, 2021

Mr. Jerome Fournier
Ascension Parish Planning Commission
P.O. Box 1659
Gonzales, La 70707

**RE: Lakes at Henderson Townhomes
Preliminary Plat Review Summary**

Mr. Fournier:

The ERA and Ascension Parish staff have reviewed the Preliminary Plat, Drainage Impact Study, and Traffic Impact Study submitted for the above referenced development for compliance with the Ascension Parish Subdivision Regulations and the Ascension Parish Development Code. Shown below are the comments made to the Consulting Engineer for the project as a result of our review of their submittals, as well as a description of their correction or response made to our comments (**shown in bold print**).

Preliminary Plat

1. Provide Preliminary Plat checklist and all required supplemental information. **Consultant has addressed.**
2. Label all existing and proposed servitudes as public or private. **Consultant has addressed.**
3. Provide dimensions of existing buildings. **Consultant has addressed.**
4. Add note: *"All structures shall be constructed a minimum of two feet above FEMA BFE and top elevation of nearest adjacent sanitary sewer manhole on the sewer collection system servicing the proposed structure."* **Consultant has addressed.**
5. Add note: *"Source of water supply shall be approved by the Ascension Parish Health Unit."* **Consultant has addressed.**
6. Note number of parking spaces required and provided. **Consultant has addressed.**
7. Add section lines to vicinity map. **Consultant has addressed.**
8. Label drainage servitudes between Lots 15 & 16 (private), east of lot 35 to pond (public), and west of Lot 9 (public). **Consultant has addressed.**
9. Only 87 of the 88 required parking spots are shown. Add labels to guest parking including, number of spots per group, to confirm. **Consultant has addressed.**
10. Under General Notes No. 11, the 'no curve' statement is incorrect. Revise accordingly. **Consultant has addressed.**
11. After checking with addressing and 911, the street name, 'Lakes at Henderson Bayou Ave.' is not an acceptable street name. Please submit substitution(s) for review. **Consultant has addressed.**

Drainage Study

1. The site acreage from the original submittal differs from the new submittal because it now includes the commercial building that are between the existing cell tower and LA 44. These are now being removed to add more lots and to reroute the existing road. Therefore, the original study is not valid. Provide an updated drainage study. **Consultant has addressed.**
2. Provide existing and proposed drainage sheets including pond outfalls, any swale ditches, and drainage areas. **Consultant has addressed.**

3. Provide capacity calculations for the box culvert to confirm no adverse impact upstream or downstream. **Consultant has provided sufficient information for the preliminary review process. This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**
4. HEC-RAS Proposed crossing dimensions do not match the DIS; revise accordingly. **Consultant has provided sufficient information for the preliminary review process. This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**
5. HydroCAD results are not representative of the most recent submittal from QES referenced in the Waiver Request; revise accordingly. **Consultant has provided sufficient information for the preliminary review process. This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**

Traffic Study

1. Provide updated traffic scoping information form. **Consultant has addressed.**

Drainage Impact Study Summary:

Consulting Engineer:	Chad Stevens, PE
Date of Study:	May 24, 2021
Size of Development:	5.11 acres
Existing Land Use:	Mostly undeveloped; some woods; small, commercial buildings
Receiving Basin:	Henderson Bayou
FEMA Flood Zone:	X
100-year Flood Elevation:	19.50 ft (nearest)
Record Inundation:	None provided by Parish.
Offsite Drainage Area:	Approximately 63 acres
Fill Mitigation:	N/A

The Drainage Impact Study substantially conforms to the requirements of the Drainage Impact Study Procedure included in the Subdivision Regulations. The Engineering Review Agency has performed a review of the input parameters and results of the submitted drainage calculations for compliance with the Subdivision Regulations and generally accepted practices for storm water hydrologic design. Upon approval of the preliminary plat, the applicant can proceed with final drainage design in accordance with the concepts submitted in the study.

Traffic Impact Study Summary:

Consulting Engineer:	Chad Stevens, PE
Date of Report:	N/A
Date of Traffic Counts:	N/A
Number of Proposed Lots:	35
Peak Hour Trips:	20 Trips
Study Threshold Level:	1
LOS D Analysis:	N/A
Offsite Intersections Studied:	N/A
Conclusion:	N/A
Sight Distance Evaluation:	Sight distance was evaluated at the current condition and concluded that sight distance is adequate.

The following items should be considered by the Planning Commission in their analysis of the case:

- The proposed culvert crossing calculations are sufficient for the preliminary approval process. More calculations for the culvert crossings will be submitted during the detailed construction plan process and reviewed with DPW. That approval process may result in the applicant to be required to install larger culverts than what is currently proposed.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (225) 769-0546.

Respectfully,

Engineer Review Agency for the Ascension Parish Planning Commission



Shaun Sherrow P.E., PMP

CC: Chad Stevens, PE, MR Engineering & Land Surveying, LLC

May 5, 2021

Mr. Jerome Fournier
Ascension Parish Planning Commission
P.O. Box 1659
Gonzales, La 70707

**RE: Longleaf Townhomes
Preliminary Plat Review Summary**

Mr. Fournier:

The ERA and Ascension Parish staff have reviewed the Preliminary Plat, Drainage Impact Study, and Traffic Impact Study submitted for the above referenced development for compliance with the Ascension Parish Subdivision Regulations and the Ascension Parish Development Code. Shown below are the comments made to the Consulting Engineer for the project as a result of our review of their submittals, as well as a description of their correction or response made to our comments (**shown in bold print**).

Preliminary Plat

1. More than six continuous townhouses have the same front-of-lot building setback line in several instances; revise accordingly to satisfy section 17-4022G.1. of the Development Code. **Comment has been addressed.**
2. Correct the flow direction arrows of the southern ditch that flows into the site's southern boundary. **Comment has been addressed.**
3. Label Section 14 on vicinity map. **Comment has been addressed.**
4. Current zoning is Mixed Use – 2 (MU-2). **Comment has been addressed.**
5. Winston Court is similar sounding to Wynstone Drive. 911 has asked that an alternative name be chosen as this could cause confusion in the event of an emergency. Please submit for review. **Comment has been addressed.**
6. Continue and label existing servitude and ditch south of proposed street, Longleaf Drive to southern property line. **Comment has been addressed.**
7. Depict a preliminary proposed routing/piping of the south ditch through the project. **Comment has been addressed.**
8. State routing of drainage to ultimate outfall. **Comment has been addressed.**
9. Graphic scale numbering is off. **Comment has been addressed.**
10. Add, "...privately owned and operated" to 'Sewer' under, 'General Subdivision Information'. **Comment has been addressed.**
11. Revise 'no curves' statement. **Comment has been addressed.**
12. Shift 15' side building line(s) from lots 70, 80, 90 & 100 to lots 61, 71, 81 & 91. **Comment has been addressed.**
13. Add note to Plat that no fences will be allowed within any public drainage servitude. **Comment has been addressed.**
14. The flow arrows on the offsite ditch south of lot 29 are pointing in the wrong direction. **Comment has been addressed.**

Drainage Study

1. Provide a Flood Zone Determination certificate from the Floodplain Administrator. **Comment has been addressed.**
2. On the Pre- and Post-Development Maps, label all watercourse entry (inflow) and exit (outfall) points along the site's boundary. **Comment has been addressed.**
3. Update the drainage summary tables to show the runoff rates experienced at the site's boundary outflow locations instead of at the current downstream locations described in the tables. **Comment has been addressed.**
4. Confirm that proposed drainage features and fill are not being placed within 10' of the property line nor within existing servitudes. **Comment has been addressed.**
5. Include drainage servitudes on the Pre- and Post-Development Maps. **Comment has been addressed.**
6. Revise HydroCAD node labels on the Pre- and Post-Development Maps to reflect the HydroCAD model schematics. **Comment has been addressed.**
7. Revise the 'Site-Only' HydroCAD models' extents to produce runoff rates for all site exit points instead of at the ultimate outfall. *Contact ERA to discuss.* **Comment has been addressed.**
8. Pre-Dev Site-Only HydroCAD Model: revise Tc calculations for nodes A and E so that the site exit points are being analyzed instead of the ultimate outfall. *Contact ERA to discuss.* **Comment has been addressed.**
9. Post-Dev Site-Only HydroCAD Model: revise Tc calculations for nodes A, E, and F so that the site exit points are being analyzed instead of the ultimate outfall. **Comment has been addressed.**
10. Provide information in the narrative describing the outfall structure layout of pond 1P. **Comment has been addressed.**
11. Confirm that 1P's outlet devices' inverts are lower than the pond bottom; otherwise, revise accordingly. **Comment has been addressed.**
12. Most of the reaches in the HydroCAD models exceed their respective inlet and outlet features, which shows that tailwater effects are not being modeled accurately. Consider reworking your models to replace these reaches with information from the HEC-RAS routing analysis so that tailwater is modeled effectively. *Contact ERA to discuss.* **Comment has been addressed.**
13. Provide pictures of pertinent drainage features (including pond 1P's outfall) per the Drainage Impact Study Procedure. **Comment has been addressed.**
14. In the narrative of the report, include a separate section for 'HEC-RAS Analysis' that describes the assumptions, methods (including how HEC-RAS was used together with HydroCAD to properly account for tailwater), alternatives (Existing and Proposed), and results from the HEC-RAS model. *Contact ERA to discuss if needed.* **Further analysis of the drainage details will occur during the construction document review phase.**
15. Include drainage tables on the Post-Development Map. **Comment has been addressed.**
16. Revise HydroCAD node labels on the Post-Development Map to reflect the HydroCAD model schematics. **This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**
17. The distance used in the time of concentration calculations for predeveloped areas A and E to match distances measured on drainage maps. For example, existing drainage area A is about 400 ft wide but only has a 100 ft overland flow path in the calculations. Review and revise. **Comment has been addressed.**
18. The pond outlet structure in the HydroCAD model shows a much more complex outlet structure than only a 30" CMP. Revise the study to describe this outlet structure consistently (narrative, HydroCAD, and HEC-RAS should all align). **Comment has been addressed.**
19. Rework your HydroCAD models to route ponds to the 'Grey Pond' feature instead of 'Reach' features so that tailwater is tested on the ponds (existing and proposed). A rating curve should be input to the 'Grey Pond' feature with information from the HEC-RAS routing analysis. *Contact ERA to discuss if needed.* **Comment has been addressed.**
20. The total site area on the Pre- and Post-Development Maps and tables (both in the narrative and on the maps) does not match the total site area shown on the Preliminary Plat; revise accordingly. **This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**

HEC-RAS

1. Several cross sections do not represent the most recent LiDAR nor show any indication that survey data was implemented to create these cross sections; revise accordingly. **Comment has been addressed.**
2. Revise Bank stations on River 'Johnson Bayou', Reach 1-DS-0, Cross Sections 996 and 997. **Comment has been addressed.**
3. Redraw cross section surrounding the junction such that all cross sections are drawn perpendicular to the flow path. *Contact ERA to discuss if needed.* **This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**
4. Based on the current state of the model, it is clear that Structure -128.58 is not significantly impeding flow compared to the other structures being modeled (it is the only structure that overtops for the 10-YR event). Given this fact and 'HEC-RAS' comment 3, it is our recommendation to remove this structure and associated cross sections. *Contact ERA to discuss if needed.* **Comment has been addressed.**
5. Revise the model so that structures are being modeled with respect to the 'Bridges and Culvert's section of the HEC-RAS User's Manual (number of cross sections, cross section spacing, ineffective flow areas, contraction/expansion coefficients, etc). **This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**
6. Confirm that the losses due to the 2 90 deg. turns in the proposed 48" culvert were accounted for. **Comment has been addressed.**
7. Revise structures so that the culverts reach past the edge of the deck when viewing the profiles. **Comment has been addressed.**
8. Extend cross section lengths for all appropriate instances where the water surface is truncated so that the water is contained within the channel. (Truncation is frequently appropriate near junctions). *Contact ERA to discuss if needed.* **This comment will be addressed during the construction document review phase.**
9. The water surface profile lengths are inconsistent between existing and proposed; revise the downstream reach lengths, culvert distance to downstream cross section, and junction lengths. It will also help to use the same river line in the existing and proposed models. **Comment has been addressed.**

Traffic Study

1. The study suggests that both LA 73/C Braud and LA 73/LA 74 intersections operate at LOS C. The northbound segment of the LA 73/LA 74 intersection routinely has traffic backed up 1 mile south to Cornerview in the PM. And traffic is backed up on LA 73 on the segment of LA 73 in between LA 74 and C Braud in the PM. The analysis are not matching observations. **The consultant responded that the type of intersection analysis that was agreed on during the pre-application scoping meeting that is consistent with the traffic policy will not be able to account for any congestion that would be impeding the intersection operation from offsite backups. The narrative of the traffic report has been updated to account for visual observations that would suggest worst LOS results than what the traffic model shows.**
2. Volumes on LA-73 should have increased since 2014, however data in the study reflects a decrease in volume along the corridor and at the intersections of C Braud and LA 74. **The consultant provided a sufficient response describing the differences in the results from the other traffic studies from 2014.**
3. Recent studies shown that the LOS of LA 73 @ C Braud should be performing considerably worse than 2021 results:
 - a. AM: 2014 (LOS D) → 2018 (LOS F) → 2021 (LOS C)
 - b. PM: 2014 (LOS E) → 2018 (LOS F) → 2021 (LOS C)

The consultant provided a sufficient response describing how different software, timing patterns, and assumptions would yield different results. However, the analysis performed cannot account for backups from the corridor or adjacent intersections.

4. Did the current study account for unmet Demand in the data collection for signals?

The consultant responded, “No. Ascension Parish policy does not require unmet demand as part of the data collection. However, as explained in the response to comment number 1 above, observations were made and queueing at these signals only exists during some signal cycles (not all) due to corridor congestion preventing vehicles from proceeding through the intersections. It is outside the scope of this study to determine the cause of the queueing along the corridor. It was observed that there are several schools along this corridor that could be contributing to congestion during these peak hours.”

5. The response to the previous traffic comments, state that the intersection study results may not be matching field observations of backups due the corridor not being analyzed through corridor analysis. The traffic study policy requires describing existing condition observations. The text of the study needs to be updated to note that field observations suggest worse level of services due to intersection analysis not being able to account for backups from roadway or nearby intersections. **The text has been revised.**
6. The executive summary needs to mention of the findings of capacity of LA 73 and recommendation to improve to LOS D or better. **The text of the study has been revised.**

Drainage Impact Study Summary:

Consulting Engineer:	William Purser, PE
Date of Study:	May 2020
Size of Development:	13.60 acres
Existing Land Use:	Pasture
Receiving Basin:	Johnson Bayou
FEMA Flood Zone:	X
100-year Flood Elevation:	13.0 FT (nearest)
Record Inundation:	None provided by Parish.
Offsite Drainage Area:	Approximately 127 acres
Fill Mitigation:	N/A

The Drainage Impact Study substantially conforms to the requirements of the Drainage Impact Study Procedure included in the Subdivision Regulations. The Engineering Review Agency has performed a review of the input parameters and results of the submitted drainage calculations for compliance with the Subdivision Regulations and generally accepted practices for storm water hydrologic design. Upon approval of the preliminary plat, the applicant can proceed with final drainage design in accordance with the concepts submitted in the study.

Traffic Impact Study Summary:

Consulting Engineer:	Rebecca B. Lala, PE, PTOE
Date of Report:	May 3, 2021
Date of Traffic Counts:	January 2021
Number of Proposed Lots:	100
Peak Hour Trips:	PM is peak. 59 Total
Study Threshold Level:	2

ATTACHMENT C

LOS D Analysis: Existing analysis show that the EB movement of C. Braud at La 73 operates at an LOS E during PM peak hour. Signal timing changes are not recommended because they would increase delay on La 73 and cause issues with nearby on La 73 and I-10. A solution was not provided to improve this movement to a LOS D or better. LA 73 resulted in LOS worse than a D. Recommendation for improvement would be to add additional lanes on LA 73 in each direction. These proposed improvements would result in a LOS of a B.

Offsite Intersections Studied: C Braud at La 73 and La 73/ La 74

Conclusion: There were no drops in Level of Service due to the proposed project's trips. No solution was provide to improve eastbound C Braud at La 73 to a better than a E. Additional widening is needed for LA 73 to improve roadway to a LOS of a B. Observations in the field show more congestion than the results of the table.

Sight Distance Evaluation: Sight distance was evaluated at the current condition and concluded that sight distance is adequate.

Below are summary tables of traffic analysis at offsite intersections:

Table 5: LA 73 at C. Braud Road Analyses

Hour	Scenario	LA 73 NB LOS (delay, s)	LA 73 SB LOS (delay, s)	C. Braud EB LOS (delay, s)	Driveway WB LOS (delay, s)	Overall LOS (delay, s)
AM Peak	Existing	B (18.7)	B (18.3)	D (45.0)	D (35.6)	C (24.3)
	No-Build	B (19.4)	B (18.6)	D (45.0)	D (35.6)	C (24.5)
	Build	B (19.9)	B (18.6)	D (44.9)	D (35.6)	C (24.7)
PM Peak	Existing	B (14.0)	B (18.5)	E (58.8)	C (31.2)	C (23.3)
	No-Build	B (14.2)	B (19.2)	E (58.5)	C (31.2)	C (23.6)
	Build	B (14.3)	B (19.6)	E (58.4)	C (31.2)	C (23.8)

Table 6: LA 73 at LA 74 Analyses

Hour	Scenario	LA 73 NB LOS (delay, s)	LA 73 SB LOS (delay, s)	LA 74 EB LOS (delay, s)	LA 74 WB LOS (delay, s)	Overall LOS (delay, s)
AM Peak	Existing	C (27.7)	C (21.4)	B (18.7)	C (25.3)	C (23.5)
	No-Build	C (28.5)	C (21.9)	B (19.2)	C (25.9)	C (24.1)
	Build	C (28.8)	C (22.0)	B (19.3)	C (26.1)	C (24.3)
PM Peak	Existing	C (28.7)	C (20.7)	C (27.3)	C (28.2)	C (25.2)
	No-Build	C (29.2)	C (21.1)	C (28.8)	C (29.6)	C (26.1)
	Build	C (29.5)	C (21.4)	C (29.2)	C (30.1)	C (26.5)

Table 7: LA 73 at Belle Savanne Avenue

Hour	Scenario	LA 73 NBL LOS (Delay, s)	Belle Savanne Ave EB LOS (Delay, s)
AM Peak	Existing	A (8.8)	C (15.9)
	No-Build	A (8.9)	C (16.4)
	Build	A (8.9)	C (16.7)
PM Peak	Existing	B (11.9)	D (27.0)
	No-Build	B (13.0)	D (27.6)
	Build	B (13.1)	D (28.4)

Table 8: LA 73 at Driveway Analyses

Hour	Scenario	LA 73 SBL LOS (Delay, s)	Driveway WB LOS (Delay, s)
AM Peak	Future	A (9.4)	B (12.3)
PM Peak	Future	B (10.5)	C (16.5)

Table 9: LA 73 Roadway Segment Level of Service

Hour	Scenario	Northbound				Southbound			
		LOS	Follower Density (fol/mi/ln)	Avg. Speed (mph)	Demand/ Capacity	LOS	Follower Density (fol/mi/ln)	Avg. Speed (mph)	Demand/ Capacity
AM Peak	Existing	E	19.8	37.6	0.58	E	20.2	36.5	0.58
	Build	E	20.6	37.6	0.60	E	20.5	36.4	0.59
PM Peak	Existing	E	18.6	37.8	0.56	E	26.6	36.3	0.71
	Build	E	19.1	37.7	0.57	E	27.3	36.2	0.73

End of Traffic Summary

The following items should be considered by the Planning Commission in their analysis of the case:

- The eastbound left of C. Braud at La 73 resulted in a LOS E. A solution was not provided to improve LOS to a D or better.
- LA 73 is at a LOS worse than a D. The proposed solution is to add additional northbound and southbound travel lanes on La 73.
- Modifications are needed with the existing striped turn lane to accommodate this new entrance.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (225) 769-0546.

Respectfully,

Engineer Review Agency for the Ascension Parish Planning Commission



Shaun Sherrow P.E., PMP

CC: William Purser, PE, Quality Engineering & Land Surveying, LLC