

1 City of Pass Christian
2 Municipal Complex Auditorium
3 105 Hiern Avenue

4
5 **Planning Commission**
6 **Meeting Minutes**
7 **Tuesday, November 27, 2018, 6:00 PM**
8

9 **MEETING LOCATION NOTE**

10 Due to a special election held in the Auditorium, the meeting was moved to the adjacent Library. A
11 notice was placed at the City Hall Bulletin Board, and signs were posted on the doors to the Auditorium
12 directing the public to the Library.
13

14 **CALL TO ORDER**

15 Chairman Tom Phares called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. In attendance were Commissioners Lisa
16 Smith, Adam Pace, Ken Austin, Margaret Jean Kalif, Rebecca O'Dwyer, Lisea Johnson and Steve Hunter.
17 Commissioner Michael Lizana was not in attendance.
18

19 Also in attendance was the City Planner, Danit Simon.
20

21 **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

22 The first order of business was the adoption of the minutes from the monthly Planning Commission
23 meeting held on September 25, 2018. A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner
24 Kalif, was made to adopt the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.
25

26 **NEW BUSINESS**

27 ○ *Open Public Hearing*

28 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner Pace, was made to open the public hearing.
29 The motion passed unanimously.
30

- 31 ○ *Application PD-49-2018, Dennis L & Barbara Henry, 512 E 2nd Street, #0413D-03-023.000, Re-*
32 *Subdivision Application to divide one lot into two; creating a conforming western lot, and an eastern*
33 *lot that conforms to the size and width requirements, but the existing house does not conform to the*
34 *24-foot front setback maximum, in the T4L Limited Mixed-Use Zone.*
35

36 Chairman Phares introduced the application.
37

38 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the application: Unfortunately the
39 applicant is unable to attend tonight's meeting. He has requested that if the Commission is leaning
40 towards approval to move forward, and if you are leaning towards denial, to make a motion to table the
41 application. I will then re-advertise the application for a future meeting.
42

43 The applicant proposes dividing the lot into two approximately 8,892 square foot lots, with lot widths of
44 40 and 48 feet along Second Street. These dimensions meet the T4L Zone's minimum size and width
45 requirements. The current parcel has a principal building at the front and an Ancillary Dwelling Unit
46 ("ADU") at the rear. The proposed lot division turns the rear ADU into the Principal Structure of the
47 eastern lot. While the lot dimensions of the proposed eastern lot are allowed by right; the existing rear
48 house has a 125-foot front setback that exceeds the zone's 24-foot maximum front setback. Please see
49 the site plan and maps included in the packet.
50

51 From Second Street nothing will visually appear different if the lot is divided. The owner may choose to
52 install a driveway or side yard fence, but the visual impact will be minimal. And if a new house is built at
53 the front of the eastern lot, it will comply with the T4L standards and integrate with the neighborhood.
54 The proposed division will be in harmony with the scale, density and character of the neighborhood, as
55 the smaller lot widths will incorporate into an area with lot widths that vary significantly from 20 to 175
56 feet, including 10-parcels with lot widths of 55-feet or less. And, the larger front setback will also
57 incorporate into an area with front setbacks that vary from 12 to 215-feet, including six houses with
58 front setbacks of 100-feet or more. There are three Objection Letters included in your packets, and this
59 concludes my report.

60

61 Chairman Phares stated that the applicant purchased the property with both structures on it. If the lot
62 is divided and the ADU becomes the Principal Building, having it positioned so far back creates an
63 inconsistent line up of houses (Principal Structures) along Second Street, and most importantly it is
64 problematic to approve a non-conforming Re-Subdivision Application.

65

66 Commissioner Pace agreed with Phares, stating that the division creates a non-conformity, which if
67 approved creates a serious precedent, and the two proposed parcels are not in keeping with the
68 character of the neighborhood.

69

70 Commissioner Austin agreed and stated that he is against approving a non-conforming Re-Subdivision
71 Application.

72

73 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace seconded by Commissioner Kalif, was made to *deny* the Re-Subdivision
74 Application. The motion passed unanimously.

75

76 ○ *Close Public Hearing*

77 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner O'Dwyer, was made to close the public
78 hearing. The motion passed unanimously.

79

- 80 ○ *Application PD-50-2018, Kenneth L II & Marian A. Torgeson, 621 E North Street, #0412M-01-006.000,*
81 *Application for a metal shed to the rear/north of the existing commercial building, in the G2*
82 *Controlled Growth Sector.*

83

84 Chairman Phares introduced the application.

85

86 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the application: The applicant
87 proposes building a 30 by 60 foot, three sides metal shed to the rear of the existing commercial building
88 to provide additional storage and work space for Torgeson Motors, please see the site plan and maps
89 included in your packets. The parcel is part of a sector that is intended for development, but was not
90 assigned a specific zone with the adoption of the 2010 zoning maps. Apart from Torgeson Motors and
91 the Torgeson's home located on the adjacent parcel to the west, the neighboring parcels are
92 undeveloped and densely wooded. Located approximately 500-feet east on North Street is Camille
93 Village, a residential development, and over fifteen hundred feet to the west are commercial and
94 industrial businesses within the Special Districts.

95

96 Since the G2 Sector does not provide any standards, the Planning Commission has the authority to
97 recommend approval of the shed's size, material, setbacks, etc. The applicant proposes locating the
98 shed to the rear of the existing building, in the third layer, with 12-foot side setbacks, and a rear setback
99 that is over 200 feet. The shed will almost entirely be screened from North Street by the existing

100 building and the dense woods on either side of the property. The development will allow the owner to
101 grow his business, with a nominal impact on the surrounding area. This concludes my report, and the
102 applicant is here to answer any questions you may have.

103

104 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif seconded by Commissioner O’Dwyer, was made to *approve* the
105 application for a shed. The motion passed unanimously.

106

- 107 ○ *Preliminary discussion on the future direction and zoning for the area north of the Railroad, east and*
108 *west of Espy Avenue, in the G3 Intended Growth Sector.*

109

110 The Commissioners discusses the possible future zoning, looking at the existing uses and possible
111 compatible future uses, residential, commercial and mixed-use. The majority of the Commissioners
112 determined that it is too early to assign zoning, and want to wait until there is some serious interest to
113 develop the land. They also requested that the Chairman and City Planner begin to review the
114 possibility of extending East Railroad Street to provide vehicular access to the land on the east side of
115 Espy Avenue, which is in the valuable X and X500 Flood Zones. With vehicular access this area could
116 provide a great opportunity for a mixed-use neighborhood, with both commercial and residential
117 development at grade. Additional discussions on zoning should happen after a road has been installed.

118

- 119 ○ *Courtesy review of a proposed lot division at 531 Espy Avenue in the G3 Intended Growth Sector,*
120 *presented by David Adams.*

121

122 The Commissioners discussed the challenges with dividing this parcel, since (1) it is in the G3 Sector that
123 has no standards, (2) it is in an area that does not have streets providing access to the lots, and many of
124 the lots are landlocked with shared driveways and easements, and (3) the proposed parcel would have a
125 workshop (Outbuilding) on a lot without a Principal Building. After much discussion the Commissioners
126 stated that because of how large the parcel is, the lack of streets in the area, and the neighborhoods
127 configuration of land locked and “flag lots,” it is a unique piece of land in a unique area of the City, and
128 therefore it is appropriate to be divided into a “flag lot” configuration. The Commissioners requested
129 that the Chairman and City Planner work on conditions of approval for the Re-Subdivision Application
130 and officially bring the application back to the Commission for review.

131

132 **OLD BUSINESS**

133

134 **OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT**

135

136 **ADJOURN**

137 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner O’Dwyer, was made to adjourn the
138 meeting at 6:50 P.M. The motion passed unanimously.