

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

---

4  
5 **Planning Commission**  
6 **Meeting Minutes**  
7 **Tuesday, August 27, 2019, 6pm**  
8  
9

10 **CALL TO ORDER**

11 Vice Chairman Ken Austin called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. In attendance were Commissioners  
12 Adam Pace, Michael Lizana, Margaret Jean Kalif, Lisa Smith and Steve Hunter. Chairman Tom Phares  
13 and Commissioner Rebecca O'Dwyer were not in attendance.  
14

15 Also in attendance was the City Planner, Danit Simon.  
16

17 **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

18 The first order of business was to table the adoption of the minutes from the monthly Planning  
19 Commission meeting held on May 28, 2019 and July 30, 2019. A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace,  
20 seconded by Commissioner Kalif, was made to table the adoption of the minutes. The motion passed  
21 unanimously.  
22

23 **NEW BUSINESS**

- 24 ○ *Begin Public Hearing*  
25 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner Lizana, was made to begin the public  
26 hearing. The motion passed unanimously.  
27
- 28 ○ *Application PD-28-2019, Jeff Kreiter & Gregory Dettwiler, 538 St Louis Street, #0313F-02-072.000,*  
29 *Planning Commission Approval for an Ancillary Dwelling Unit to exceed the 750 square foot size*  
30 *maximum by 100 square feet, in the T4L Limited Mixed-Use Zone.*  
31

32 Vice Chairman Austin introduced the application.  
33

34 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the application: The applicant  
35 proposes building a 1,200 square foot principal building, and an 850 square foot ancillary dwelling unit,  
36 ADU, or mother in laws cottage. Both of the structures are allowed by right. Tonight, the Commission is  
37 only reviewing the request for the ADU to exceed the maximum size by 100 square feet. Please see the  
38 site plan included in your packets.  
39

40 The code requires for all Outbuildings, including ADU's to be smaller in proportion and located to the  
41 rear of the main house. This standard allows for the main house to maintain the central architectural  
42 focus from the street view. The interior building space is 750 square feet, and the exterior porch is 100  
43 square feet. Due to the layout of the structures on the lot, the main house will block a significant  
44 portion of the view of the ADU from the street. And the site plan, meets all other elements of the  
45 SmartCode, which includes setbacks, parking standards, architectural standards, etc.  
46

47 The surrounding area is comprised of single-family houses, and a significant amount of undeveloped  
48 lots, with parcels in the T4+ and T4L mixed-use zones, and the T3R Single-Family Residential zone. In the  
49 T4L Zone, apartment buildings, duplexes, and single-family houses are all allowed by right. Based on the

50 density maximum, this size parcel allows for an apartment building with a maximum of three dwelling  
51 units, without any size restrictions.

52  
53 The applicants explain in an email included in your packet that they chose to build a single-family house  
54 with the ADU, as opposed to a three-unit apartment building, to add structures that are in keeping with  
55 the area and that will help to strengthen local property values. The email also explains that the design  
56 of the ADU with its front porch is intended to mimic the design of the main house, and maintain the  
57 overall style of the neighborhood.

58  
59 Please note that there is one impartial response letter, and two objection letters in your packet. The  
60 request meets the Standards for Planning Commission Approval and will be in harmony with the  
61 neighborhood in which it is located. This concludes my report and the applicant is here to answer your  
62 questions.

63  
64 The applicant, Gregory Dettwiler, stated that his family has been vacationing in Pass Christian for 25  
65 years. Because of the history I have in the area, I now want to build a house here with my business  
66 partner, who recently vacationed in the City as well. When we first reviewed the property we were  
67 considering building a three-unit apartment building, but after spending some time in the  
68 neighborhood, we decided that an apartment building was not in keeping with the neighborhood. We  
69 would prefer to do the principal and ADU to be more in keeping with the neighborhood, and we are  
70 asking for the additional square footage so that the ADU is more appealing. Without the extra square  
71 footage, we would have to remove the porch, which would leave an unattractive box. We want to build  
72 something more fitting for the neighborhood.

73  
74 Vice Chairman Austen asked if anyone from the public wanted to comment on the project. There were  
75 no responses.

76  
77 ○ *End Public Hearing*  
78 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace seconded by Commissioner Smith, was made to end the public hearing.  
79 The motion passed unanimously.

80  
81 ○ A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace seconded by Commissioner Lizana, was made to *approve* the  
82 *Variance for an Ancillary Dwelling Unit to exceed the 750 square foot size maximum by 100 square*  
83 *feet*. The motion passed unanimously.

---

84  
85  
86 ○ *Begin Public Hearing*  
87 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner Hunter, was made to begin the public  
88 hearing. The motion passed unanimously.

89  
90 ○ *Application PD-37-2019, Henry Furr as agent of Richard T & Jeri Lynne Foley, 1020 E 2<sup>nd</sup> Street,*  
91 *#0412P-04-017.000, Planning Commission Approval for an attached garage in the Second Layer, in*  
92 *the T3R Single-Family Residential Zone.*

93  
94 Vice Chairman Austin introduced the application.

95

96 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the application: The applicant is  
97 requesting to build an attached garage in the second layer due to the limitations of the existing  
98 structures and layout of the property. Please see the site plan and elevations in your packets. The code  
99 requires for garages to be located in the Third Layer so that the pedestrian entrance remains the focal  
100 point of the house, and garages and parking areas are less architecturally prominent. The house was  
101 built prior to the adoption of the code in 2010, and due to the existing layout of the house, pool and  
102 landscaping, there is no location on the property to place a garage in the third layer. With the existing  
103 landscaping on the west side and the pool on the east side, there is no space for vehicular access to the  
104 rear of the house.

105  
106 In order to conceal the proposed garage from the street view, the northern elevation of the addition is  
107 designed with the appearance of a front façade and the garage doors are located along the west side  
108 elevation. As well, a new front door will be installed as the focal point along the northern elevation. The  
109 existing non-conforming parking area is located in the First Layer, between the street and the front of  
110 the house. Granting the variance will allow for three vehicles to be concealed from the street view,  
111 which increases compliance of the SmartCode's parking standards by decreasing the number of vehicles  
112 parked in front of the house.

113  
114 The request meets the Standards for Planning Commission Approval and will be in harmony with the  
115 neighborhood in which it is located. This concludes my report and the applicant is here to answer your  
116 questions.

117  
118 The architect, Henry Furr, stated that there is a large live oak tree on one side of the house and a pool  
119 on the other side of the house. The existing house is situated far back on the property, and due to the  
120 placement the garage could only be located in front of the house. We have located the garage doors to  
121 the west, and placed some pergolas to screen the view of the garage doors and draw attention to the  
122 front door. The code is geared towards the style of houses in Pass Christian, but this is more of a  
123 midcentury ranch house, and our addition is the best solution for the situation.

124  
125 Simon asked for clarification on the pergolas, will they be parking structures? And will they be free  
126 standing or connected to the house?

127  
128 Furr responded that the pergolas will be for two guest parking spaces, but are also intended to soften  
129 the front area that has a large colonnade design that will be scaled back. They are separate, not  
130 attached to the house.

131  
132 Simon recommended to the Commissioners that when the motion is made that it should include the  
133 pergolas being located in the second layer. She also noted that the pergolas will be the third outbuilding  
134 on the property, which is over an acre in size.

135  
136 Vice Chairman Austen asked if anyone from the public wanted to comment on the project.

137  
138 The owner, Richard Foley, stated that the house is unusual in that it was once two separate structures  
139 built at different times and connected by a garage that was eventually enclosed. The house has been a  
140 little bit mismatched, and the addition and renovation will help to pull it together with a more cohesive  
141 style for the entire house.

142  
143 ○ *End Public Hearing*

144 ○ A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace seconded by Commissioner Smith, was made to end the public  
145 hearing. The motion passed unanimously.

146  
147 ○ A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif seconded by Commissioner Pace, was made to *approve* the request  
148 *for an attached garage and pergolas in the Second Layer.* The motion passed unanimously.

---

149  
150  
151 ○ *Application PD-39-2019, Lanny W Moore III, 120 Victoria Lane, #0512M-02-028.008, Warrant*  
152 *Application for sections of the roof to have a 3:12 roof pitch and for the first habitable story to be*  
153 *built higher than the maximum allowable four feet above the BFE.*

154  
155 Vice Chairman Austin introduced the application.

156  
157 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the application: The applicant  
158 proposes constructing a single-family house at 120 Victoria Lane in the Pass Oaks Subdivision. They are  
159 requesting for sections of the roof to have a 3:12 pitch, as increasing the pitch to the 5:12 minimum will  
160 adversely alter the chosen architecture of the house. The Building Code Official has confirmed that if the  
161 proposed shingle roof is installed to the manufacturer's specifications and warranty requirements, the  
162 reduced pitch will not impact the roof's drainage or function. And, this minor architectural deviation  
163 from the code will not affect the neighboring properties or larger community.

164  
165 You are reviewing the Warrant Application at tonight's meeting, because this is the first application of its  
166 kind, asking to increase the height of the elevated section of a house. Building heights in different zones  
167 have both minimums and maximums, and along with the maximum number of stories, this is how the  
168 overall height of a house is regulated. Capping the height of houses in an area has the same logic as  
169 front setbacks, which creates continuity along the street view and ensures that views are not blocked.  
170 The two habitable stories of the house meet the maximum height restriction. The applicant is  
171 requesting for the elevated portion of the house to be increased by two feet over the maximum to  
172 accommodate under-house parking. Please see the site plan and elevations in your packets.

173  
174 Please note that the subdivision's architectural review committee has approved the house plans, which  
175 includes the roof pitch and elevation. The two-foot height difference will not impact the surrounding  
176 area, but will allow for the applicant to park underneath the house. The request meets the standards  
177 for planning commission approval, and will be in harmony with the area it is located in. The contractor  
178 is here to answer any questions you may have.

179  
180 Commissioner Lizana stated that having the subdivision's Architectural Review Committee approve the  
181 design is a strong endorsement of the request.

182  
183 ○ A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif seconded by Commissioner Pace, was made to approve the request  
184 *for sections of the roof to have a 3:12 roof pitch and for the first habitable story to be built higher*  
185 *than the maximum allowable four feet above the BFE.* The motion passed unanimously.

---

186  
187 **OLD BUSINESS:** N/A

188 **OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT:** N/A

189 **ADJOURN**

190 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner Smith, was made to adjourn the meeting at  
191 6:15 P.M. The motion passed unanimously.