

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

4
5 **Planning Commission**
6 **Meeting Minutes**
7 **Wednesday, August 17, 2016, 6:00 PM**
8

9 **CALL TO ORDER**

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

14 **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

15 The first order of business was the adoption of the minutes from the monthly Planning Commission
16 meeting held on July 20, 2016. A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner Austin, was
17 made to adopt the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.
18

19 **NEW BUSINESS**

20 ○ *Open Public Hearing*

21 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner Kalif, was made to open the public hearing.
22 The motion passed unanimously.
23

- 24 ○ *Application PD-32-2016, Martin O III & Whitney E Miller, 113 Fairway Drive, Parcel #0213A-02-*
25 *027.000, Planning Commission Approval to access under house parking at the front façade of the*
26 *house addition with no garage door or screening at the front or 20 feet on each side, in the T3R*
27 *Single-Family Residential Zone.*
28

29 Chairman Phares introduced the project.
30

31 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the project: Before I start, if anyone
32 is here for the North Street application, PD-31-2016, it has been tabled and will be re-advertised at a
33 future date.
34

35 The applicant has proposed constructing an addition on the west side of the existing house, with parking
36 underneath, which is allowed by right. The variance request is to access the parking through the front
37 façade, and not to install any screening or a garage door on the front and on 20-feet on each side as is
38 required by our code. Please reference the attached site plan and map.
39

40 The SmartCode requires screening of the elevated portion of the house from the street, to conceal
41 stored items and parked vehicles. This improves the view of properties from the street and the overall
42 character of the neighborhood. The proposed addition will not be visible from Fairway Drive; if you look
43 at the site plan, you can see that the addition is approximately 300 feet back from the street, and it will
44 be concealed by a wooded area and by the layout of the existing driveway. If you look at the photos in
45 your packet, you can see that only a sliver of the existing house is visible from the street, but not the
46 existing carport which is where the proposed addition will be located. The carport will be demolished
47 and the addition constructed in its place.
48

49 Due to the location of the existing house on the lot, there is limited space for the addition and
50 insufficient space for a driveway along the side to provide side entry parking. Since the addition will not
51 be visible from Fairway Drive, the view from the street will not be affected by the front-loading parking
52 or by the lack of screening. This concludes my report, and the applicant is here to answer any questions
53 you may have.

54

55 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner Pace, was made to approve the request to
56 access under house parking at the front façade of the house addition with no garage door or screening
57 at the front or 20 feet on each side. The *Motion* passed unanimously.

58

- 59 ○ *Tabled- Application PD-31-2016, Jimmy Strickland as agent for Pass Christian Properties LLC, 0 North*
60 *Street (four parcels on the north side of the street, between Davis Avenue and Saucier Avenue),*
61 *Parcels #0312P-02-009.000, #0312P-02-010.000, #0312P-02-011.000, #0312P-02-012.000, Planning*
62 *Commission Approval for the Boat & Recreational Vehicle Storage Use, in the Special District Auto-*
63 *Oriented Zone & the T2 Rural Zone.*

64

65 Chairman Phares explained the challenges that arose with the parcels most likely being classified as
66 wetlands, and that the applicant needs to provide additional documentation before the Planning
67 Commission can properly review the application.

68

69 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner Kalif, was made to table the application.
70 Commissioner Austin abstained and the remaining Commissioners voted to approve, the *Motion* passed.

71

- 72 ○ *Application PD-30-2016, Brice Marks as agent for Kimberly & David Callecod, 629 E Scenic Drive,*
73 *Parcel #0413D-03-001.000, Planning Commission Approval for a Fourth Outbuilding/pool house in*
74 *the T3E Estate Zone.*

75

76 Chairman Phares introduced the project.

77

78 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the project: The applicant is
79 requesting to install a fourth outbuilding on the property. The proposed pool house will be located to
80 the rear of the main house, it is 24 by 18 feet or 438 square feet. A lot that is one acre or more can have
81 three outbuildings by right. The property has a garage, a shed, and a living space that has a bathroom
82 but no kitchen. Please reference the site plan.

83

84 Please note that in 2015 a 130 by 100 foot section of the parcel along 2nd Street was subdivided, and is
85 now a completely separate lot that has its own principal building, like many of the parcels between
86 Scenic Drive and 2nd Street. The remaining 1.8-acre parcel, is approximately 770 feet in length, going
87 north south. At Scenic the property is only 40 feet wide, but it slowly widens as it extends north to
88 about 126 feet. The lot is about 110 feet wide at the location of the proposed pool house.

89

90 Tonight, you will be evaluating whether or not it is appropriate for the property to have an additional
91 outbuilding. The main Standard for Planning Commission Approval for you to consider is that the
92 development must be in harmony with the scale, bulk, coverage, density, and character of the area in

93 which it is located. I am going to list the pros and cons of the project in relationship to that standard.
94 Starting with the con: The Estate Zone is composed of large lots with single-family houses at a minimum
95 of 3,000 square feet. The low-density residential area has large blocks and deep setbacks.
96 While the properties are large and can accommodate multiple outbuildings, it is important that
97 overdevelopment does not occur, which would crowd the character of the Estate Zone properties.
98 Along Scenic Drive between Courtenay & Donlin there are 11 developed lots that have an average of
99 two outbuildings per lot. When you look at the breakdown, you can see that it is rare to have four
100 outbuildings, and more common to have two or three outbuildings. You must determine whether the
101 fourth outbuilding does or does not crowd the lot.

102
103 Moving to the pro side: One, the T3E Zone allows for a maximum lot coverage of 40%, and with the
104 proposed pool house, the property will only have a lot coverage of 17.5%. Two, due to the shape of the
105 lot and the location of the existing structures, the proposed pool house will barely be visible from Scenic
106 Drive. And three, the 30-foot side setbacks will reduce any impact the project has on neighboring
107 properties.

108
109 No Objection Letters were received for this project, no other elements of the project require a variance,
110 and if approved, the Historic Commission will review the design. This concludes my report, and the
111 contractor is here to answer any questions you may have.

112
113 Commissioner Kalif asked the contractor Brice Marks, if the owners would be amenable to constructing
114 a breezeway that would connect the carport (part of the Principal Building) to the garage (Outbuilding
115 #2), therefore eliminating one of the outbuildings on the property?

116
117 Marks responded that it is possible, but he would have to discuss it with the owners.

118
119 Commissioner Smith asked Brice to clarify which of the buildings have bathrooms and kitchens.

120
121 Brice answered that the main house (Principal Building) has a kitchen and bathrooms; Outbuilding #1 on
122 the site plan has a bathroom but no kitchen; and that the proposed pool-house will have a bathroom
123 and some kitchen components, a microwave and fridge, but no stove.

124
125 The Commissioners continued to discuss the affects of a fourth outbuilding on the property.

126
127 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner O'Dwyer, was made to deny the request
128 for a fourth outbuilding. The motion passed unanimously.

- 129
130 ○ *Application PD-27-2016, Daniel Taylor as agent for Marc P Levy, 753 E Scenic Drive, Parcel #0413C-*
131 *02-015.000, Variances to expand the existing Ancillary Dwelling Unit (mother-in-law cottage at the*
132 *rear of the parcel) to more than the 1,200 square foot maximum; and to construct an additional*
133 *outbuilding/gazebo at the front of the property; in the T3E Estate Zone & T3R Single-Family*
134 *Residential Zone.*

135

136 Chairman Phares introduced the project.

137

138 Commissioner O'Dwyer recused herself and left the room.

139

140 The City Planner, Danit Simon, briefed the Planning Commission on the project: The property is large at
141 approximately 2.2 acres. It is 630 feet in length, going north south. And, 130 feet wide at Scenic, and
142 then further north the parcel widens even further to 178 feet. Please reference the site plan.

143 The applicant is restoring this neglected parcel, and while most of the work can be done by right, two
144 elements require variances. To simplify the application, you will be voting on the two requests
145 separately.

146

147 We are starting with the variance request to expand the ancillary dwelling unit at the rear of the lot to
148 1,500 square feet, which is 300 square feet larger than the 1,200 square foot maximum. The applicant is
149 converting the existing barn into the principal building, including an addition so that the barn meets the
150 T3E Zones 3,000 square foot minimum. This large 2.2 acre parcel can accommodate both the 3,000
151 square foot principal building and a 1,500 square foot ADU. The proposed ADU is still 50% smaller than
152 the principal house, and will appear appropriately smaller and in proportion on the large property. If
153 you look at the site plan, you can see the large distances between the majority of the structures. The
154 site plan maintains an open aesthetic in keeping with the Estate Zone.

155

156 The second variance request is for a fourth outbuilding, a peristyle at the front of the property. The
157 architect designed this outbuilding as a homage to the porch that once fronted the property's original
158 house. The peristyle is positioned at the location of the original porch. There are two elements to
159 consider regarding this variance. One is the fact that it will be the fourth outbuilding, and two is the fact
160 that the outbuilding will be located in front of the principal building or the barn.

161

162 Lets start by reviewing the fact that this is the fourth outbuilding. Similar to the last application, this
163 property is in the Estate Zone, which is comprised of large lots with single-family houses at a minimum
164 of 3,000 square feet. While the properties are large and can accommodate multiple outbuildings, it is
165 important that overdevelopment does not occur. We want to avoid overcrowding the lot. You are
166 determining if a fourth outbuilding is in harmony with the scale, bulk, coverage, density, and character
167 of the area. On Scenic between Lang & Hackett there are six developed lots that have an average of two
168 outbuildings per lot. On this block it is rare to have four outbuildings and more common to have three
169 or less outbuildings. But, keep in mind that 753 E Scenic is double or triple the size of all the developed
170 lots on this block. So when you look at the site plan, a fourth outbuilding does not appear crowded or
171 overdeveloped. In the T3E Zone the maximum lot coverage is 40%, and including the proposed peristyle
172 and the larger ADU at the rear, the property will only have a 15.5% lot coverage.

173

174 The bigger point to consider is whether having the peristyle in the first layer, or in front of the main
175 house, is in harmony with the scale, bulk, coverage, density, and character of the area. Lets begin with
176 the pros: One, the architect placed the peristyle at the current location due to its historic significance.

177 Two, between scenic and the existing barn there is over 300 empty feet of lawn, which the peristyle will
178 help to fill and define, creating a more residential focal point than the existing barn. Three, the peristyle
179 is lined up with the neighboring house to the west, so it doesn't obstruct any views.

180
181 And, now to the con: Along Scenic Drive there is no other peristyle or gazebo of this size, 12 by 60 feet,
182 that sits in front of the principal house. You need to determine if the location of the peristyle is in
183 harmony with the scale, bulk, coverage, density, and character of the area.

184 Keep in mind that you have the option of denying, approving, or approving the application with
185 conditions. If you see fit you can request that the front setback increase beyond 100 feet or that the
186 size of the structure decreases. There are two Objection Letters in your packet that stress that the
187 peristyle is not in harmony with the character of the area due to its size and location. This concludes my
188 report, and the applicant & architect are here to answer any questions you may have.

189
190 Please remember, first you will be voting on the variance to enlarge the rear ADU to 1,500 feet. And
191 then, you will vote on the variance for the fourth ADU on the property.

192
193 The Commissioners discussed the layout of the different structures, and the fact that there is nothing
194 like the proposed peristyle on any other lot on Scenic Drive.

195
196 Danny Taylor gave background on the project, the overall narrative for rehabilitating the existing
197 buildings on the site, and the significance of the peristyle. He clarified that the pool-house was removed
198 from the site plan, in order to reduce the number of requested variances, but the pool is still on the site
199 plan and is allowed by right.

200
201 Commissioner Kalif stated that the Historic Commission only approves the design, when this application
202 came before the Historic Commission, they trusted that all needed variances were approved by the City.

203
204 Chairman Phares asked Commissioner Kalif if the Historic Commission approved the concept?

205
206 Commissioner Kalif repeated that the Historic Commission only approves the design.

207
208 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner Pace, was made to approve the Variance to
209 expand the existing ADU at the rear of the parcel to 1,500 square feet. The *Motion* passed unanimously.

210
211 A *Motion* by Commissioner Pace, seconded by Commissioner Austin, was made to deny the request for a
212 fourth outbuilding at the front of the property. The *Motion* passed unanimously.

213
214 Commissioner O'Dwyer returned to the room.

215
216 ○ Close the Public Hearing

217 A *Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner Pace, was made to close the public hearing.
218 The motion passed unanimously.

219

220 **OLD BUSINESS**

221

222 **OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT**

223

224 **ADJOURN**

225 *A Motion* by Commissioner Kalif, seconded by Commissioner Smith, was made to adjourn the meeting at
226 6:45 P.M. The motion passed unanimously.