



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
 P. O. Box 625
 COVINGTON, LA 70434
 Phone: (985) 898-3329
 Fax: (985) 898-3003
 e-mail: planning@stpgov.org

Kyrin Davis
 Parish President

Appeal #7

THE PETITIONER OR ANY AGGRIEVED PERSON HAS TEN (10) DAYS TO
 APPEAL THE DECISION OF THE ZONING COMMISSION. APPEALS MUST BE
 FILED WITH THE ST. TAMMANY PARISH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING.
 A COPY OF THE APPEAL REQUEST IS PROVIDED BELOW.

ZC Denied
 8-4-04

Tabled 9-2-04

Postponed 10/7/04 pending

2025

APPEAL REQUEST

DATE: 8/4/04

(Reference Case on Zoning Commission Agenda)

ZC 04-07-055



We are hereby appealing to the St. Tammany Parish Council at its next appropriate
 regular scheduled meeting on the above referenced matter of an adverse decision of
 the St. Tammany Parish Zoning Commission.

This letter shall serve as official notice to put the above referenced matter on the Parish
 Council agenda.

Sincerely,

PLEASE PRINT NAME, MAILING ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER BELOW

SIGNATURE

[Handwritten Signature]

(SIGNATURE)

Favo Lonesome Development, L.L.C.

P.O. Box 1810

Covington, LA 70434

PHONE #: 892-4801

ZC04-07-055

Existing Zoning:

SA (Suburban Agriculture) District

Proposed Zoning:

PUD (Planned Unit Development) District

Acres:

206.437 acres

Petitioner:

Lonesome Development, L.L.C., c/o Tim Henning

Owner:

Lonesome Development, L.L.C., et al.



Location:

Parcel located west of Tantella Ranch Road, east of LA Highway 1077,
 north of the intersection of Tantella Ranch Road and LA Highway 1077,
 S8, 17, & 20, T6S, R10E, W and 1, District 1

Council District:

1

CASE NO.: ZC04-07-055
PETITIONER: Lonesome Development, L.L.C., c/o Tim Henning
OWNER: Lonesome Development, L.L.C., et al.
REQUESTED CHANGE: From SA (Suburban Agriculture) District to PUD (Planned Unit Development) District
LOCATION: Parcel located west of Tantella Ranch Road, east of LA Highway 1077, north of the intersection of Tantella Ranch Road and LA Highway 1077; S8, 17, & 20, T6S, R10E; Ward 1, District 1
SIZE: 206.437 acres



ZONING STAFF REPORT

Date: July 23, 2004
Case No.: ZC04-07-055
Prior Action: Tabled (07/06/04)
Posted: 07/15/04

Meeting Date: August 4, 2004
Determination: Denied

GENERAL INFORMATION

PETITIONER: Lonesome Development, L.L.C., c/o Tim Henning
OWNER: Lonesome Development, L.L.C., et al.
REQUESTED CHANGE: From SA (Suburban Agriculture) District to PUD (Planned Unit Development) District
LOCATION: Parcel located west of Tantella Ranch Road, east of LA Highway 1077, north of the intersection of Tantella Ranch Road and LA Highway 1077; S8, 17, & 20, T6S, R10E; Ward 1, District 1
SIZE: 206.437 acres

SITE ASSESSMENT

ACCESS ROAD INFORMATION

Type: Parish Road Surface: 2 lane asphalt Condition: fair
State 2 lane asphalt good

LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS

SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING:

<u>Direction</u>	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
North	Undeveloped	SA (Suburban Agriculture) District
South	Undeveloped	SA (Suburban Agriculture) District
East	Undeveloped	SA (Suburban Agriculture) District
West	Undeveloped	SA (Suburban Agriculture) District

EXISTING LAND USE:

Existing development? N Multi occupancy development? Y

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Planned Districts - Coordinated development on several parcels, usually at a higher density - but not in all cases - than other parcels in the proximity, planned in an integrated fashion as single units including residential, commercial and possibly other (institutional, recreational, e.g.) uses, as well as the supporting infrastructure and public services they will require (See "Small Area Plans," below). Generally, such developments improve environmental qualities, preserve natural environments, provide for open space and recreational uses, and for residential as well as commercial uses, and are equipped with central utility systems and efficient and effective internal and external transportation access in multiple modes.

Single Family Residential - Conservation - These planned districts would include clustered single family residential uses, at a density - within the overall tract - which is similar to that of adjoining residential uses, and conservation areas, following a Small Area Plan, and providing for balance, compatibility and integration of uses and all supporting infrastructure. Such individual Planned Residential - Conservation developments should aim to achieve contiguity among adjoining conservation areas in adjacent developments.

STAFF COMMENTS:

The petitioner is requesting to change the zoning from an SA (Suburban Agriculture) District to a PUD (Planned Unit Development) District. The site is a parcel located west of Tantella Ranch Road, east of LA Highway 1077, north of the intersection of Tantella Ranch Road and LA Highway 1077. The surrounding area is entirely rural and undeveloped save for a small Planned Unit Development approximately half a mile north along Highway 1077 from the subject site. In December of 2003,

the petitioners submitted an application to change the zoning classification of the subject property from SA to A-4 (ZC03-12-082). Although it was never submitted as an official component of the rezoning application, the original, conceptual development plan would have consisted of 260 single family home sites on 206 acres. In response to staff criticism and meetings with neighboring residents, the petitioners have submitted a revised plan in the form of a PUD.

The revised plan is unquestionably an improvement upon the previous plan. The new conceptual plan provides minimum 50' buffers along the entire road frontage, thereby making the development less visually obtrusive than a conventional subdivision. It also provides for ample greenspace (although it is not clear that the plan meets the minimum 25% greenspace requirement, as much of the greenspace is "limited use" land). Finally, the overall subdivision design displays a much greater degree of creativity and aesthetic sensitivity than a conventional subdivision design.

The developers have clearly attempted to provide a more attractive, more harmonious version of their original development concept, and they have succeeded. However, staff's principal concern with the original rezoning application was less with the details of the development (which the revised plan has adequately addressed) and more with the overall development concept, from which the petitioners have not deviated. Indeed, the new plan calls for the exact same number of lots as the original plan, resulting in an overall site density of 1.26 units per acre. It was precisely the density and scale of the development that concerned staff at the time of the initial rezoning application. Although the proposed density is less than the median density of newly approved subdivisions within the Parish (1.55 units per acre) and less than the *potential* density of the A-4 zoning classification, staff still feels that the size of the parcel and the proposed density of development would constitute a profound change in the landscape and the overall character of this portion of the Parish. Staff also feels that a development of this scale would dramatically affect the natural hydrology, the traffic patterns, and the infrastructure needs of the surrounding area.

When staff initially expressed similar misgivings in response to the original rezoning application, it did so without the benefit of the 2025 Comprehensive Plan. At that point, staff's concerns were based on a more nebulous standard of "compatibility" with the surroundings. Now that the 2025 Land Use Plan and accompanying land use map have been adopted by Council, staff has a more concrete basis for judging the appropriateness of zoning changes. Unfortunately, the proposed PUD runs counter to much of the language within the Comprehensive Plan as well.

The 2025 land use map designates this area for "Single Family Residential - Conservation" use. The proposed PUD fails to meet the definition of this land use classification in two ways. First, it fails to provide true conservation areas that could potentially be linked with future conservation subdivisions or recreation areas. The greenspace that the petitioners have provided is merely interstitial greenspace rather than large, preserved swaths of nature that could "achieve contiguity among adjoining conservation areas in adjacent developments." The Comprehensive Plan also defines this land use designation as one that "results in the placement of buildings and improvements on a part of the land to be subdivided in order to preserve the natural and scenic quality of the remainder of the land." With the vast majority of its designated open space consisting of narrow spindles of greenspace and engineered detention ponds, the proposed development plan would fall short of any reasonable interpretation of this land use objective.

The second way in which the proposed PUD fails to conform to the "Single Family Residential - Conservation" classification is that this designation calls for "a density - within the overall tract - which is similar to that of adjoining residential uses." A cursory examination of the surrounding area would undoubtedly yield the conclusion that the proposed density of development is grossly out of scale with the surroundings; but to examine more precisely the extent to which the Bedico Ranch development deviates from the surrounding density, staff conducted a field count of extant housing units within the 12 square miles that include and surround the development site. This field count yielded a total of 398 units in 7,680 acres for an overall density of 0.052 units per acre or, stated inversely, an average parcel size of roughly 19 acres. The Bedico Ranch PUD would, therefore, have a density 24 times that of the immediate surroundings. It is difficult to see under what reasonable interpretation a 2,323% increase in density qualifies as a density that is "similar to that of adjoining residential uses."

There are a number of other less egregious yet still significant ways that the proposed development runs counter to the spirit and the language of the Comprehensive Plan. The

comprehensive plan states that

The Parish should encourage redevelopment within existing cities and towns, villages and hamlets, whether incorporated or not, both as a means to efficiently accommodate growth where infrastructure currently exists or can be installed or expanded efficiently, and to serve market segments which prefer proximity to associated uses and required services.

Staff would argue that the kind of development precedent that Bedico Ranch would establish in an area that is currently *completely* undeveloped does not conform with this goal. Future petitioners would doubtlessly cite the density standard established by the Bedico Ranch development in applying for rezonings in this area; and the scale and density of development that would ensue would run entirely counter to the above stated goal. Of course, it is instructive to examine the alternatives to the proposed development as well. Under the Parish's subdivision and zoning regulations, the petitioners could create up to three new lots in any given year along an existing public road. Each new lot could be as small as 22,500 square feet (roughly 1/2 acre) and as narrow as 100' in width. Because of the density that would be permitted (albeit over a longer time horizon) and because of the safety hazard that could result from laying multiple driveways along Highway 1077 and Tantella Ranch Road, staff considers this to be unappealing development scenario as well. The potential for this kind of development suggests that the Parish should perhaps re-examine the subdivision and zoning standards for the SA zoning district. Nevertheless, staff's preeminent concern is that, under the proposed PUD scenario, a precedent for density within this region would be established that would perhaps facilitate the large-scale subdivision of large swaths of undeveloped properties that are located off of public roads.

Furthermore, the Comprehensive Plan enumerates a number of factors that should guide future residential growth. The proposed development fails on a number of counts, including "proximity to employment centers," "the actual (market-based) need for new residentially-zoned areas, given the existing surplus of available appropriately zoned areas," and preserving the "towns, villages and hamlets separated by rural areas and green space" that are characteristic of the historical pattern of development in St. Tammany Parish.

In conclusion, staff sincerely commends the applicants on submitting a revised development plan that is more attractive and creative than the original design. However, in exercising its judgement as to the fitness of a proposed development, whether the proposal merits a change of zoning, and whether the proposal conforms to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, staff finds much in this proposal that runs entirely counter to the general objectives and the specific language of the recently adopted 2025 Land Use Plan. Staff feels that the proposed PUD is entirely incompatible with the surrounding area.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The staff recommends that the request for an PUD (Planned Unit Development) District designation be denied.

JONES FUSSELL, L.L.P.
Attorneys at Law
1001 Service Road East, Highway 190, Suite 103
Post Office Box 1810
Covington, LA 70434
(985) 892-4801 - Telephone
(985) 892-4925 - Fax



f a c s i m i l e
T R A N S M I T T A L

Name: Diane Hueschen ccs: Marty Dean Sidney Fontenot Dr. John Martin
Fax: 898-2593 892-5583 898-3003 504-835-4306
Phone: 898-2770
From: Jeff Schoen
Date: February 16, 2005
Subject: A-14,949
Pages: 3

Comments:

This facsimile communication contains information that is intended only for the recipient named and may be confidential and subject to attorney-client privilege. If you are not the intended recipient or an agent responsible for delivering this communication to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this facsimile in error and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (call collect (504) 892-4801) and return the original facsimile to us by mail, without retaining any copies. Thank you.

JONES FUSSELL, L.L.P.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

NORTHLAKE CORPORATE PARK, SUITE 103
1001 SERVICE ROAD EAST, HIGHWAY 190
P.O. Box 1810
COVINGTON, LOUISIANA 70434

TELEPHONE (985) 692-4801
FAX (985) 692-4925

WILLIAM J. JONES, JR.
HOWARD R. FUSSELL
A. WAYNE BURAS
JEFFREY D. SCHOEN
MARGARET H. KERN
WILLIAM J. GRAIN*
LELAND R. GALLASPY
CALVIN P. BRASSEAUX
PAUL J. MAYRONNE
*ALSO LICENSED IN TEXAS

February 16, 2005

VIA FAX (898-2593)

Mrs. Diane Hueschen, Council Clerk
St. Tammany Parish Council
P. O. Box 628
Covington, LA 70434

Re: **ZC 04-07-055: Bedico Ranch Subdivision**
Our File #A-14,959

Dear Diane:

Our Firm represents both the Petitioner and Owner in connection with the above referenced matter, and, in connection therewith, I have enclosed a copy of Mr. Fontenot's August 16, 2004 letter setting the zoning appeal case for your prior September 2, 2004 Council Meeting.

At the September 2, 2004 Council meeting, the zoning appeal was tabled indefinitely pending the development of the Small Area Plan in the 2025 process.

I have advised Councilman Dean that my clients and I have decided to go forward with the appeal at your March 3, 2005 Council Meeting, and, in connection therewith, I respectfully request that this matter be set on the agenda accordingly.

If you have any questions or comments, please don't hesitate to contact me.

With best regards,

Very truly yours,

JONES FUSSELL, L.L.P.

BY: 

JEFFREY D. SCHOEN

JDS:wjd
Enclosure


Mrs. Diane Hueschen, Council Clerk
St. Tammany Parish Council
February 16, 2005
Page 2

ccs: Hon. Marty Dean (Via FAX 892-5583)
Mr. Sidney Fontenot, Director of Dept. of Planning (Via FAX 898-3003)
Dr. John R. Martin (Via FAX 504-835-4306)
Lonesome Development, L.L.C.

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

P.O.B.

SECTION CORNER



Sketch of

A ±206.437 ACRE PARCEL OF GROUND LOCATED IN SECTIONS 8, 17 AND 20, TOWNSHIP 6 SOUTH, RANGE 10 EAST ST. TAMMANY PARISH, LOUISIANA

THE SURVEYOR HAS CONDUCTED A VISUAL CHECK OF THE SURVEY AND FOUND IT TO BE CORRECT AND ACCURATE AND THAT IT IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYING ACT, CHAPTER 333, R.S. 17:501, 17:502, 17:503, 17:504, 17:505, 17:506, 17:507, 17:508, 17:509, 17:510, 17:511, 17:512, 17:513, 17:514, 17:515, 17:516, 17:517, 17:518, 17:519, 17:520, 17:521, 17:522, 17:523, 17:524, 17:525, 17:526, 17:527, 17:528, 17:529, 17:530, 17:531, 17:532, 17:533, 17:534, 17:535, 17:536, 17:537, 17:538, 17:539, 17:540, 17:541, 17:542, 17:543, 17:544, 17:545, 17:546, 17:547, 17:548, 17:549, 17:550, 17:551, 17:552, 17:553, 17:554, 17:555, 17:556, 17:557, 17:558, 17:559, 17:560, 17:561, 17:562, 17:563, 17:564, 17:565, 17:566, 17:567, 17:568, 17:569, 17:570, 17:571, 17:572, 17:573, 17:574, 17:575, 17:576, 17:577, 17:578, 17:579, 17:580, 17:581, 17:582, 17:583, 17:584, 17:585, 17:586, 17:587, 17:588, 17:589, 17:590, 17:591, 17:592, 17:593, 17:594, 17:595, 17:596, 17:597, 17:598, 17:599, 17:600.

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY



Randall W. Brown & Associates, Inc.
 Professional Land Surveyors
 Planners • Consultants
 288 W. Conway App. Mandeville, LA 70448
 (985) 624-5308 FAX (985) 624-5309

Date: OCTOBER 12, 2003
 Scale: AS SHOWN
 Date: 11-10-03
 Scale: AS SHOWN

204-07-055

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT DATA FORM

Description of Project

Applicant's Name LONESOME DEVELOPMENT

Address P.O. BOX 67 MANDEVILLE, LA. 70470

Attach area location Map showing the proposed development

Name of Development BEDICO RANCH

Section 8, 17, 20 Township 6-S Range 10-E

Number of acres in Development 206.437

Type of streets ASPHALT

Type of water systems CENTRAL

Type of sewerage system CENTRAL

Ultimate disposal of wastes ON SITE TREATMENT PLANT

Ultimate disposal of surface drainage TCHEFUNCTA RIVER / LAKE PONCH

Land form: Flat Rolling _____ Marsh _____
Swamp _____ Inundated _____

Existing land use: Rural Residential _____
Commercial _____ Industrial _____

Proposed land use: Rural _____ Residential
Commercial _____ Industrial _____

Conforms to Major Road Plan: Yes No _____

Water frontage: Yes _____ No if so how much _____

Name of Stream _____

Major highway frontage: Yes No _____

Name of Highway LA. HWY. 1077

Is development subject to inundation in normal high rainfall and/or tide?
Yes _____ No

Will canals be constructed into rivers or lakes?
Yes _____ No

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS BY A CIRCLE AROUND YES OR NO

1. Does the proposed development
 - a. Disrupt, alter or destroy an historic or archeological site or district. YES NO
 - b. Have a substantial impact on natural, ecological recreation, or scenic resources. YES NO
 - c. Displace a substantial number of people. YES NO
 - d. Conform with the environmental plans and goals that have been adopted by the parish. YES NO
 - e. Cause increased traffic, or other congestion. YES NO
 - f. Have substantial esthetic or visual effect on the area. YES NO

Cont:

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS BY A CIRCLE AROUND YES OR NO

- g. Breach national, state or local standards relating to
- | | | |
|--|-----|--------------------------|
| (1) Noise | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (2) Air Quality | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (3) Water Quality | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (4) Contamination of public water supply | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (5) Ground water levels | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (6) Flooding | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (7) Erosion | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
| (8) Sedimentation | YES | <input type="radio"/> NO |
- h. Affect rare or endangered species of animal or plant habitat or such a species
- i. Cause substantial interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species
- j. Induce substantial concentration of population
- k. Will dredging be required
- YES NO
- YES NO
- YES NO
- YES NO
- If yes, denote the area proposed for spoil placement and the anticipated volume in cubic yards.

2. Attach specifications on the following, if applicable

- a. What types of materials will be disposed of as a result of the production of manufacturing process. If applicable explain where and in what manner disposal will occur.
- b. What will be the average noise level of the development during working hours.
- c. Will any smoke, dust or fumes be emitted as a result of the operational process, if so explain fully.

Explain in detail the items marked YES above indicating how you propose to reduce or eliminate the environmental problems caused by your development and explain how you will ultimately dispose of the surface water generated by your development including the route of the surface water into a major stream and if you propose a center sewerage system the ultimate disposal of the effluent produced.

Gentlemen:

I have completed the attached Environmental Impact Assessment Data Form and hereby certify that the information shown thereon is accurate and is based on a thorough study of the environmental impact by this development named:

BEBICO RANCH

DATE: 5-18-04

TITLE

[Handwritten Signature]

I have reviewed the data submitted and concur with the information with the following exceptions:

I recommend the following:

DATE:

PARISIL ENGINEER:

I have reviewed the data submitted and concur with the information with the following exceptions:

I recommend the following:

DATE:

PARISIL PLANNER:

I have reviewed the Environmental Assessment Data Form and concur with the information submitted with the following exceptions:

I recommend the following:

DATE:

POLICE JUROR:
WARD