

**OFFICIAL MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
April 13, 2005**

Members Present: Clay Breaud, Melvin Adams, and Marguerite Erwin

Members Absent: Bert Boquet and Sheard Ber

Also Present: Honorable Charles Caillouet, Mayor, Kermit Kraemer, Jr., Public Works Director, Errol Price, Zoning Administrator, Councilmen Dee Richard and Chad Mire and Ruby Maggio, Secretary

Mr. Breaud stated they had been furnished a copy of the minutes for the February 9, 2005 meeting, Ruby is still one month behind right now, would you all like to act on this now or take an opportunity to read them. Mr. Adams made a motion to hold off until they read them and it was seconded by Ms. Erwin, all members in favor.

The first item on the agenda was old business to review the City of Thibodaux Sign Ordinance No. 1593, Article XXI, Division 1, Section #2005 relative to on-premise and temporary signs. Mr. Breaud stated as you all are aware, we have had several public hearings on this issue. We had formed a committee, Ms. Erwin was the Chairman and the committee met on several occasions and he would like to call on Ms. Erwin to go ahead and explain the recommendations of where we are now. Ms. Marguerite Erwin stated they were presenting a temporary sign ordinance to allow temporary signs in the City for C-2 and above, to allow one, she didn't know if everyone has been furnished a copy that's here, however, we worked hard, we had six public hearings just on temporary signs, so we think that we got a lot of input, we got it from both sides. We think we've come up with a good ordinance that's sort of aesthetically pleasing as well as allows the businesses to advertise their business things that might be specials or sales and so forth but also to do it in a pleasing to the environment and to the residents of the City. We also, in addition to this, are asking for more time to, when we initially were asked to do off-premise signs, she meant on-premise signs and temporary signs, going through all of our ordinances, we found it quite difficult to pick all the sign ordinances and all the different areas in where they were and they'd like to consolidate that into one complete sign ordinance and they were asking for direction from Planning & Zoning to continue that process, but they would like to get approval for the temporary signs. Mr. Breaud replied and like Marguerite said what this was, it was an effort to try and give some immediate relief, we had a lot of development it seemed like coming into the City and we just went through the Lenten season and we had a lot of people coming and requesting variances to allow them to do some advertising in the City. He thought the City has recently started to enforce the regulations a little more than what has been done in the past and we got quite a public outcry, so this is an effort, it was not a complete deal, but it's an effort to allow some temporary signs and they're listed here from A through M which would be an add on to Section 2004 of the existing ordinance. Like Marguerite said, the committee would continue to meet and address the whole sign ordinance, we realize we still have problems in the sign ordinance but what this would give is some kind of immediate relief to allow some advertisement to go on a temporary time basis. So with that being said and like Marguerite said, he didn't think everybody had a copy of the sign ordinance, if anyone would like for us to go through them, they could go through them all or if we've got any public comments, we can hear from the public at this time. (No one came forward). Mr. Breaud then asked the Mayor if he was satisfied with that for now, or did he have a chance to read them, he knew he wasn't totally satisfied, but like he said, this is just to try and give some kind of immediate relief. Mayor Caillouet came forward and stated well, again, like everybody, he thought nobody was really totally satisfied with it in terms of it's a much bigger project but he appreciated the fact that the effort is being made to at least give some relief immediately and as we go through the entire range of signs throughout the City, hopefully we'll continue to have public input, but he appreciated the efforts by the committee that Marguerite head up and hopefully this can be something that they can work with and people and the businesses and all in the City can work with too. We don't have the personnel to constantly monitor all of these things but he appreciated the efforts that have been put forth. Ms. Erwin replied and they tried to make sure that it was easy, that the enforcement was not a problem with this. Mayor Caillouet replied it's not that it's improvement needed, it was just personnel wise, again the enforcer that is listed in here is the Zoning Administrator for the City which happens to do many, many tasks other than just the signs, so that's the only thing he's saying. Maybe that was something that they could address when they did the whole review of all the sign ordinances. Mr. Breaud stated and in the future, that's one thing we had talked about is it seems like we've got an imbalance between off-premise and on-premise signs and that's something that the committee will try to address and bring that more in line so that we're not hurting our local people and then allowing outsiders to come in and advertise. Mayor Caillouet replied right. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any other

comments by the public (no one responded). Errol do you have any comments being you're the enforcer on this thing or the interpretation is clear to you on...? Mr. Price replied it was clear. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any comments from the commission, if not, he would entertain a motion to adopt the temporary sign ordinance, Section XXI, 2004.1, paragraph 15 as presented, moved by Ms. Erwin and seconded by Mr. Adams, all members were in favor, motion carries. Mr. Breaud stated he would like to thank the committee and commend Ms. Erwin in her efforts in getting the committee together and he would like to continue on some kind of basis to get the whole thing re-written and any help that the planning commission can give you please call on us. Ms. Erwin replied well our next meeting is scheduled for May 9th, this was for information purposes. Mr. Breaud stated anyone in the public that is interested in signs, we would appreciate your attendance at these meetings, it would be on May 9th, we're trying to address all the problems that are coming about and like he said put more equality into the sign ordinance. If you would like to serve on the committee he was sure Ms. Erwin's got some openings that she won't mind filling. Ms. Erwin stated they were always looking for input. Mr. Breaud replied ok, with that being said,

The next item on the agenda was new business to consider a request by Acadia Land Surveying, LLC on behalf of Jaron Land Development Company, LLC for preliminary plat approval of Phase One of Village One, Project A, Acadia Plantation located on the West side of Percy Brown Rd. (LA Hwy. 648) South of the intersection of South Acadia Rd. and Percy Brown Rd. in Section 36, T15S-R16E, City of Thibodaux, Lafourche Parish, Louisiana. Mr. Gary LeBouef of Duplantis Design Group came forward and stated again, this is the Project A for Acadia Plantation and this project has been in front of this Board before for preliminary plat approval, it was granted and since that time they made some modifications due to concerns of the residents and the Planning Commission, so we revised the plans and the plats to make these changes. We revised the 50' drainage servitude along the southwest side of the subdivision to extend all the way to Percy Brown Road so that change was added to the plat and to the plans. We adjusted the centerline slopes of the proposed road to meet the point .35% minimum slope requirement with the City. The radius call outs have been added to the plans at the intersection of South Acadia Rd. for the proposed road. The detention ponds have been removed from this, there are no more ponds adjacent to Lot #8 or 9 of the subdivision and in turn they made some linear addition improvements to the existing drainage ditch located on the southwest side of the site. They did a reservoir capacity instead of a detention pond to meet the drainage requirements of the City and they also submitted the drainage calculations and report to the City and the Planning Commission for review. The last change was there's an existing ditch adjacent to Acadia Point Subdivision and this property which will be re-graded as a swale ditch instead of a steep field ditch, he believed the cane farmer dug a field ditch along that property line so they're going to do more of an aesthetic looking ditch where the water still sheet flow from Acadia Point but it would be more of a gentle swale instead of a field ditch there so if there were any questions from the Planning Commission or the City with these changes. Mr. Adams stated that 30' drainage servitude, would that be part of the ditch or is that going to be just the servitude, along the new road that ties into Percy Brown. Mr. LeBouef replied there's a 50' drainage servitude which a portion of it's a ditch and a portion of it is to maintain, so maybe 1/3 of it will be ditch, the rest of it would be where you can get in and out and maintain the ditch. Mr. Breaud replied this was a 50' servitude already, so it's a 50' plus the 30' back there. Mr. Adams stated what happened to the pond, there was a retaining pond... Mr. LeBouef replied now we've widened the ditch on the northeast side of it just adjacent to our development and created more reservoir capacity so it's just been widened in the area adjacent to the subdivision and it's shown on the grading plan, sheet C-2. Mr. Breaud replied this would serve as a pond right now. Mr. Adams replied that was what he was wondering, that's why he was asking, if that's going to be part of a wider ditch instead of just a servitude. Mr. LeBouef replied then you could maintain it from either side, you'll have the public right of way on the east side and the drainage servitude on the west side. Mr. Adams stated and on that new road, the last plan that you had you didn't tie into Percy Brown, is that in the planning of the new phase? Mr. LeBouef replied no, that's correct, at this time they would stop with a turning "T" and in the future either bring it to Percy Brown or they could tie it somewhere else, maybe Erwin Dr. or something if the plans call for that in the future. Currently they would dead end with a turning "T." Mr. Breaud stated let me make a few statements he guessed, the T.N.D. District was defined as the 952 acres to be incorporated into the City. This is not in the T.N.D. District at this time and it's already zoned an R-4, we therefore fall under the subdivision regulations and not the T.N.D. codes. Mr. LeBouef replied all right. Mr. Breaud stated all land use shall comply with the R-4 Zoning District Regulations. He wanted to make sure that the developers realized that and they didn't have a problem with that because whatever falls under the R-4, he knew those two big tracts, he wasn't sure what they were planning, but it's got to fall into the R-4 Zoning, do they realize that? Mr. LeBouef replied he thought so and he thought that was being written into the annexation agreement where this will also be, well not annexation excuse me, it would be part of, it will be re-zoned, go through the re-zoning process to change this area to a T.N.D. Zone. Mr. Breaud stated are you going to try and get this re-zoned from an R-4 to a T.N.D. Zone you're saying? Mr. LeBouef stated he guessed they could do what they wanted to do in the R-4 District right here, what's being proposed here fits in with the current zoning so he thought just to appease the people who are buying into this they're going to want to... Mr. Breaud stated well if there was any reason to re-zone we should have gone through that by this point in time right now, we've gone ahead and designed the project based on R-4 regulations and we need to comply, I can't guarantee you that if they come back and ask for a re-zoning that we would give them a T.N.D. Zone. Mr. LeBouef stated right and he could check into it, he wasn't sure, he hadn't read the agreement yet, they are still going back and forth with the City, so that may be written. Mr. Breaud

stated let's make them aware that this is an R-4 Zone, you're complying with the subdivision regulations which is this book here and not the T.N.D. District codes that are being presented, there's a little bit difference in there and whatever is not complying, that's the distinction he wanted to make tonight because we've got some new districts. When something does not comply, you need to ask for a variance, ok, tonight we're being presented with a roadway that's 26' wide with a 46' right-of-way. The subdivision regulations require a minimum 50' right-of-way. Mr. LeBouef replied it says 50' here on the plat here, where do you see 46' at? Mr. Breaud replied well the plans, the typical section on the roadway... Mr. LeBouef replied he could put a scale to it but he didn't think they had, he was pretty sure that was shown as 50'. Mr. Breaud stated on the proposed typical roadway section, we're showing a 28' wide road with a 48' right-of-way. Mr. LeBouef replied he saw that, yes. Mr. Breaud stated and that fits in with the T.N.D. District guidelines. Mr. LeBouef replied he understood. Mr. Breaud stated and that may be what you want, with this or the master plan that was approved, this allowed parallel parking on both sides of the road with a 14' center line and if that's what you want you need to ask for a variance for it, and that was his request right now is that we've got to follow the rules of the subdivision regulations because this is an R-4 District. Mr. LeBouef replied he agreed. Mr. Breaud stated so he would ask that you ask for a variance tonight allowing this and he wasn't sure this doesn't conform with the 50' right-of-way shown on the plat, so he wasn't sure which one... Mr. Adams stated but this was submitted later on, after the Phase I came about and they desired to develop this, so this wasn't part of the T.N.D. section. Mr. Breaud replied no it's not but it was approved, the master plan that we approved did set the guidelines for this development. Mr. LeBouef replied that was correct but it was drawn as a 50' and his section calls for a 48', he guessed they could, if they could ask for a variance that's fine, he would like to ask for one but he didn't believe that they needed on with this current layout, but just in case for some reason the developer chooses to do so, we can shrink it down on the final plat. Mr. Breaud stated to be safe I would ask for a variance because the normal subdivision regulations have got a 27' road and you've got in here a 28' foot road, it was a little bit beyond the standards so he would ask for that variance to be safe. The master plan also shows for Percy Brown Rd. to be a boulevard section with 170' right-of-way, is that no longer being proposed? Mr. LeBouef replied at this time, no. Mr. Breaud stated ok, we need to ask for a variance for that also, is there no time in the future that it would be widened to a boulevard section. Mr. LeBouef replied he didn't know. Mr. Breaud replied because the servitude that we're granting and the installation of the utilities is right behind the right-of-way and if we ever did widen the roadway the utilities would be in conflict with the proposed widening of it, so as far as you're concerned you're going to ask for a variance that it's not going to be a boulevard section in the future. Mr. LeBouef replied it would not be a boulevard section in the future. Mr. Breaud replied ok, let's make that a variance to it, he didn't have a problem, it's a State road, we can't require you to construct a boulevard section but the master plan shows it that way and whenever we deviate from that master plan we need to ask for a variance because it's just like a zoning ordinance, if Zoning R-1 allows certain things and if you don't follow those then you need to ask for a variance for them. Mr. LeBouef replied he agreed. Mr. Breaud stated it also shows a 20' temporary easement along Percy Brown Rd., what is that? Mr. LeBouef replied that was an existing pipeline corridor that was granted to a pipeline company so... Mr. Breaud replied well you've got a pipeline corridor but inside of that you've got another 20'. Mr. LeBouef replied that was just for construction purposes, the pipeline is not there now but they want to have enough room to get in there to work on it, so once the pipeline is constructed, if it's constructed, it would go away. Mr. Breaud replied ok, so that's for the construction of the pipeline. He then stated also, on the preliminary plat it doesn't show a 10' servitude for the sub-surface drainage that you are proposing to put in on Lot 2, across Lot 2 we're putting in sub-surface drainage, would that be part of the construction? Mr. LeBouef replied let's see, yes, that would be a private drainage servitude for Lot 1 to get across Lot 2 in the event that they want to sell it so it wouldn't be a city dedicated, it would be a private drainage servitude between the two parties, but there is a party that is interested in buying both Lots 1 and 2 so that may not be an issue. Mr. Breaud replied ok, well if it's something that has to be dedicated to the City just make sure on the final plat that they include the servitude for it. Mr. LeBouef replied ok. Mr. Breaud stated he didn't see anything on light standards specified on here. Mr. LeBouef replied locations? Mr. Breaud stated yes, it's not called out at all. Mr. LeBouef replied there's nothing on the utility plan, there's no lights shown on there, because he didn't have his plans in front of him, he left his set at the house. Mr. Breaud asked if it was the intent to put the light standards in? Mr. LeBouef replied yes it is, he believed it was every 250' was the maximum space, they would definitely have to add that to the engineering plans but that was a mishap on their end. Mr. Adams replied also fire hydrants. Mr. LeBouef replied it would be on sheet C-3. Mr. LeBouef replied it's not coming out well, but yes, there are street lights, every third lot, so we do have lights at the intersection here, the symbol is kind of small, it doesn't really stand out well on the plans. Mr. Price replied there are five lights and two fire hydrants, here and here. Mr. LeBouef replied there's the existing ones along here and there's one here, we're putting one here as well, there's an existing one here, so we've met the spacing requirements of the City. Mr. Breaud replied ok, Errol you don't have any problem with the utilities. Mr. Price replied no. Mr. Breaud stated no problem giving service to them. Mr. Price replied no, no problem. Mr. Breaud then asked Ms. Erwin if she had any comments, no comments Melvin? Mr. Adams replied no, he thought they had settled what he had. Mr. Breaud stated the redivision of the lots and the drainage, moving the drainage pond to the other location along the road he had no problem with it, he thought it was a better layout that they had before. Mr. LeBouef replied yes, he agreed. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any comments from the public? Mr. Lea Rutter of 206 Creole Lane came forward and stated that they main thing he just wanted to make sure was that the retention pond is as he saw it on the review is actually just a drainage enlargement towards Percy Brown Rd. and that's actually a good idea, whether it

be upstream or downstream just as long as it wasn't in their stream, they were ok. Mr. Breaud stated he liked when he was satisfied, Lea. Mr. Rutter replied he appreciated that Clay. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any further comments from the public, if not, he guessed he would entertain a motion to accept the preliminary approval for... Ms. Erwin stated could she ask a question? Mr. Breaud replied go ahead. Ms. Erwin stated can we grant a variance, this Board? Mr. Breaud replied yes, we can grant variances for this, we can't grant off set distances in our variances but variances in the subdivision regulations are granted by us. Ms. Erwin replied ok, she just wanted to make sure on the R-4 because. Mr. Breaud stated this is an existing R-4 District. Mr. Kraemer stated he was trying to do what Marguerite asked him, you're granting the preliminary approval with the variances or making them come up to what the standards are. Mr. Breaud replied no, we're going to grant them a variance for this being it's part of the T.N.S. Master Plan, we're going to allow them to go with the 28' road, we'll allow them to go with the 48' or 50' right-of-way you've got on the plat; we will require light standards, that's not a variance, we require that to be installed and, well let me make the motion. Ms. Erwin replied the lights are on there, Clay, they are there. Mr. Adams replied yes, they're on there. Ms. Erwin stated so that's not an issue. **Mr. Breaud stated ok, so what we're doing is recommending preliminary plat approval for Phase I of Village One, Project A with a variance for the 28' wide roadway as presented and a variance from the 50' right-of-way to 48' if needed and a variance from the boulevard section of Bowie Road. The motion was made by Ms. Erwin.** Ms. Erwin replied of Percy Brown Rd., you said Bowie. Mr. Kraemer stated that's in opposition to the Master Plan. Mr. Breaud replied that was correct, which is a State highway, the Master Plan showed a boulevard section all the way through there and it was his understanding now that they're not going to go with the boulevard section, his concerns were if it was a boulevard in the future that all the utilities we're putting adjacent to this section would fall in conflict with any proposed widening. But it was his understanding right now and we' cant' force them to put a boulevard section and he guessed since it was a state right-of-way he's running into problems getting it himself, there's no plans to put the boulevard which is a deviation from the Master Plan. Mr. Kraemer replied you can make him leave the right-of-way, however. Mr. Breaud replied they could if there's future plans for widening it, they could definitely do that, it would move all of the utilities out. Now, he did think they were boxed in on a couple of sides with some existing utilities, the power lines or the pipelines. Mr. LeBouef replied there's power there but there's not much on Percy Brown. Mr. Price replied that pipeline that was proposed? Mr. LeBouef replied yes, it's not even there; it's just a reserved easement. Mr. Breaud replied but this affects everything down the line, the intersection of Acadia Road and Percy Brown all the way through. Mr. Adams replied it would become a busy intersection. Mr. Breaud stated Gary, there was no other discussion on this as far as you know? Mr. LeBouef replied no. Mr. Breaud replied, what is the wishes of the commission? Ms. Erwin stated Kermit, do you have any recommendation on that? Mr. Breaud stated the existing right-of-way is 80' wide for Percy Brown Rd. right now. Mr. Kraemer replied the boulevard section was proposed in connection to the four-lane highway and the potential for other four lane highways, you could end up with a section that's only two lanes wide through that area. Mr. Breaud then asked the wishes of the commission. Mr. Adams stated he was thinking they needed to reserve that property for future development. Mr. Breaud then asked Gary where were the developers tonight? Mr. LeBouef replied he wasn't sure. Mr. Breaud then stated do we want to go ahead and require at least the right-of-way being reserved for the boulevard section. Ms. Erwin replied why not? Mr. Adams replied yes, he would recommend it. Mr. Breaud stated it would be a collector type of street. Mr. LeBouef replied how much right-of-way are we talking about? Mr. Breaud replied 170', 90 more feet, 45' on each side, it would affect the layout of all of your lots on both ends. Mr. Adams stated it wouldn't affect this Phase A, this project A, it wouldn't affect that but it would affect the future development. Mr. Breaud stated yes it would affect it. Ms. Erwin replied I mean, that was the first request. Mr. Adams stated what do you mean, not here? Mr. Breaud stated yes it would affect that lot, it would affect all the utilities that are being constructed. Mr. LeBouef stated if we're building water and sewer we would need to know where to put them now whether or not it's in the way of a future road, so we'd have to have 170,' then our utilities would need to be out that much further, it would change the layout of the whole subdivision up here as well. Mr. Breaud stated that's why he was saying they had to request variances, if we're not going to follow the master plan that has been presented and approved by us, we need to ask for variances on it. We're getting ready to approve something that is going to box us in that's not going to allow a boulevard section to be built afterwards because all the utilities would be in place and the road not widened. So if we can give a conditional approval tonight that the right-of-way be widened to 170' as presented on the master plan and all utilities be adjusted accordingly, was that the wishes of the commission? Mr. Adams stated he definitely ought to be reserved. Mr. Breaud replied ok. Councilman Dee Richard stated you're putting conditions and sending it to the Council with conditions. Mr. Breaud stated the conditions would have to be, could be sent to the Council but the conditions need to be met before the Council acts on it. The Council doesn't want to act on conditions, so the plans would need to be revised and presented as parts of the conditions are met. Mr. LeBouef stated he thought they would have to resubmit plans back to the Planning Commission he would imagine, you really can't start construction without, because this would change everything. Mr. Breaud stated it was a pretty drastic change. Mr. LeBouef stated it was a drastic change to the plans so he would think they would have to come back in front of the Planning Commission at the next meeting with these kind of changes. **Mr. Breaud stated let's retract the motion that's on the table right now. Ms. Erwin replied there was no second and she withdrew. Mr. Breaud stated ok, they would make another motion that the developer resubmit a plan incorporating at least the right-of-way for the boulevard section of Percy Brown Rd.** Mr. Gary LeBouef asked if that would be 170', is that what... Mr. Breaud stated as shown on your master plan that

was presented by them, your master plan addresses it, if you look on the Village One layout section it calls for a boulevard, BLV 170 Section and if you turn to the typical section of a BLV 170 Section it shows the 170' right-of-way with two 23' foot lanes with a 57' grass median in the middle and that's what was approved on the master plan that was presented to us. This is the rules that we're following right now with the master plan on the T.N.D. District right here and if there's anything that changed to that, you need to request a variance for it. Mr. LeBouef replied ok. Mr. Breaud stated we considered this to be a pretty drastic change right now because Percy Brown Rd. will be a collector street and an 80' right-of-way will not be enough to give us any kind of collector type street. So, the motion on the floor right now is to request that the developer resubmit his plans incorporating the 170' right-of-way as shown on the master plan. He didn't think that they requested that the actually construction take place under this phase of work, but at least the right-of-ways be reserved and the utilities be adjusted accordingly. You're going to back all the utilities off now so in the future we're not in conflict with them. It shouldn't affect your drainage plan, all this other stuff, or your road layout per say, it affects those two lots adjacent to it. Ok, that's the motion, do you want to make that Marguerite, Ms. Erwin replied yes. Mr. Breaud stated moved by Ms. Erwin and seconded by Mr. Adams, all members were in favor.

The next item on the agenda was to consider a request by Acadia Land Surveying, LLC on behalf of Jaron Land Development Company, LLC for sketch plat approval of Phase One of Village One, Project B, Acadia Plantation located on the West side of Percy Brown Rd. (LA Hwy. 648) North of the intersection of North Acadia Rd. and Percy Brown Rd. in Sections 35, 36 & 37, T15S-R16E, City of Thibodaux, Lafourche Parish, Louisiana. Mr. Gary LeBouef came forward and stated that tonight they were here for Tract B and Tract A, this is part of Project B, at the intersection of North Acadia Road and Percy Brown Road. They were proposing to build a new street connecting North Acadia and Percy Brown in order to come back and they would extend sewer, water, gas and drainage as well to this development. They submitted plans as well along with the plat tonight, he knew they were kind of ahead of sketch plat but they wanted to get some comments on their proposed improvements for this development. This is an area that is being brought in as a T.N.D. District and he didn't believe that they would be asking for any variances except they would have to revise now that you say it to have the 170' right-of-way on Percy Brown. Mr. Breaud stated ok, just a few comments, a drainage impact study will be required, he knew they had the drainage layout pretty much showing the plan but you do have to submit a drainage impact study. At this time the way is it presented there will be no development allowed on Tract B, right now the only infrastructure that you are putting in is the roadway and the utilities to support Tract A, so there would be no allowed development on Tract B until the roads are all built as part of the master plan. Mr. LeBouef replied on B, he got him, he agreed with that. Mr. Breaud stated make sure your developers understand it because the master plan shows some roads going through Tract B and we're not building that now, so the only development that they would allow is on Tract A. Mr. LeBouef replied even the lots that are adjacent to, on the side of B. Mr. Breaud replied adjacent, yes, that was fine. Mr. LeBouef replied as long as it has a direct contact... Mr. Breaud replied access to it. Mr. LeBouef stated access to the road or utilities, got you. Mr. Breaud stated like you said, this is part of the T.N.D. District and land use and construction standards shall comply to the T.N.D. codes and the master plan. What he would like to show on these final plats or preliminary plats is a note to that effect that all land use shall comply with this master plan and code standards. We can't sell property and decide that we want to build a commercial building on something that's specified as something else in the master plan, so on the plat we need to designate that, it's just like a zoning type deal, just to make sure everybody is clear. We've got some green spaces denoted on the master plan, he would like that to be shown on the plan, we can't sell a green space but they show on the master plan as a reserve green space, it's got to be reserved as a green space and not so much on this one but on the other submittals, all the little alley ways we talked about were going to be private alley ways. Mr. LeBouef replied that was correct. Mr. Breaud stated he didn't know if it was still proposed that way we need to show the distinction on the plats, what is publicly dedicated right-of-ways to be maintained by the City and what's private servitudes to be maintained by the landowner. Mr. Breaud stated once again, unless he missed it, he didn't, light standard will be required on here, we need to make sure you've got light standards on here. Mr. Adams stated we're not showing any subdivision of lots anyway, they're only showing one street. Mr. Breaud replied they're only showing the Tract A part right now but if you look at the master plan, there's streets that subdivide all along here. Mr. LeBouef replied right, this is a portion of the master plan but it is in the same line as you see it on the master plan. Mr. Breaud stated but if it's the intent and the master plan doesn't show a division of all of this, this is a big tracts right here. Mr. Adams replied it shows two big lots, it don't show the division of the lots. Mr. Breaud stated but it does show all these roadways and alleyways to be built. Mr. LeBouef replied right. Mr. Breaud replied so until we get these roads built here, we're going to say that this is not, the infrastructure is not in place so the only thing we are approving right now is this Tract A. Mr. LeBouef stated so if you want to put a lot adjacent to that road you're saying we can't do that right now? Mr. Breaud replied well if you can do it, it's not shown like that on the master plan, he thought the intent was to sell this as large tracts, or if he is, come back with a variance requesting that change. Mr. LeBouef replied he didn't think any lots, any separate lots were laid out on here but he was sure they're going to divide this into maybe three or four pieces. Mr. Breaud stated well when you come back with your preliminary submittal we need to, this is a division of land and it's got to be approved by the Planning Commission. You can't come back and do this and then come back after and carve it up unless, anyway he does it, he's got to come back and subdivide it and be approved by the Planning Commission. Mr. LeBouef replied all right, even if the use is for what is required. Mr. Breaud replied if he's going to subdivide it, yes. Mr. LeBouef then asked how is that a

variance, we're not varying, we're just, the master plan is a pie on the side, so it's like advising to the master plan, it could change, he meant. Mr. Breaud replied maybe we're misunderstanding, if you're going to subdivide this, it's not a variance but you've got to ask, you're subdividing property, it's got to be shown, you can't come and get approval of it as a large tract of land and then subdivide it. Mr. LeBouef stated we'd have to come back to the Commission to resubdivide the property, if they want to carve a one acre piece of this corner here or one piece here. Mr. Breaud replied that was correct, they'd have to come back again. Mr. LeBouef replied and they knew that, they agreed with that. Mr. Breaud replied and the same, what he was getting at is these other tracts though, we're not building the roads and we're not putting in the utilities so we're not going to allow any development in there. Mr. LeBouef replied he agreed and what would happen is they're going to build this road and when the use comes for whoever wants to put a one-acre, they're going to carve it out and come back for preliminary plat approval. It would already be built and then once that's the fact then they can occupy and build at their site. Mr. Adams replied yes, apply for a resubdivision. Mr. LeBouef replied he followed them. Mr. Breaud then stated he was sorry for keeping the public in the dark about this, but we've got to make sure that we're getting this straight and their developer understands what he's getting on his request. Also, a D.O.T.D. permit is going to be required if they're tying into a State highway. Mr. LeBouef replied right. Mr. Breaud stated the plat shows an 80' right-of-way for North Acadia, a 50' road right-of-way on South Acadia and then we show a 50' median in the middle, who owns that strip of land, what is that going to be, what is the purpose of that. Mr. LeBouef stated that's the area between the two roads, he believed that Jake and Ronald own it but he thought that was going to be given to the City, or that was in the works for the annexation agreement. Mr. Breaud stated it's an existing tract of land in between. Mr. LeBouef replied right, he thought that would be dedicated as a green area and maybe a bike trail in the future or something, that was part of the annexation package that is being presented. Mr. Breaud replied most of these are statements because this is sketch plat approval and he was just making these statement so when you come back in the engineering request, it was the same thing, he didn't think they would make any motion for any variances at this time but you need to address the 150' right-of-way on Percy Brown Road again. Mr. LeBouef replied right. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any other comments by the Commission, Melvin? Me. Adams replied no, he just want it understood that you're just subdividing that one lot, you can't develop that unless you resubmit for a re-subdivision of it. Mr. LeBouef replied right, he understood. Mr. Breaud stated the infrastructure has got to be in place before... Mr. LeBouef stated before you allow somebody to start construction. Mr. Breaud stated and make that note on the plat, that no development, even though Tract B is the remaining tract, there's no development allowed on Tract B until the infrastructure is constructed. Mr. LeBouef replied he understood. Mr. Breaud then asked Ms. Erwin if she had any comments and she replied no. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any comments from the public, if not, he would entertain a motion for sketch plat approval for Phase I of Village One, Project B of Acadia Plantation, the motion was made by Mr. Adams and seconded by Ms. Erwin, all members were in favor, motion carries.

The next item on the agenda was to consider a request by Acadia Land Surveying, LLC on behalf of Jaron Land Development Company, LLC for sketch plat approval of Phase One of Village One, Project C, Acadia Plantation located on the East side of Percy Brown Rd. (LA Hwy. 648) East of the intersection of North Acadia Rd. and Percy Brown Rd. in Sections 37, 38 & 39, T15S-R16E, City of Thibodaux, Lafourche Parish, Louisiana. Mr. Gary LeBouef with Duplantis Design Group came forward and stated that this is Phase I, they would fix that on the plat, he thought it said Phase II of Village One, so they would fix that to say Phase I of Village One so this part of the first phase. This is the property across from Project B on the other side of Percy Brown and North of Acadia Woods Road. This plan is verbatim from the master plan and they weren't asking for any changing at this point in time. All are residential lots and commercial lots will remain as per the original T.N.D. plan, this is a piece of the property that is going to be annexed in as a T.N.D. District as well. They were here tonight just to get comments, again they submitted more information than sketch plat requires but we wanted to get feedback on what they were proposing to do, so that's the reason why they did that. We have the sewer, water and gas layouts, the road layouts, the private alleys laid out, so if there's any questions. Mr. Breaud stated Mr. Price, I failed to ask you about the utilities on the other section, we can provide services to these two tracts? Mr. Price replied yes. Mr. Breaud stated no problems, all right; also a drainage impact study will be required for this development. Just to re-emphasize what we talked about before this is part of the T.N.D. District and the plat shows no land use as per the T.N.D. Plan and the Codes. The reserved green space shall be shown, we've got some little chips of corners of lots which don't conform to any kind of minimum lot dimensions and those are shown to be green areas, that's why he wanted it shown on the plat, that they can't be sold for a snowball stand, they're green areas and they need to be reserved for a green space so we need to denote that on the plats. Mr. LeBouef replied all right. Mr. Breaud stated and shown the distinction between the public dedication and the private alleys because we've got a lot of private alleys that are tied into the publicly dedicated, if you look at the plat, there's no distinction between the two and he thought it always was the agreement that the private alleys would remain private and the City would take over dedication of the public road. Mr. LeBouef replied that was correct. Mr. Breaud stated you also need D.O.T.D. permits for this, you need to incorporate the right-of-way for the Percy Brown Rd. He didn't see any light standards shown on this submittal neither and also, he would like him to explain the work to be done on the Forty Arpent Canal, he saw some shading and all on the canal and he didn't quite understand exactly what work was going to be taking place on the Forty Arpent. Mr. LeBouef replied that would be a right-of-way, the right-of-way jumps from different sides of the canal for one reason or another so they were proposing to have a 50' easement on

one side across the whole property just so it doesn't jump back and forth, just to make a good straight easement parallel to the existing canal, so they weren't doing any digging or any improvements to the Forty Arpent at this time, that just designates the proposed maintenance servitude for the Forty Arpent canal. Mr. Breaud stated your drainage impact study has got to reflect that no improvements are needed on the Forty Arpent canal. Mr. LeBouef replied they would have some detention ponds on this one and they would have typical... Mr. Breaud stated also, explain the relocated Acadia Woods Drive plan on the map, I see they've got relocated Acadia Woods Dr., would you explain that, would that be a boulevard section? Mr. LeBouef replied let me make sure he was looking at the same plan, that will be.... Mr. Breaud stated somewhere on here the plans had showed, you're going to add a second roadway to the existing, the existing road is going to stay in place and the second... Mr. LeBouef stated this particular drive will remain as is and they will build another lane on the North side parallel lane to create a boulevard section, an extension of North and South Acadia through this area. Mr. Breaud stated and there will be some additional tie-ins to the existing subdivision. Mr. LeBouef replied there will be, the existing tie-in will remain as is that is correct. Ms. Erwin stated this is talking about a second road and then that tie in on the same turn, she guessed, is where it is now. Mr. Breaud stated he thought it was shown on the other map, showing some additional tie-ins at a couple of locations. Mr. Adams stated he had a questions, back to elevation, on this map it shows all of these different elevation points or is that what he is intending to bring it to that elevation because he saw they have been doing a lot of elevation work over there, in other words he's planning to drain that towards the canal, the Forty Arpent? Mr. LeBouef replied no, it's going to drain to sub-surface drainage and then into the detention pond and then into the Forty Arpent so you still won't be dumping water into Forty Arpent un-restricted, so it would be a restricted flow. Mr. Adams replied because he was looking to see which way he would run that drainage with the elevation for the development. Mr. LeBouef replied these are storm pipes. Mr. Adams replied you're going to the pond before you go to the canal. Mr. LeBouef replied correct. Mr. Breaud then asked Mr. Adams if he got his question answered. Mr. Adams replied yes, he was trying to figure which way it would flow with that elevation the way they're run, but he going to dump it into the pond before he goes into the ditch. Mr. Breaud then asked Mr. Price if he had any comments on any of this proposed work. Mr. Price replied no, they still have lots not shown yet that they needed to clarify. Mr. Breaud stated yes, the sketch plat is basically a general layout of what they are proposing to do but it's good to have this information at this time so we can get our comments so when you do come back next time at least it would all be addressed. Mr. LeBouef replied right. Mr. Breaud then asked Ms. Erwin if she had any comments, Ms. Erwin replied no. Mr. Adams stated by that time we would know more about the boulevard or what they are going to intend to do. Mr. Breaud replied that was correct. Mr. LeBouef then asked if he could ask a question, let's say a portion of this, and he would show them over here, a portion of this road would not be constructed in Phase One but it was called for in Phase One, like for instance, this road right here and this road, if they decide they're not going to build this at this time because they don't want to build this road and be tied into a piece of property. They don't want to limit themselves, if there's a need for a bigger tract for a school or whatever they want to make sure that they're not tying themselves down into a trap just because the master plan says it's that far. If they want to scoot it over 100' to make this a bigger tract for a school then, what they want to do at this point is leave this section of the road out of here and this section as well so that the school has time to come up their plans to fit it into this development. Mr. Breaud replied he didn't have a problem with modifying layout, but only present to us what you propose to dedicate to the City and construct under that phase of work; don't propose something and decide during construction that you're not going to build it. Mr. LeBouef replied no, he agreed. Mr. Breaud stated modifications for the master plan are fine as long as you come to us but designate what is going to be built under that particular phase. Mr. LeBouef replied right and he showed that on his plans, he showed for future road and that's why he wanted to bring it to their attention that they're not planning on building this section of road at this time. Mr. Breaud replied that's fine but on your plat let's show the cut off here, dash this or something to show it's future and not part of this, it's not being approved as part of the dedication of this phase of work. Show it as future and show it as dashed lines or something but we need to show a distinction between what you are proposing under this phase and what you are going to propose under different phases. Mr. LeBouef stated right and he clarified it on his plan submittal but it wasn't clarified on the plat, ok. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any comments by the public, surely the public has got to have some comments on these big two developments. Mr. Jerry Marcello of 312 Hale Drive came forward and stated he had mainly a question and he did not study the original plan in any depth but his question was he thought they were going to maintain the existing road which is going into Acadia Woods and then an additional road, two-way street would be constructed to the left of the existing road, which would probably be used to come out of their development and Acadia Woods, was that about right? Mr. Breaud replied it would be a boulevard section two-lane road, one coming in and two going out, that's correct. Mr. Marcello then asked what steps or precautions have been taken to assure that the drainage on the existing road would be taken care of because we're going to have a lot of development possibly to the right, possibly to the left and he had seen the existing road during heavy rains flood to the point where it was not passable, so does the plan incorporate significant improved drainage or any elevation to avoid flooding when we would have normal, heavy, South Louisiana rains. Mr. Breaud stated yes, the phase that we're in right now is called sketch plat approval in which the developer and his engineer presents to us the layout of what they are proposing to build. The next submittal he comes back to us is called the preliminary engineering phase where he submits calculations on all of his drainage, he's got to do a drainage impact study to show that his development is not going to have an adverse impact on adjacent property. He couldn't guarantee him that they would solve all of the existing problems, that is not part of his task, his task is to make sure

that he doesn't make them any worse. If he can correct a problem by tying in to the existing road he was sure they would accommodate that but he's responsible that his development does not have an adverse impact on any adjacent property; so they could only make the conditions better than what they are now. If he has a means when he's putting in the other roadway, he's going to have to analyze the area between to make sure he's not causing drainage problems so to answer your question, they would tell the developer tonight to go ahead and take a look at that situation and see if he could address it. Mr. Marcello replied ok, thank you very much. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any other comments from the public, if not, he would entertain a motion for preliminary plat approval for Phase I, Village 1, Project C of Acadia Plantation located on East side of Percy Brown Road and to address the comments that you've heard tonight on his next submittal, motion was made by Ms. Erwin. Mr. Adams stated that he would like to add that we reserve that corridor prior to preliminary approval. Mr. Breaud stated he does have to address the Percy Brown Road right-of-way. Mr. Adams then seconded the motion, all members were in favor, motion carries.

Mr. Breaud stated let me make one other comment, he looked back to the minutes of what was approved on December 14th as far as the approval of the T.N.D. District and he would read a couple of paragraphs and he wanted to make sure this was addressed because there were some conditions on the T.N.D. District and those conditions need to be met. It says that Mr. Breaud stated, "Ok, are there any comments relative to zoning, if not, he would entertain a motion that we recommend a T.N.D. District for the 952.887 acres (which was the overall tract at that time) of Acadia Land Plantation as presented to us on the map provided by Acadia Land Surveying to set a T.N.D. District conditioned upon that this area get incorporated into the City limits through the legal process of the City Council and that a set of signage restrictions be presented to the Commission to apply to this T.N.D. District." At this time he didn't know of any signage that we've got to address the signs in this district, so talk to your developers, that was a condition for this to be met and as far as he knew it wasn't met. It goes on and says that, "Does that take into everything that we spoke about? Mr. Oubre replied and the change from Lafourche," there is some wording in this code and master plan that talked about the Lafourche Planning Commission, that was supposed to be changed and he had not received any kind of change on that yet, "and Mr. Breaud stated and to also change the book with the codes striking out Lafourche Planning Commission and the parish in a couple of locations and applying the City of Thibodaux to those regulations. It was moved by Ms. Erwin and seconded by Mr. Adams." So that was conditions on the T.N.D. District. Now all the approvals that we submitted tonight on the T.N.D. District, or the last two tracts are conditioned upon this property getting annexed into the City. Right now we're acting on property that's not even, well the last tract is not in the City limits, so this is conditioned upon this land getting annexed into the City.

The last item on the agenda was to consider a request by Jaron Land Development Company, LLC to re-define the boundaries of the Traditional Neighborhood Development (T.N.D.) previously presented to the Planning Commission for zoning approval on December 14, 2004. Mr. Breaud stated what this is, we were originally presented a map that showed the 900 and 80 something acres which was a whole tract of land that we were going to incorporate into the city and form that as a T.N.D. District. Tonight they are requesting that we re-define those boundaries to be 150 acres or something like that, he didn't think they had the total acreage shown, but as it's shown or presented on the map which pretty much is bounded on the North by the Forty Arpent Canal, on the West by Bowie Road and on the South by North Acadia Road and on the East by remaining property of Acadia Land Subdivision. So, they were re-defining these boundaries and he wasn't sure if the Council ever did act on any of this yet, so this is still recommendations to the Council conditioned upon that this property gets annexed into the City. So, were there any comments from the Commission, this was a re-definition of the boundary that we approved last time, so what they were doing is re-tracking the boundaries that we gave approval on last time and re-defining them as these boundaries. Mr. Adams stated use these as a guideline. Mr. Breaud replied yes, this is what they are proposing to incorporate into the City limits, the shaded area on the map. The master plan was approved for the overall tract. Ms. Erwin replied for the overall tracts. Mr. Adams replied yes, Phase II is not even in here. Mr. Breaud replied but if it's not in the City limits it doesn't have any meaning, but we don't have to change, well he guessed they did, he guessed they were re-defining this as both the annexation of the City and the re-definition or re-defining of the T.N.D. boundaries. This would be the boundaries of the T.N.D. District and as future land gets incorporated we'll extend the boundaries of the T.N.D. as well as annexation into the City. Mr. Adams asked if he had see, do you have a copy of the map, Gary? Mr. LeBouef replied yes. Mr. Breaud then asked if there were any comments by the Commission. Mr. Adams stated the only thing, we had the preliminary plans, this doesn't include the Phase II of what we had from the beginning, this is just really the Phase I. Mr. Breaud stated that's all they asked for is Phase I. Mayor Caillouet came forward and stated let me make sure exactly what we are going to be doing, it was his understanding tonight their request is to reduce the size of the T.N.D. that you recommended down to, it's 115.09 acres. Mr. Breaud asked if he saw that on the map. Mayor Caillouet replied you can't read it on there; don't you have microscopic vision? He had a larger map that he was reading it from, the same map, that's a condensed version. The plans are, if plans work, this is going to be coming up in front of the City Council next Tuesday, the 19th for a combination of things to take place. One of them is a cooperative endeavor agreement and annexation ordinance; the other thing is for the Council to approve the T.N.D. that you had previously recommended and now presumably will re-define, really it's just the geographical area tonight, but the one thing he as unfamiliar with is that there's conditions on your T.N.D., one of them that you have to have some signage language in the T.N.D. that goes before it, this is all coming up Tuesday. It is proposed to be annexed

into the City this coming Tuesday, less than a week from now. The other thing and the language about pretty much taking out the language about the Lafourche Planning Commission, he didn't think that would be too difficult but they haven't provided that yet. But he was concerned about the language about signage and that was a condition that you're recommending that has to be accomplished before the T.N.D. is approved, is that correct? Ms. Erwin stated well that was one that was recommended back in December. Mayor Caillouet replied right, but it's getting ready to come up for Council approval and again, he was, he didn't know if Dee was aware of it, maybe he heard about it at the time, but he forgot about it, he didn't know. But he didn't know what would be done about getting that. Mr. LeBouef replied it was the first he heard of it tonight as well, so he needed to check into it and see what was going on. Mayor Caillouet replied because nothing can happen, this whole thing as he understood the developers side is conditioned upon a T.N.D. District being in place at the same time that they're annexed into the City even to the extent that they want to come back after it's over and come back and have everybody ratify everything that was done because of an issue of what type of zoning you can have when you're actually annexed into the City but that was an issue for another day, he was more concerned that if there is a question of signage before the Council can even approve the T.N.D. which is a preliminary step to the annexation, but it's all trying to take place on that same night. Mr. Breaud stated well, let's discuss the signs he guessed. Mr. Adams stated do we have anything on our guideline book for signage in that... Ms. Erwin stated they didn't have anything in our guidelines but she certainly wouldn't see that there would be a problem if we removed that condition and asked the sign committee that you've appointed to address, because they were looking at just to remove that condition and have the sign committee address signs in the T.N.D. District. Mayor Caillouet stated then what you're asking the Council to do is to approve a District, a Zoning District in effect in the City that would have no signage. Ms. Erwin replied it would have no signage, zero signage would be allowed. Mr. Adams replied if he remembered right when they attended that meeting in Lafayette that was brought up to Mr. Oubre's attention and he said he was going to check into it and submit an additional amendment to their guidelines. Ms. Erwin replied and he was supposed to. Mr. Breaud replied that was part of the condition and that's why he pulled them out because the conditions are supposed to be addressed before the Council acts on it. Mayor Caillouet replied right. Mr. Breaud stated to his knowledge they hadn't been addressed, he had never received anything on it and he never received any revisions to the change in Lafourche Parish deal which is something minor. Ms. Erwin replied signage was major. Mayor Caillouet replied signage is never going to be minor. Mr. Breaud replied Lafourche Parish. Mayor Caillouet stated the Lafourche Parish issue is right. Mr. Breaud stated they could go ahead and he guessed put no signs would be allowed until it was addressed if they wanted to do it so that the Council could act on it, it would be the safest thing to do. Mayor Caillouet replied if they wanted to proceed with it, you can't, can you speak for the developers, or? Mr. LeBouef replied he couldn't speak for them but he thought they would go along with that just to get the process flowing but he guessed one of the people that made the comment that if there was no specific definition in the codes for instance signs, then you would fall underneath the City Ordinance or the city subdivision ordinance. Mr. Breaud stated the City ordinance are all based on the zoning in the areas. Ms. Erwin replied and there is no sign ordinance for the T.N.D. Mr. Breaud stated they could place an R-1 sign ordinance to it. Mr. Adams replied we'd really restrict them. Mr. Breaud replied until they go ahead and address it, it's either that or nothing. Mayor Caillouet replied the point he was making and they were absolutely right, unless it's addressed they'll be no annexation, they'll be nothing because it's conditioned upon the T.N.D. and he didn't know the effect of it if you don't put anything into it if that means you have no signs, unless we have a law that says you can't have signs in an area that doesn't, isn't zoned, it seems to him that you could have any sign you want because there's nothing regulating signs. Ms. Erwin replied that was what she was afraid of, that you could just have any signs. Mayor Caillouet stated it may be an idea if they can't do anything else, would be to put it the most restricted sign we have which is R-1 and then in the meantime let Mr. Oubre or whoever wants to come in after the fact, propose a change to signage, but that's their decision because once we put it into place our T.N.D. District is completed and adopted then we fulfill an obligation under their cooperative endeavor agreement. But again, because we do have these two conditions that would have to be taken care of before the Council could approve the district or the zone whatever it's called. Mr. Breaud replied he thought what they could do is pass a resolution tonight to lift a condition that was granted for the T.N.D. District on the meeting of December 14th addressing signs and that we place a regulation that all signs in a T.N.D. District comply with the R-1 regulations at this time and that would lift the condition out if we want to approve that tonight the Council can act on it. When they do act on it, the signs that they'll have to conform to would be the R-1 sign ordinance. Mayor Caillouet replied correct and he would prefer rather than even making a reference to R-1, whatever they come up with, that they actually put the conditions, the signage into the, using the terminology not using refer back to R-1. Mr. Breaud replied this would be an interim until that gets addressed, like you said they would come back to us and then we would lift the R-1 but until they come back to us and address it they would have to comply with the R-1 regulations. Mr. Adams replied yes, they'd have to submit their own plans for that T.N.D. Mayor Caillouet replied right and they're doing that, everything has been approved and tonight would have been normally just reduce the territorial size of the T.N.D. until these two conditions came up that have not been complied with. One of the conditions was having some signage, you're still staying there's a condition and the condition is that it comply with R-1. Mr. Breaud replied well he was saying that they lifted the condition and that we require, we lift the condition that we put on last time and we require that the signing in the T.N.D. District comply with the R-1 regulations of the subdivision regulations of the City of Thibodaux. Mayor Caillouet replied and that has to appear in, if he recalled correctly when somebody wants to look up and see exactly what the T.N.D. is here, they're going to be

looking at that big book, the big major section of that book, someplace in there it has to say, he didn't remember what the signage was for R-1, but it can't be very much. Ms. Erwin replied its not. Mayor Caillouet replied that they actually incorporate that into the book so that it is part of the T.N.D. Mr. Adams replied he didn't think it was addressed, it was left out. Mr. Breaud stated well we can add that, they have a page that talks about codes, we can add that as a note in the code book, we've got to go back on that same sheet and change out Lafourche Parish to City of Thibodaux; on that same sheet let's add a note saying that all signs in a T.N.D. District shall comply to the R-1 District until... Ms. Erwin replied don't say until, just say comply. Mayor Caillouet replied just comply and then if they want to come back and change it then they would look at it at that time. Mr. Breaud replied let's do it that way so before it goes back to the City of Thibodaux we need to get this sheet revised with the City of Thibodaux on it and that note added on it presented to the Council before they can vote on it Tuesday night. Mayor Caillouet replied right and the second condition also because in the cooperative endeavor agreement we're stating on behalf of the City that we do have a T.N.D. District enacted by the Council so in order to get that properly enacted we need those two conditions, one could be resolved with R-1 the other one with the Lafourche Parish Planning Commission. Mr. Breaud replied ok, did he have a motion for that? Ms. Erwin replied yes. Mr. Breaud stated moved by Ms. Erwin...Mr. Gary LeBouef asked if he could see exactly what, he wanted to make sure.... Ms. Erwin replied it was right in front. Mr. Breaud stated keep going, do you see right here they've got Lafourche Parish and down in the next sentence they've got City/Parish, so then come back underneath here and add the note under the codes, just add a note here saying that the signs within the T.N.D. District shall comply with the R-1 Zoning signage requirements (none, except for one (1) non-internally illuminated sign for the sale of on-site property only and not exceeding nine (9) square feet in surface area). The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams, all members were in favor. Motion carries.

Mr. Breaud then asked Mr. Price if he had any problem with that sign? Dee? Councilman Richard replied they should vote on it first. Mr. Breaud replied they just voted on it. Councilman Richard replied he would just ask that she give the minutes to the Council and he would say this and he guessed he shouldn't but he didn't think the Council should be introducing these things before they come and see you guys, he knew they've done that in the past and he knew that they were trying to get this thing done in a hurry but you know we will have some changes here that he's going to have to present and we don't have that in our possession right now. Normally when we introduce an ordinance is what we have in our hands for two weeks so we can vote on it at that next meeting, so here we are we've introduced last week and we've got less than six days to the Council meeting and we're going to vote on it next Tuesday night and it's a poor practice and it's not you guys fault, it's the City Council's fault, we shouldn't have introduced it, but he would just ask that she try to get those minutes to us individually so that we could at least look, especially when you talked about the conditions that are coming up now, if we had that and the Council knew that they were acting on it, we wouldn't have acted on it. Mr. Breaud replied Dee, that was a good point, he was glad he brought it up and the plan was not to come in front of this Planning Commission until I questioned it and what he would like to do and this is a good time to do it he guessed, in the zoning ordinance, the zoning ordinance is made up of about twenty or twenty one articles. Those twenty one articles pertain to district regulations pertaining to off-street parking, it pertaining to the Board of Adjustments, building permits and appeals but Section 14 pertaining to amendments of how you amend the zoning ordinance and he would like to take this opportunity right now to read Article 14 because the Council has done some stuff in the past dealing with parking and stuff like this and it hadn't come in front this Planning Commission. There's a lot of stuff in these regulations that are vague and not clear but in his mind this is something that's real clear, ok, it says "The regulations, restrictions and boundaries set forth in this ordinance may from time to time be amended, supplemented, changed or repealed, provided, however, that the legislative body shall not hold any public hearings or take any action until it has first referred the request to the municipal zoning commission." That was pretty clear in his mind. The other day you all made a clarification on the parking downtown. He sat in the audience and he didn't say anything, but that's about the third time that things have changed in relation to zoning that has not come in front this Planning Commission. The other day we wanted to incorporate the land by Nicholls and we wanted to incorporate the Rienzi House, I had to beg for this thing to come in front of this Planning Commission but this thing says "you shall not have public hearings" you should not do anything until this Planning Commission has acted on it and the language even gets stronger, he didn't want to bore them but if you read the next two or three paragraphs of this thing the guidelines are pretty clear. He realized that the stuff we talked about parking the other day wasn't clear at all, it needs to be clarified but it tells you in here that if you want to amend the rules of the zoning ordinance you come in front of this board and they make a recommendation to you guys. You guys don't have to take our recommendation, you may decide to do your own thing but before you do it, it needs to come through the Planning Commission. So he would appreciate in the future whenever we get any items that address zoning, whenever we're changing boundaries, we're annexing property into the City, we're changing the boundaries, we're amending the boundaries and it needs to come in front of the Planning Commission so he was glad he brought that point up because he's been wanting to make it. Councilman Richard replied he would ask that they go a step further and you put that in the form of a letter to the Council. Mr. Breaud replied Ruby if you would draft me up a letter he would be glad to sign it. Councilman Richard replied it was the City Council's mistake as far as he was concerned, he should have said something and he held his tongue and he thought a mistake was made, especially now that you're bringing up these conditions which would all, if the Mayor wouldn't have brought up on the signage, we would have never seen it probably and if you wouldn't have brought it up. Mr. Breaud replied we've got some duties and

the next sentence says, "it shall be the duty of the Zoning Commission to recommend approval or rejection of any requests for zoning amendments, modifications, supplements or changes thereto." So it was their duty to recommend something to you all, it may be rejection, it may be approval but they need to recommend something to you guys so you can act on it. With that being said, Mr. Kermit you haven't said anything tonight, we didn't even get in an argument tonight, you must have something to talk about. Mr. Kraemer replied he was going to compliment him actually, Mr. Chairman, with your work with the Plan A and the changes that he saw, he didn't have to say anything. Mr. Breaud replied he was relying, he didn't call on him because he was relying on Errol to relay the message to us. Mr. Kraemer stated and Errol is doing a fine job too, but he would tell him that two of those properties are not within the City that were acted upon tonight, and you will see them again just so that we do have all of our "I's" dotted and "T's" crossed once the annexation takes place. Mr. Breaud stated so when you come back to us next month with these revised plans we should be annexed into the City, right, you are going to act on this Tuesday. Mayor Caillouet replied if everything goes well, it is set for the 19th you know but like everything else it's getting all the paperwork and documentation and making sure all of the conditions are met before they're annexed in; but if everything goes as planned they should be in the City, annexed into the City by next Tuesday night. Mr. Breaud stated well from the Planning Commission standpoint we want a revised sheet showing the City of Thibodaux in it, we want the note about the sign ordinance and we want that distributed to the Commissioners as well as forwarded to the Council before they can act on it Tuesday night, Gary. Mr. Adams replied he had his work cut out for him. Mayor Caillouet replied Mr. Chairman, if it goes through on Tuesday night it will not be effective until June 1st, we're going to have an effective date on it, so even at your meeting next month, I mean will it pass, the only thing you're waiting on is a time period to pass. He was bringing that up because it gets a lot of technical stuff with the T.N.D. and when it gets put in and when it's annexed into the City, etc. etc., so it was agreed that the effective date of everything would be he believed June 1st so in your meeting next month it may not technically still be in the City. Mr. LeBouef replied he guessed they couldn't come back for preliminary approval because you can't act on it to approve construction until this is in the City, we can't come for preliminary plat approval until it's annexed, was he correct, or? Mr. Breaud replied well he didn't know what their schedule of construction, you've got a part of it that's in the City already, you've got to go back and revise it based on the right-of-way widths but that you can get approval on and go to construction immediately. The other two sections, the only way it would be, to do it would be to give you conditional approval that it gets incorporated into the City and that once it gets enacted over time well then you would have that approval in hand. Mr. LeBouef replied all right. Mr. Breaud replied so it could be done, he guessed conditionally. Mayor Caillouet replied when you do that, if you take that as a condition and you proceed further, you do that at your own risk because if it's never annexed in, you know the City won't be responsible for that. Mr. Breaud replied that was correct. Mr. Price replied you do realize that North of Acadia is not in the City, that section you keep talking about, the corner of Percy Brown and North Acadia. Mr. Breaud replied yes, he was talking about the Southern corner. Ok, were there any further comments to be brought in front of the commission, if not, meeting adjourned.