

Paul Cramer

From: John Koefel <johnkoefel@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 9:19 AM
To: Dominique L. Verner
Cc: Paul Cramer; William Waiters; Sarah Debacher; Andy Stephens; Mary N. Fontenot-Smith
Subject: FLUM map change proposed 5227 Chartres

PD 8-01

Hi Ms Verner,

In making our comments we have noticed a letter from CPC staff to you 9-7-16 citing above address for a change in the FLUM to match the new zoning for business.

However we feel the FLUM residential category is the more correct and should be retained, and that NO CHANGE is the better decision.

The zoning change has a proviso that would revert it to residential when the CSED is done using it as a residential energy efficient demonstration house and as their office.

It is intended to once again someday soon be a residence again. This is an inappropriate location for a commercial site and we have Dauphine, Reynes, and St Claude for that.

Changing the FLUM would make it very difficult to bring it back to residential, so we hope you will ask the planners, as we have, to not make the proposed alternation in FLUM.

Comments are due today for us but I assume you will have further chance to act.

Wishing you best for new year.

Thanks.

John

John Koefel
board chair, HCNA
504-615-7266
johnkoefel@gmail.com

Paul Cramer

From: CPCinfo
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 8:33 AM
To: Paul Cramer
Subject: FW: MP Amendment Comment HCNA 010916

From: John Koeferl [mailto:johnkoeferl@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 09, 2017 4:53 PM
To: CPCinfo
Cc: hcnaboard-@googlegroups.com; Dominique L. Verner
Subject: MP Amendment Comment HCNA 010916

January 9, 2017

City Planning Commission

1300 Perdido St—7th Floor

New Orleans, LA 70112

cpcinfo@nola.gov

Re: Master Plan Amendment Comments of Holy Cross Neighborhood Association

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

We wish to submit the following comments in the MP process today:

1. With respect to our HCNA previously submitted comments that were listed in the summary as Text 06-08 Locks & Bridges, etc and Text 04-23 Zoning and Land use principles—we failed to find them though saw in the summary index.
2. We believe our original amendment requests remain worth incorporating into the MP. The Corps has recently proposed removing the St Claude Bridge and historic IHNC Lock in favor of the barge industry without the least consideration of impacts on the City of New Orleans itself and its neighborhoods and historic future. We feel the City should consider its own stake in these structural assets and make its own assessments, decisions and initiatives toward what is good for the City and its future. You don't know what you have till its gone, the song says. Provisions in the MP can help the City in this respect to look broadly ahead. These structures in question are 100 years old and still functioning, nationally significant maritime and engineering structures built by Goethals and Strauss, famous people. This speaks to the unique need and opportunity we have to reach out to speak for these extraordinary past achievements and move them with our historic web of neighborhoods into the future. If the City sleeps, they disappear.

2. FLUM PD-8-1 5227 Chartres St. The CPC suggests to be consistent that the FLUM should be altered to be consistent with the zoning (business). We suggest that it be unchanged for the following reason: The FLUM has it right, as the neighborhood wants, and was arrived at through broad inclusive planning process

The zoning change was necessitated when The Center for Sustainable Engagement and Development (CSED) was given a residential property and decided to use it as a demonstration recovery house with state of the art insulation, etc, and to have offices there to be available to the public. The neighborhood did not want the zoning change but the city insisted because no one would reside there, (a condition of residential zoning). What was done was a proviso to let the zoning revert to residential when the CSED moved out, and the house would be residential again.

In this circumstance, then, it is the zoning that is out of synch with the community-established FLUM, and the FLUM designation should remain as the stable intent.

3. FLUM PD-8 -9/PD-8-10. We found these on the map but not in the text. We understand that these are private lots designated as Open Space/Park and perhaps should not be. We have no objection to the concept of correcting this record, if this is the case (we couldn't find these either except on the map). But we believe a more open public process is merited for any FLUM change, including these. There are no minor changes to the FLUM in Holy Cross, and no changes we would cede to the planning director to make on our behalf for land use matters.

4. Request No. 14-22 Section A. Land Use Plan and "Force of Law" (Cf #3 preceding).

5. Request No. 14-15 and 14-16, Section C, etc. Future Land Use Category. We do not want to see multi-family capacity come into our historic one and two family zones, without some future public dialogue and assent from the neighborhood. We oppose increasing density through categorical change here without much more public discussion and acceptance. People here in Holy Cross want to live with the doubles and singles they moved in

here to and have invested in. They welcome new neighbors but see allowance of multi-family as an encroachment, and unfair, to do it this way.

6. In the general matter of removing density as a specification in residential zoning categories, this does not seem desirable, useful, or prudent. We know that density has great impact on community and residential areas. We feel this is particularly important for historic neighborhoods of one and two family houses where incongruous structures bring discontinuity and unravel old neighborhoods. Instead of removing limitations on density, we would rather this code be helping historic neighborhoods survive and thrive by giving more protection to the scale and shape of building in these areas of high community value and solid contribution to the tax base. (Cf. Request No. 14-17, Section C, etc., Future Land Use Categories).

7. Density should focus around transportation hubs, not just on high ground. There is a lot of high ground, including along the river neighborhoods, that is unsuitable for high density because of the lack of transportation facilities. MU-1 should be restored to its original purpose and definition, as the zoning category for high-rise buildings on transit lines and highways and at crossroads.

Conversely, building high rise structures away from transit, away from fast roadways and away from solid adequate infrastructure seems a recipe to bring it all to a standstill because of the heavy load on older more remote neighborhoods with aging facilities that are fine for low density but fail with overload, fail for everyone.

8. We do not want to see merging of land use categories MUL and MUM. We feel this would create a category much too awkward and unwieldy. As it is, the large categories of the "consistency table" allow a broad land use category to be arbitrarily assigned a zoning classification that may not be suitable or intended by the community. It is important that the community be involved in the application of the specific zoning from broad land use categories. The selection of MUMD in Future Land Use Element participation becomes meaningless if the variation and range of the zoning in the consistency table is too large and the zoning selection is made by staff. Alone. This selection at least demands more, not less, community participation. This is at the heart of land use decision-making that is supported by the City Charter, and rightfully requested of the staff by citizens of Holy Cross and throughout the City.

9. Re: Port NOLA Site GIWW 35 in PD-11 along Paris Road. The FLUM is requested changed by the Port of New Orleans. This was requested five years ago also but denied until an independent evaluation was made by competent scientific agencies to determine the impacts on Bayou Bienvenue, which passes through this site.

We have no beef with the Port, but we are concerned about the integrity and health of this Bayou and feel the least we can do is check it out and do what is needed to ensure its health and survival. We think the Port necessarily has a conflict of interest here, despite the best intentions. So we feel that before amending the FLUM and zoning, the condition of Bayou Bienvenue should have some priority. So we oppose the change in FLUM here until this has been positively ascertained and a plan is worked out with the Port to do what is necessary. We have confidence in the Port but we are practical and realistic too, and care very much about the bayou that begins now in Lower Nine and goes into Lake Borgne via Port property.

10. Transportation

11. Planning Districts.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Koeferl

Board chair, HCNA

Holy Cross Neighborhood Association

johnkoeferl@gmail.com