THE LAW OFFICE OF JUSTIN B. SCHMIDT, L.L.C.
1506 Seventh Street
New Orleans, Louisiana 70115
Telephone: (504) 451-6567
Facsimile: (504) 370-7079
Email: justinschmidtlaw@gmail.com

October 31, 2025

VIA EMAIL: cpcinfo@nola.gov
erhernandez@nola.gov
rdrivers@nola.gov

Board of Zoning Adjustments
City Planning Commission
1300 Perdido Street, 7th Floor
New Orleans, LA 70112

Re: Appeal and Request for Stay of the Decision of the Director of Safety and Permits for the issuance of Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 with Respect to 1407 S. Carrollton Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118

Dear Board Members:

There follows the Appeal and Request for Stay of three advocacy groups, three neighborhood associations and two neighbors who are resident immediately behind the proposed development (referred herein and as "Appellants" and/or "Applicants").[1]

Pursuant to Article 4, Section 4.8.B.1 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance of the City of New Orleans, as amended (the "CZO"), the below named Appellants affixing their names respectfully appeal the Director of Safety and Permits' February 12, 2025, issuance (but publicly noticed on October 9, 2025) of that certain zoning verification letter identified on the City's LAMA permitting platform as **"Reference Code F7J3BE"** and **Case Number: 24-1348** (the **"Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348"**) in connection with City of New Orleans Non-Structural Commercial Renovation Permit No. 25-04201-RNVN (the "Building Permit") for the commercial property bearing municipal number 1407 South Carrollton Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118 (the "Subject Property"). The Subject Property is currently owned by **CREDC Carrollton NOLA, LLC** (the "Owner"), which purportedly has leased said Subject Property to **H & W Drugstore 5, L.L.C.** doing business under the registered trade name of **"NOLA Cannabis Co.**

[1] In addition, survey responses about the development have been collected from the neighborhood. These will be added to the record at a later date. For a timeline, see Exh. 1, Chronology of the Purchase and Development of 1407 S. Carrollton Ave.

Dispensary" (the "Tenant"), which proposed to use the Subject Property as a "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary" as indicated in the Zoning Verification Letter.

Upon information and belief, the underlying request soliciting the Zoning Verification Letter from the City read as follows:

> Requesting a zoning verification letter to receive building permits to renovate the existing building without any structural changes for the use of a retail medical marijuana pharmacy/dispensary [emphasis added].

In turn, on or about February 12, 2025, the City of New Orleans' Department of Safety and Permits issued Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348, attached hereto and made a part hereof as "Decision."

In their appeal, Applicants respectfully challenge this determination and provide evidence of errors in application of the applicable provisions of the CZO. While the Applicants are aware of the Board's strict adherence and application of the forty-five (45) day deadline for filing a Director's Decision Appeal as set forth in Section 4.9.E of the CZO, Appellants bring to the attention of the Board that Zoning Administrator Dan Macnamara has acknowledged that because Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 was not properly published or noticed to the general public, the Department of Safety and Permits has reset the forty-five (45) day appeal deadline to commence on October 9, 2025, rendering this appeal timely.

ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR

As a basis of appeal, but respectfully reserving the right to further supplement their appeal within the delays permitted by the Board's *Administrative Rules, Policies and Procedures* (July 10, 2017), Appellants assign the following errors in Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 (Decision):

1. Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 (Decision) is deficient on its face as it fails to cite the specific reasons for its verification as required by Article 4, Section 4.9.B of the CZO.

2. Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 (Decision) is flawed as it fails to acknowledge that the proposed use requires a Conditional Use Permit for this proposed commercial use in excess

of 5,000 sf of floor area per Article 12, Section 12.2.B.1.b of the CZO. Upon information and belief, Owner/Tenant misrepresented the square footage (literally, the "footprint") in the building permit application process as being less than 5,000 sf.[2]

3. Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 (Decision) improperly classifies the proposed use, i.e., a "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary," as a Retail Goods Establishment (as defined in Article 26, Section 26.6 of the CZO) in this HU-B1 Historic Urban Neighborhood Business District.

LAW AND ARGUMENT

1. Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 (Decision) is deficient on its face as it fails to cite the specific reasons for its verification as required by Article 4, Section 4.9.B of the CZO.

Article 4, Section 4.9.B. of the CZO vests the authority (and obligation) to issue for zoning verifications in the Director of Safety and Permits, who "shall make and approve zoning verifications in accordance with the provisions of this section. The Director **shall** cite specific reasons for the verifications." [emphasis added]. Both Louisiana state law as well as Section 26.2 of the CZO state that the words "shall" and "must" are mandatory in nature and leave no discretion in their interpretation.

With respect to the zoning verification in question, in Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348, Zoning Specialist Antia T. Taylor signed the Zoning Verification Letter addressed to "Nola Cannabis," which stated that "a Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary is permitted as a Retail Goods Establishment in HU–B1." *See* Decision. **However**, contrary to the CZO, Ms. Taylor does not provide any reason, either general or specific, for the verification—which is mandatory per Section 4.9.B of the CZO.

[2] In the litigation preceding this Appeal, Owner asserts that the 5,000 s.f. rule applies only to that portion of its premises open to the public (retail use), and not the entirety of its use.

As stated herein, the Department of Safety and Permits appears to consider the Retail Goods Establishment use more appropriate for a "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary" than a strictly medical use. Yet no justification or rationale for this position is explicitly given.

When the Zoning Verification Letter was issued on February 12, 2025, the March 28, 2025, Declaration of Emergency had not yet been enacted by the La. Department of Health. The Declaration would establish that medical marijuana facilities were to be considered "retailers" rather than dispensaries. In this regard, the Director failed to "make and approve the zoning verification in accordance with the provisions" of Section 4.9 of the CZO—which is likewise mandatory per Section 4.9.b of the CZO. The standards are not met.

On February 12, 2025, Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 was properly issued prior to the issuance of the Building Permit. The sequence of events is as follows:

February 10, 2025 - Building Permit was application was submitted;

February 12, 2025 - Zoning Verification Letter 23-1348 issued;

April 24, 2025 - Building Permit was issued;

October 9, 2025 – Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 was posted on the Safety and Permits website.

No discrete, public-facing zoning verification application was filed. "When a zoning verification is issued in conjunction with a building permit, certificate of occupancy, or business license, no separate application is required" (Section 4.9.D.3 of the CZO). The Zoning Verification Letter was manifestly issued in conjunction with Building Permit per the chronology described herein. No discrete public-facing application appeared on the One Stop App.

Nevertheless, it appears from the public record, however, that a request and payment for a zoning verification were made as early as November 2024 for Case No. 24-1348 at 1407 S. Carrollton by one Regan Etheridge, Senior Project Manager, Store Development, Design & Construction, at the Good Day Farm company in Little Rock, Arkansas.[3]

[3] Ms. Etheridge wrote to DSP on 2/11/25 to ask about the status of the zoning verification request. (Exh. 2, Correspondence—Good Day Farm and DSP.)

A zoning verification letter is intended to verify "that the use, structure, and site improvements of the structure and or land" comply with the CZO (Art. 4.9.C). Not all of these categories are explicitly referenced in the "Comments." (See Decision):

a. Use: the "retail medical marijuana pharmacy/dispensary" is permitted as a "Retail Goods Establishment" (explicit)
b. Structure: "existing building" (inferred)
c. Site improvements: renovation ("no structural changes") (inferred)

Appellants further make the following observations on planning and use in the CZO.

1. There is no definition or use standard in the CZO for a:
    a. "Medical marijuana pharmacy dispensary"; or a
    b. Pharmacy"; or a
    c. Dispensary."

2. A six-month "Cannabis, Tobacco and Nicotine Study" is currently underway at the City Planning Commission to examine "retail establishments that sell cannabis, tobacco and nicotine products and to provide recommendations regarding updated regulation of these uses, including but not limited to the definition of the new uses, use standards, signage regulations, and density restrictions, as applicable" (emphasis added).[4]

3. On information and belief, the motion to undertake the cannabis portion of the study was prompted by public outcry (i.e., complaints to Council District A Office) about the lack of zoning controls at the 1407 S. Carrollton Ave. development.[5]

4. According to the La. Dept. of Health ("LDH"), "Retailers are now referenced as such and not as "dispensaries,"[6] per the Emergency Rule (or "Declaration of

[4] City Council Motion M-25-470, 9/11/25. (Cf. City Planning Commission Agenda of 10/28/25, p. 4, item #14.)
[5] On introducing Motion M-25-470, Councilmember Joseph I. Giarrusso, III, said: "I now have an issue of a marijuana dispensary in a residential neighborhood." (See Exh. 3, Transcript, Hearing of Motion M-25-470, New Orleans City Council, 9/11/25.)
[6] https://ldh.la.gov/bureau-of-sanitarian-services/medical-marijuana.

Emergency") published in the April 2025 Louisiana Register and effective on March 28, 2025.[7]

5. The definition of a "retailer" is given on page 17 of the Declaration of Emergency as follows: "retail facility meeting the requirements of this Subpart that sells therapeutic marijuana to patients or caregivers."[8]

6. As promulgated and enacted on 3/28/25, the "Declaration of Emergency" followed upon the issuance of the Zoning Verification Letter and preceded the issuance of the Building Permit. (No causal relationship is herewith implied.)

7. Purposively or not, this "Declaration of Emergency" by LDH, the governing regulatory authority for the State of Louisiana's medical (therapeutic) marijuana program as of January 1, 2025, facilitates and supports DSP's official zoning classification of this specific Property as a retail location rather than as, e.g., a medical facility or any other use.

8. In practice the nomenclature is inconsistently applied.

9. All NOLA Cannabis Co., signage, for example, reads "NOLA Cannabis Co. Dispensary," connoting a medical use, rather than, e.g., simply "NOLA Cannabis Co.," which may connote a retail goods use by comparison.[9]

10. In a June 18, 2025, Zoom call with Carrollton neighbors and advocates, the president of Good Day Farm Louisiana, attorney John B. Davis, referred to the

---

[7] https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center-EH/sanitarian/fooddrug/marijuana/ER_28_March_2025.pdf. The document is actually headed "Declaration of Emergency." See Subpart 2, Marijuana Retailers, pp. 16–34.

[8] Ibid. The terms "dispensary," "dispensaries," and "dispense" do not occur at all in the Declaration of Emergency. Of course, the La. State Legislature has expended much time and deliberative effort in drafting cannabis legislation in recent years—while somehow managing to omit any provision for distancing or buffer-zones with respect to schools, churches, daycare centers, etc. At any rate the development of the terminology cannot be treated here.

[9] See Exh. 4, NOLA Cannabis Co.—Dispensary signage. Again, as above (p. 2), the trade name of the company is "NOLA Cannabis Co. Dispensary."

outlets exclusively as "dispensaries,"[10] hence "the name of the dispensary is NOLA Cannabis Company" (p. 2); and "all of the dispensaries are regulated by the Louisiana Department of Health and they have promulgated rules—which officially came out January 1 of this year" (p. 3).[11]

11. The "Retailer" designation tends to detract from the alleged "therapeutic" or "medical" use for the marijuana that is sold by the licensees referenced in this document.

12. The Retailer that is licensed to sell marijuana in Orleans Parish is advertising it for the most part without reference to medical or therapeutic use or benefit.

13. Until around June 12, 2025, the Tenant's/Retailer's website contained a reference to recreational use on its website.[12]

2. <u>Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 (Decision) is flawed as it fails to acknowledge that the proposed use requires a Conditional Use Permit for this proposed commercial use in excess of 5,000 sf of floor area per Article 12, Section 12.2.B.1.b of the CZO.</u>

As a commercial use in this HU-B1 Neighborhood Business Zoning District, the property in question is further subject to the commercial Use Floor area Limitation in Section 12.2.B.1.b of the CZO, which specifically reads as follows:

12.2.B.1 Commercial Use Floor Area Limitation

1. Commercial Use Floor Area Limitation

In the Historic Urban Neighborhood Districts, the floor area of commercial uses is limited as follows:

[10] See Exh. 5, Transcript—1407 S. Carrollton—June 18 Zoom CCA meeting with John Davis—Redacted. The term "dispensary" (or "dispensaries") was used 46 times at the meeting; while "retailer" was never used.
[11] One of these rules was that "retailers are now referenced as such and not as 'dispensaries.' " See n. 6, above.
[12] See Exh. 6, NOLA Cannabis Co.—Mention of recreational use on website (screenshot).

a. Commercial uses are permitted uses up to five thousand (5,000) square feet of total floor area, unless conditional use approval is required per Table 12-1.

b. Conditional use approval required for any commercial use of five thousand (5,000) square feet of floor area or more with the exception of grocery stores. Grocery stores are permitted by-right up to 10,000 square feet in area.

c. Any commercial use over ten thousand (10,000) square feet of total floor area is prohibited. This applies only to new construction as of the effective date of this Ordinance. Grocery stores are exempt from this prohibition. Grocery Stores over 10,000 square feet in area require conditional use approval. Commercial uses that locate within an existing structure as of the effective date of this Ordinance that are over ten thousand (10,000) square feet of total floor area require conditional use approval.

Adopted by Ord 28805 MCS, 10-21-21, ZD 48/21

Per the Tenant/Retailer's own plans submitted in conjunction with City of New Orleans Commercial Non-Structural Renovation Permit No. 25-04201-RNVN and which were stamped as code compliant by Jay Dufour, the Chief Plans Examiner, on April 17, 2025, the proposed Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary occupies 5,204 square feet as set forth on the schedule in the stamped plans below.

ROOM	USE	GROSS AREA	SQ. FT. PER PERSON	OCCUPANT LOAD
101	LOBBY/RECEPTION	596 S.F.	150	4
101A	EXPRESS CHECK OUT			
102	IT ROOM	68 S.F.	--	
103	FULFILLMENT	486 S.F.	300	2
104	DISPENSARY (SALES AREA)	1786 S.F.	60	30
104A	POINT OF SALE			
105	OFFICE	240 S.F.	150	1
106	VAULT	1181 S.F.	300	4
107	BOH CORRIDOR	264 S.F.	--	
108	JANITOR CLOSET	29 S.F.	--	
110	BREAK AREA	327 S.F.	300	2
111	ADA UNISEX RESTROOM	65 S.F.	--	
112	ADA UNISEX RESTROOM	65 S.F.	--	
113	CONSULT ROOM	97 S.F.	150	1
TOTAL		5,204 S.F.		44

Because by Tenant/Retailer's own admission, the proposed use exceeds the permitted Commercial Use Floor Area limitation of 5,000 square feet, Section 12.2.B.1.b of the CZO

mandates that this proposed use must obtain a Conditional Use Permit, which was not obtained in this case.

The ***plain language*** of the provision is not limited to that portion of the premises open to the public for retail use. There exists no authority for the assertion that "back of house" floor area is to be excluded from the calculation. The "back of house" use in a commercial enterprise is, in fact, itself a "commercial" use. In the litigation that was instituted in this matter, Owner admits that the CZO lacks a definition of "commercial use of floor area." However, that does not entitle Owner to submit its own definition. To the contrary, Appellants direct the Board to Section 26.6 of the CZO and the definition of "Gross Floor Area" that is contained therein. There, the CZO defines "**Gross Floor Area**" as follows:

> A. **Gross floor area includes:**
> 1. Basements that provide structural headroom of seven (7) feet or more.
> 2. Elevator shafts or stairwells at each floor.
> 3. Floor space used for mechanical equipment.
> 4. Floor space in penthouses.
> 5. Attics, whether or not a floor has been laid, providing structural headroom of seven (7) feet or more.
> 6. Floor space in interior balconies or interior mezzanines.
> 7. Floor space in accessory structures.
> 8. Floor space in enclosed porches.
> 9. Any floor space used for residential use, no matter where such floor space is located within the structure.
> 10. For commercial uses, institutional, and industrial uses, balconies, galleries, covered or uncovered patios, decks, and commercial leased space.
> 11. For commercial, institutional, and industrial uses, any outdoor space, whether covered or uncovered, which is used for seating, performance, or similar activities.
> 12. Floor space within an enclosed structure.
>
> B. **Gross floor area <u>does not include</u>:**
> 1. Accessory water tanks or cooling towers.
> 2. Exterior balconies on residential uses.
> 3. Uncovered steps.
> 4. Basements and attics, whether or not an attic floor has been laid, providing structural headroom of less than seven (7) feet.
> 5. Floor space used for required accessory off-street parking spaces.
> 6. Galleries located in residential uses, through arcades and breezeways.
> 7. Accessory flat roof features as provided in Section 21.6.

The case cited in support of Owner's assertion does not support this argument. To the contrary, the cited case discusses **<u>a variance</u>** from "the strict letter of the CZO." The "strict letter of the CZO" applies to **"<u>any</u> commercial use."** Owner was not granted a variance; it was granted a permit in violation of "the strict letter of the CZO." Additionally, the building permit was granted

for "building." The plans for the totality of the commercial building referenced a "scope of work" in excess of 5,000 sf. The "scope of work" applied to the entirety of the building, not simply that portion destined for retail use. This argument lacks merit, and at the very least supports and underscores the Plaintiffs' desire for a BZA determination of the issue and the requested relief for a zoning interpretation on this issue.

3. **Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 (Decision) improperly classifies the proposed use as a "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary" as a Retail Goods Establishment (as defined in Article 26, Section 26.6 of the CZO in this HU-B1 Historic Urban Neighborhood Business District.**

Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 states, in part, that "[a] Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary is permitted as a **Retail Goods Establishment** in HU-B1 [Historic Urban Neighborhood Business Zoning District]."

Unfortunately, the term/use "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary" is neither a defined term in Section 26.6 of the CZO, nor does it appear as a permitted or conditional use in any section of the CZO and in particular in Table 12-1 of the CZO.

However, Section 12.2.A of the CZO, which regulates the uses in the HU-B1 Historic Neighborhood Business Zoning district affirmative states:

> **Only those uses of land listed under Table 12-1: Permitted and Conditional Uses as permitted uses or conditional uses are allowed within the Historic Urban Neighborhood Districts.** A "P" indicates that a use is permitted within that zoning district. A "C" indicates that a use is a conditional use in that zoning district and would require a conditional use approval as required in Section 4.3 (Conditional Use). No letter (i.e., a blank space) or the absence of the use from the table indicates that use is not permitted within that zoning district. [emphasis added]

Obviously, it would be impractical for the drafters of the CZO to have included every single conceivable use in the universe within the use tables of the CZO, so in a number of cases, more general categories are applied, such as "Retail Goods Establishment" or a "Place of Worship" or even a "Live Performance Venue." So, under this scheme, the City, and specifically the Director of Safety and Permits through her Zoning Administrator are often faced with the arduous task of forcing a proposed undefined and/or unclassified use, as is the case here, into one of these general

categories. However, given the implications of such a determination/classification, this task is not easy and requires a great deal of consideration. This is also the reason that the Section 4.8.B of the CZO affords any "aggrieved party" the opportunity to appeal these decisions to the BZA, as is being done herein.

In this case, Tammie T. Jackson, the Director of Safety and Permits, through Zoning Specialist Antia T. Taylor, formally classified the proposed "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary" as a "Retail Goods Establishment." *See* Decision.

Article 26, Section 26.6 of the CZO defines **"Retail Goods Establishment"** as:

> [a] business that provides physical goods, products, or merchandise directly to the consumer, where such goods are typically available for immediate purchase and removal from the premises by the purchaser. A retail goods establishment does not include any adult uses**.** A retail goods establishment may not sell alcoholic beverages unless retail sales of packaged alcoholic beverages is allowed within the district and a separate approval is obtained for such use. A retail goods establishment that sells food products, such as a delicatessen, bakery, or grocery, may offer ancillary seating areas for consumption of food on the premises. [underlining added]

While in the world of Venn Diagrams, the Director is not wrong; a reasonable person could objectively place the Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary oval within the large Retail Goods Establishment oval, given the nature of the particular proposed "retail good" in question, coupled with the manner in which the CZO addresses other highly regulated products and uses like alcoholic beverages, guns, and sexually-oriented materials, to name a few, and apply the same principles to a proposed "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary," which falls closer on the spectrum to these highly regulated products than to a candy shop, which is another example of a Retail Goods Establishment.

Notwithstanding that the CZO relegates "Adult Use" to those uses of a sexual nature, and therefore would never include a "Medical Marijuana Pharmacy Dispensary," an examination of how the CZO addressed the defined term "Adult Use" in the CZO will, however, provide useful guidance in the application of age-restrictions currently imposed for the consumers.

On June 18, 2025, Good Day Farm Louisiana President John B. Davis stated: "*No one can enter that's under 21 and no one can work for the dispensary [sic] that's under 21.*"[13] Again, this sounds like a restriction that is implemented upon potentially noxious uses such as bars, casinos, packaged liquor stores, strip clubs, adult book stores/novelty shops as opposed to confectionery stores or bakeries.

Additionally, a review of La. R.S. 40:1046 (A)(2)(b), which regulates the "Therapeutic Use of Marijuana" in state law, states:

> No authorized clinician shall recommend medical marijuana for treatment of any condition associated with autism spectrum disorder for a patient who is under the age of eighteen unless the clinician complies with the provisions of this Section and consults with a pediatric subspecialist. For purposes of this Subparagraph, a pediatric subspecialist is an individual licensed to practice medicine in any state in the United States who provides care to patients with autism spectrum disorder.

There is also an age restriction (21+) splash-screen at the NOLA Cannabis Co. website.[14] Conditional uses and distancing laws for packaged liquor sales and tobacco are analogous, as contingent on the age of the consumer. On November 19, 2024, a representative from Zach Smith Consulting and Design wrote to the Department of Safety and Permits to confirm that no "restriction" (i.e., distancing laws) was in force for cannabis sales, citing the presence of "a middle school and a church" (i.e., the Noble Minds Institute and Central St. Matthew UCC) within 300 feet of the proposed Tenant at 1407 S. Carrollton.[15] It looks like even former Director of Safety and Permits Smith recognized the inherent issue with this proposed use in close proximity to a school.

[13] See Exh. 5, p. 5.
[14] See Exh. 7, NOLA Cannabis Co.—Age-restricted (21+) splash-screen (screenshot).
[15] See Exh. 8, Correspondence—Zach Smith Consulting and Design and DSP, pp. 1–2.

REQUEST FOR STAY OF FURTHER PERMITTING

Section 4.8.E of the CZO provides for a Stay of Proceedings and states:

> An appeal stays all administrative proceedings in furtherance of the action appealed from, unless the Director of the Department of Safety and Permits certifies to the Board of Zoning Adjustments, after the notice of appeal is filed, by reason of facts stated in the certificate, that a stay would, in the Director's opinion, cause imminent peril of life or property. In such case, proceedings may not be stayed after application to the Board or to the Civil District Court and notice to the Director of the Department of Safety and Permits, for due cause shown thereon, unless a restraining order is issued.

Accordingly, Appellants seek the imposition of a stay on all further proceedings as required by Section 4.8.E, including a stay on the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and an Occupational License for this development.[16]

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

For these reasons, Appellants seek:

1. The imposition of a stay on all further administrative proceedings as required by CZO Art. 4.8.E, including a stay on the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and an Occupational License.
2. That the Department of Safety and Permits amend or modify Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 to require that the development undertake the Conditional Use Process required by Section 12.2.B.1.b; and

[16] Owner or its representative applied for a Business License (ref. no. #BBG51X) on 10/14/25.

CONCLUSION

The challenged Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 improvidently issued and is subject to fatal flaws. It fails to cite the specific reasons for its verification, as required by Section 4.9.B of the CZO. Zoning Verification Letter 24-1348 is also flawed by its failure to require Owner/Tenant to obtain a Conditional Use Permit for the proposed commercial use in excess of 5,000 square feet of floor area.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (504) 451-6567.

Sincerely,



Justin B. Schmidt,

Legal Counsel for Appellants:
Just Say Nix, LLC
Town of Carrollton Watch, LLC
Historic N.O. Neighborhoods, LLC
Carrollton Riverbend Neighborhood Association
Central Carrollton Association, LLC
Maple Area Residents Inc.
Lane Rutherford Trippe
Julia McLellan

Enclosures:
- Application
- Decision
- List of Exhibits
- Exhibits 1-8