

**SHREVEPORT METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION OF CADDO PARISH
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING OCTOBER 6, 2021**

A regularly scheduled public hearing of the Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission of Caddo Parish was held on Wednesday, October 6, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. at Government Plaza Chamber, 505 Travis Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA. The members met virtually on October 21 for case manager presentations.

Members Present

Winzer Andrews, Chair
Curtis Joseph, Vice Chair
Chris Elberson, Secretary
Laura Neubert
Rudy Morton
Gabriel Balderas
Rachel Jackson
Bill Robertson
Harold Sater

Staff Present

Alan Clarke, Executive Director
Stephen Jean, Deputy Director
Reginald Jordan, Zoning Administrator
Adam Bailey, Community Planning & Design Manager
Emily Trant, Executive Assistant
Manushka Desgagne, City Attorney's Office
Henry Bernstein, Parish Attorney's Office

Members Absent

None

The hearing was opened with prayer by **MS. JACKSON** . The Pledge of Allegiance was led by **MS. NEUBERT**.

The meeting was called to order & the procedure for hearing the applications on today's agenda was explained. Speakers should speak clearly into the microphone & give their name & mailing address for further reference. Comments on any item not on the agenda will be limited to 3 minutes at the end of the public hearing. Any written comments that were submitted may be viewed in the public record files.

All decisions rendered by the Metropolitan Planning Commission are subject to appeal to the appropriate governing body, either the City Council or the Caddo Parish Commission. Appeals must be filed within 10 days from the date a decision is rendered by the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MR. MORTON, to approve the minutes of the September 1, 2021 public hearing as submitted.

The motion was adopted by the following 7-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, ELBERSON, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Meses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Messrs. BALDERAS & JOSEPH

Mr. Jordan took the time to introduce Ms. Annie Peck and Glenda Thomas.

Mr. Clarke explained Emily Trant transitioned to the Community planning division, while Jasmin Samuels transitioned to Executive Assistant, and making mention of new receptionist, Amber Byerly.

Ms. Desgagne explained to the Board members if there is any conflict of interest pertaining to any case listed on the agenda must abstain from discussion and voting. Furthermore, for the sake of quorum that board member cannot be considered. The member must advise the Chair beforehand and must publicly address the reason as to why there is a conflict of interest and why they must abstain from discussion and voting.

CONSENT AGENDA

draft

CASE NO. 21-10-SC FINAL PLAT (MINOR)

Applicant: Polaris Services, LLC
Owner: Liberty Baptist Church of Shreveport
Location: 3075 Colquitt Road (south side of Colquitt Road, approx. 1,430 feet southwest of Mansfield Road.)
Existing Zoning: R-1-7
Request: 3-lot Subdivision
Proposed Use: 3-lot subdivision

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MS. JACKSON to approve this application.

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Meses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Messrs. JOSEPH.

PUBLIC HEARING

CASE NO. 21-7-SC FINAL PLAT (MAJOR)

Applicant: Mohr and Associates, Inc
Owner: Latsos, Richard Craig, ETAL
Location: tbd proposed Ardenwood Street (East side of Kingston Rd., approx. 155' north of Melba Dr.)
Existing Zoning: R-1-7
Request: 42 Lot Subdivision
Proposed Use: Single-Family Residential Subdivision

Representative &/or support:

David Strange 725 Avignon, Ridgeland, MS 39157
Patrick Furlong 505 Travis Street, 3rd floor, Shreveport, LA 71101

Mr. Strange provided the Board with updates regarding drainage issues on and off site. Mr. Strange explained that he met with the Southern Hills Homeowners Association which was facilitated by Councilmen Flurry, Chavez, and Commissioner Slater. He shared the meeting was well attended and all questions were answered relative to how the financing mechanism worked under Section 42. He shared that he was asked to produce and provide the paperwork relative to their resident selection criteria, the rules regarding housing, and the rules of the program, which Mr. Strange emailed to the Southern Hills Association.

Mr. Strange explained that on behalf of Southern Hills, Roger Ketchum volunteered to drive down to look at other developments in hopes to provide feedback to him as well as the Homeowners Association. Mr. Strange quoted Mr. Ketchum's remarks, stating "the properties were clean, well maintained, and very attractive, and we have nothing as a neighborhood to be concerned about".

Mr. Andy Craig with Mohr and Associates met with city representatives and the city engineer concerning the drainage issues. Mr. Strange shared the plat was tweaked a little, which resulted in the final preliminary plat for the subdivision that has the necessary lot sizing and detention sizing to accommodate the drainage. He mentioned he was requested at the meeting to consider designing the subdivisions so that it met the 100-year flood requirements whereas the local zoning ordinance only requires a 25-year flood event. Mr. Strange noted from the calculations he would be able to meet the 100-year flood event with enough excess capacity to take some of the rainwater that's troubling some of the adjacent areas into their system and appropriately discharge that.

Ms. Neubert inquired about the opportunity for residents to have ownership.

Mr. Strange explained that after the 15th year of the rental program an application can be submitted to the state to convert into an ownership program.

Mr. Robertson made note of the property being heavily wooded area and inquired if this was still the case.

draft

Mr. Strange stated only the center area of what they are developing is wooded, reassuring Mr. Robertson that the really wooded area is beyond the property boundary.

Opposition:

John Glover 9100 Walker Road, Apt 121, Shreveport, LA 71118
LeVette Fuller 519 Kirby Place, Shreveport, LA 71104

Ms. Glover inquired of how the 15-year payments working into the favor of the citizens and if any of the funds that they would have utilized of the span of the 15 period be considered towards their ownership. She stated the 15-year period binds citizens and almost disadvantages the citizens.

Ms. Fuller inquired about placing stipulations on a site plan for the drainage. She asked for clarity on the engineering and drainage, as well as the storm water retention. Ms. Fuller asked for clarity since it is a use for rights, the only thing the Board could do at the present time was approving or not a proving the site plan.

Mr. Clarke stated the city engineer has reviewed the drainage plans and the civil engineer. Mr. Clarke explained that the current application was concerning a subdivision, making note of the difference.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Strange stated the 15 years was not just an arbitrary time, under Section 42, which is apart of the Internal Revenue Code, for the first 15 years of any development that receives tax credits as the funding mechanism, it must be a rental for the first 15 years. Thereafter, there is a mechanism to change those circumstances. He shares that the resident that lives in the houses are given substantial credit for the time the house was occupied, meaning everything goes to the benefit of the resident at a much-reduced price.

Mr. Strange reassured the Board there will be further engineering that goes into the actual design of the subdivision and its drainage as it relates to the sizing of the pipes, which will further be approved by the city.

Mr. Furlong explained to the Board there is a lot more to the drainage than just the plat. He further explains that when looking into drainage there are two factors; the city's infrastructure, the pipes as they are laid out throughout the development and the detention. The detention has minimum requirements which is what they make sure to enforce.

Mr. Sater made mention of abstaining from discussion and voting due to his ties to the Southern Hills Business Association and his contact with the parties involved.

A motion was made by MR. ELBERSON, seconded by MR. ROBERTSON to approve this application.

The motion was adopted by the following 7-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, MORTON, & ROBERTSON and Meses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Messrs. JOSEPH. Abstain: Messrs. SATER.

CASE NO. 21-5-CAP CLOSURE & ABANDONMENT

Applicant: Caddo Parish Public Works
Owner: Caddo Parish Public Works
Location: 1100 blk E Pine Island Road (East end of E Pine Island Road, approx. 980' southeast of Pine Island Road intersection.)
Existing Zoning: R-1-12
Request: Closure and abandonment
Proposed Use: Single Family Residential

Representative &/or support:

Jimmy Whittington 505 Travis Street, Suite 820, Shreveport, LA 71101

Mr. Whittington stated the request was sent to his office, further explaining this is a portion of a dedication for East Pine Island Road. The road is not built to parish standards, and it is basically a dirt road. He stated his office does not maintain it, sharing he received the request from all the adjoining landowners and Caddo Parish Public Works has no objections to the request.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MR. MORTON to approve this application.

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Meses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Messrs. JOSEPH.

CASE NO. 21-9-SC FINAL PLAT (MINOR)

Applicant: Wallace Lake Development, LLC
Owner Country Club Estates Number One, LLC
Location: 0 Pitcairn Pointe (East side of Wallace Lake Rd, approx.
1835 feet north of Southern Trace Parkway)
Existing Zoning: R-E
Request 19-Lot Subdivision
Proposed Use: Single -Family Residential

Representative &/or support:

Mr. Clarke explained to the Board that the MPC staff received a request from the applicant for a deferral and continue this application for 30 days.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MS. JACKSON To defer and continue this application to the next regularly scheduled public hearing.

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Meses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Messrs. JOSEPH.

CASE NO. 21-136-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: William Hall
Owner William Hall
Location: 828 SHREVEPORT BARKSDALE HWY (NW side of
Shreveport Barksdale Hwy. at the intersection of Reily Lane)
Existing Zoning: C-2
Request C-2 to C-3
Proposed Use: Law Office

Representative &/or support:

William Hall 828 Shreveport Barksdale Highway, Shreveport, LA 71105

Mr. Hall stated he is requesting to rezone from C-2 to C-3 for the purposes of obtaining a pole sign along the Shreveport Barksdale corridor. He explained to the Board there are two businesses beside him that are zoned-C-2 as well, disclosing they have big, monument signs and they have no objections to his request to rezone to C-3.

Mr. Robertson inquired staff about the size of the signs permitted in C-2 and C-3.

Mr. Jordan clarified for C-3, a pole signs the size is 40 ft in height and 80 sq ft in area and for a monument sign 8 ft in height, 64 sq ft in area. He stated pole signs are prohibited in C-2. Mr. Jordan explained monument signs are permitted in C-2, further explain the maximum dimensions; 8ft in height and 48 sq ft in area.

draft

Mr. Robertson asked about a resolution of the matter be found without having to rezone the property and if the commission approve a specific sign for the property without rezoning to C-3.

Mr. Clarke clarified that it would not be possible, stating Mr. Hall would have to go through the Zoning Board of Appeals and request a variance.

Mr. Robertson inquired about Mr. Hall installing a flush-mounted sign on the building in C-2.

Mr. Jordan stated wall signs are permitted in C-2. He shared if the property is 200 feet street frontage and it is two acres or more, Mr. Hall is allowed a 25 ft and 200 sq ft in area monument sign

Mr. Robertson expressed concern with Mr. Hall's application, asking him for specifics on the type of sign he plans to build.

Mr. Hall presented pictures to the Board pictures of pole signs that already exist in the area and further explained if he were to get a monument sign it would not be consistent with the neighborhood and it just would not look right. He stated he wants a sign that will give him equal footing. He shared with the Board that he would be unable to do a wall mounted sign due to the slanted roof that when the roof comes together it has angles. He reassured Mr. Robertson that he plans to build the neighborhood up and he does not plan to be intrusive.

Mr. Robertson inquired about the length Mr. Hall has occupied the building with the law firm.

Mr. Hall answered about 25 years. He shared that he was taught to that word of mouth and representation should speak for itself which is why he has worked so long without a sign thus far. Mr. Hall recognized that times have changed regarding advertisement. He also explained that he plans to hand over the business to his son, who would not have the 50 years' experience to build up a practice which is the cause for a request to rezone for a sign.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MS. JACKSON to recommend this application for approval.

The motion was adopted by the following 7-1 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, MORTON & SATER and Meses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: ROBERTSON. Absent: Messrs. JOSEPH.

CASE NO. 21-139-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: Zhiqiang Ni
Owner: ZHIQIANG AND XUELAI WU NI
Location: 826 Gladstone Blvd (North side of Gladstone Blvd. approx. 260' west of Line Ave.)
Existing Zoning: R-2
Request: R-2 to C-UC
Proposed Use: Above the Ground Floor Dwelling - Clinic

Representative &/or support:

Zhiqiang Ni PO Box 218, New Llano, Louisiana 71461
Jeremiah Munson 102 Derrick Lane, Pollock, Louisiana 71467

Mr. Munson stated he was in favor of Mr. Ni's proposed request to do a medical clinic and he was asked by Mr. Ni to attend the meeting. He shared with the Board no one attended the meeting, and no one was there to raise any concerns for this request. He stated Mr. Ni's plans of renovating the property, adding additional parking, fifteen cars, adding an iron metal fence, and landscaping the property.

Opposition:

draft

LeVette Fuller 519 Kirby Place, Shreveport, LA 71104

Ms. Fuller raised some concern for future use if this particular use for this property would go away. She inquired about deferring the case to give the residents more information on this since many were unable to attend the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Chair stated from his understanding the request to defer must come from the applicant.

Mr. Clarke shared the Board was well within their purview to decide whether the case should be deferred and continued if they felt the need to gain more information regarding the application. Furthermore, he explained the case was very clear cut.

Ms. Fuller expressed her concerns about the residents on Gladstone having enough time to attend the meeting prior to the hearing.

Mr. Clarke stated that a list of all persons that were notified of the neighborhood participation planned meeting was hyperlinked under that case. Making mention the staff was indeed informed none of the citizens were compelled enough to attend to learn all information about the rezoning case.

Mr. Robertson expressed his confusion, stating that the case seemed very clear cut of business encroachment into a residential street, but staff is coming out in favor of it. He stated the public interest would be better served by keeping this property a home.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Munson addressed Mr. Robertson's concern about the residential zoning. He stated the property does sit on the boundary line for the C-UC and R-2, the residential zoning. Mr. Munson stated the property is in line with the 2030 Master Plan for the Economic Development Corridor. It showed in the future that there will be development to residential to commercial.

Mr. Clarke stated one of the caveats that is done with the staff reports is a list of all available uses that can go in the requested zoning classification. Making mention that those uses are not considered the most intrusive uses that could impact a residential area.

Ms. Neubert asked Mr. Clarke to weigh in and confirm that what Mr. Munson spoke of about the Master Plan will be what will be seen in that area.

Mr. Clarke shared Mr. Munson basically read from the staff report in the Board's packet regarding this application. Stating, the property is zoned neighborhood commercial, C-UC would be consistent with the intentions of the Master Plan which is what the recommendation is based on for development of properties.

Mr. Joseph inquired about how many of the houses of that block are houses versus how many are being converted into a business.

Mr. Clarke shared there was no knowledge provided on the number of houses being converted.

Mr. Joseph stated there would possibly be a different consideration if it were on a thorough fair like mentioning Kings Highway or of that nature. He pointed out Gladstone being a cross street and the houses sitting in this location, in the middle of the block. He expressed that would be his concern as a resident.

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MR. MORTON to recommend this application for approval.

The motion was adopted by the following 6-3 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, MORTON, & SATER and Mses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: Messrs. ELBERSON, JOSEPH, & ROBERTSON. Absent: NONE

CASE NO. 21-145-C SPECIAL USE PERMIT & SITE PLAN

Applicant: EAN Holdings, LLC
Owner: Autos Mall Boat RV & Self Storage, LLC
Location: 8748 QUIMPER PL (North side of Quimper Place, approx.
665' east of Business Park Dr.)
Existing Zoning: C-3

draft

Request Special Use Permit & Site Plan Approval for Vehicle Rental
w/ Outdoor Storage/Display
Proposed Use: Vehicle Rental - With Outdoor Storage/Display

Representative &/or support:

Karen Cameron 1205 Mercedes Benz Drive, Shreveport, LA 71115

Mr. Clarke asked if the rental dealership was an Enterprise and if they plan to move from their current location to across the street to the location on the application.

Ms. Cameron replied yes.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MR. ELBERSON to approve this application.

The motion was adopted by the following 9-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, JOSEPH, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Meses. JACKSON & NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: NONE

CASE NO. 21-146-C PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT & SITE PLAN

Applicant: Shreveport Highland LLC
Owner CADDO PARISH SCHOOL BOARD
Location: 1545 COTY ST (NE corner of Coty St. and Herndon St.)
Existing Zoning: C-1 (PUD)
Request Re-approval of Preliminary Site Plan for General Commercial
Proposed Use: General Commercial

Representative &/or support:

Granger Harris 1513 Line Avenue, Suite 345, Shreveport, LA 71101
LeVette Fuller 519 Kirby Place, Shreveport, LA 71104

Mr. Harris stated he was present to answer any questions regarding the re-approval of a site plan for the old Alexander Learning Center, it's the area border by Centenary, Lister, Herndon, and Coty Street. Mr. Harris made mention of a PUD that was approved in 2016 as well as a preliminary site plan, which expired. Mr. Harris stated the site plan is predetermined by the amenities that were guaranteed as part of the PUD approval process, like maintaining the existing trees and the parking lot issues. He mentioned the things in the site plan follows the requirements from the original PUD. The only two changes requested were to remove the flagpole and a backstop.

Mr. Robertson asked about Mr. Harris being behind the Shreveport Motor Hotel redevelopment.

Mr. Harris stated that project was what originally brought him to Shreveport. He explained that he has sold all except for a Texaco that resides in the corner on that block.

Mr. Robertson inquired about what the citizens would see after the Alexander Center project is fully developed.

Mr. Harris stated as far as the building there will be very little difference, noting the historic value of it. He stated it being very difficult to maintain a vacant building, further explaining having people come in and out promotes an incentive to keep it up and keep it secure.

Mr. Robertson inquired about the School Board still owning the property and if they were willing to sell the property to Mr. Harris if the plan is approved by the city.

Mr. Harris reassured him that was correct. Mentioning he is under contract and still their due diligence period. He explained that part of the process is making sure to get the necessary approvals and the physical due diligence.

Mr. Robertson inquired about a typical tenant for the development.

Mr. Harris replied any type of office user, stating the success he has had with counselors in the past. He also stated people who want an inexpensive office space, but something that is clean and safe. He mentioned he has had a lot of success with photographers and law firms. He reiterated anyone who wants a relatively basic office space.

Ms. Fuller explained she is in favor of this project, stating the difference between this and what is going on in Broadmoor is that Highland is so much mixed use. She inquired about considering an urban village zoning. She stated she does not think the School Board would see a better purchaser or development. Ms. Fuller asked about the development being in the HPC zone and if they would have to come back to the historic preservation for certificate of appropriateness. She stated that this development is a win-win.

Opposition:

A motion was made by MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MS. NEUBERT to approve this application with stipulations.

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, JOSEPH, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Mses. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Mses. JACKSON.

CASE NO. 21-147-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: Marsha Everett
Owner: VIP Enterprises, LLC
Location: 220 East Stephenson St (North side of East Stephenson St.
Approx. 260' of West of Beverly PL.)
Existing Zoning: C-1
Request: C-1 to R-2
Proposed Use: Single Family Residential

Representative &/or support:

Marsha Everett 134 Lavender Private Drive, Frierson, LA 71027
Christina Copeland 126 Lavender Drive, Frierson, LA 71027

Ms. Everett stated she hoped for her new address to be 220 East Stephenson Street, requestion a commercial property to be moved to residential. She stated she is a retired nurse, her daughter, Christina Copeland, is a nursing student, and her son-in-law is an IT computer specialist. She stated she had a neighborhood meeting where 10 people were in attendance. She stated she addressed public concerns such as, opening a bar, tearing down the existing building, building an apartment on the site, putting in a daycare, or putting other buildings on the property. All of which she replied to no. Ms. Everett shared there were concerns about property value. She explained the location was on a dead-end street and it was completely residential on one side with condo apartments and then across the street there was an abandoned building, which VIP Enterprise bought for cleaning services. She explained with COVID and staff shortage the business failed. Instead of selling it she wanted to make it a residential property.

Ms. Everett further explained she received no opposition at the time of the neighborhood meeting but has since received a letter with concerns that she would like to address. She states that she does want the property for her personal resident's long term and has no plans to open a business in the future. She stated she consulted with an architect to make the building look more like a house making mention the building used to be the Old Knights of Columbus building.

Ms. Copeland stated she is the owner of VIP Enterprises and explained the building was vacant prior to VIP Enterprises taking over. She explained that a lot of money has went in to remodeling and getting trash out of the building. She explained she does have plans for the outside lot area to plant trees and do more ornamental things to make it blend in with the rest of the neighborhood.

Opposition:

Diane Faulks, 9855 Bayou Bend Drive, Shreveport, LA 71115

Ms. Faulks stated she is the treasurer for the HOA of the Stephenson Square Townhomes. She explained that she hopes that the property will truly be used for residential use. She shared the meeting took place in the middle of the week on an afternoon where many people could not attend. She further explained that she did not receive a letter in the mail and one of the residents at the townhomes happened to come across it on the MPC website. Ms. Faulks confirmed she did receive a card in the mail about a chance of rezoning. She recognized going from commercial to residential is a good benefit for the townhomes and confirmed it is a dead-end street.

Mr. Chair requested Mr. Clarke share with Ms. Faulks what the staff does when they notify the individuals about with property request.

Mr. Clarke replied, the notification persons that were sent out to attend the Neighborhood Participation Planned meeting were listed in the packet, confirming the cards do get sent out and the webpage was another source of notice to the public. Mr. Clarke stated the NPP meeting that took place was a relatively well attended meeting with neighbors. Mr. Clarke shared he felt there was a decent amount of representation of the neighborhood.

Rebuttal:

Ms. Everett reiterated the meeting was well attended and she felt she did a very good job with being honest on her intentions for the property. She stated she would appreciate the support of the Board members.

Mr. Morton inquired once the property is rezoned R-2, a business cannot be put in there once it is residential.

Mr. Jean stated a community center, cultural facility, like a museum, a daycare, and an age restricted housing, education facility, a place of worship, and a residential care facility were a few things that could be placed on the property in the future.

A motion was made by MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MR. ROBERTSON to recommend this application for approval.

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, JOSEPH, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Meses. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Meses. JACKSON.

CASE NO. 21-148-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: Faida Hussain
Owner: Adair Holdings LLC
Location: 3420 JEWELLA AVE (NW corner of Jewella Ave. & Woodrow St.)
Existing Zoning: C-2
Request: Special Use Permit & Site Plan Approval for Vehicle Sales w/ Outdoor Display
Proposed Use: Used Vehicle Sales w/ Outdoor Display

Representative &/or support:

Reginald Mims 633 Eden Boulevard, Shreveport, LA 71106

Mr. Mims stated he was at the meeting on behalf of Mr. Hussain, who is proposing to rezone from C-2 to C-3 for used vehicle sales with outdoor display and storage. He mentioned the location has been vacant and Mr. Hussain's plans are to purchase the building and refurbish it. He also plans to make improvements and uses for auto sales.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MR. ROBERTSON, seconded by MR. ELBERSON to recommend this application for approval.

draft

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, JOSEPH, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Mses. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Mses. JACKSON.

CASE NO. 21-149-C SPECIAL USE PERMIT & SITE PLAN

Applicant: Faida Hussain
Owner: Adair Holdings LLC
Location: 3420 JEWELLA AVE (NW corner of Jewella Ave. & Woodrow St.)
Existing Zoning: C-2
Request: Special Use Permit & Site Plan Approval for Vehicle Sales w/ Outdoor Display
Proposed Use: Used Vehicle Sales w/ Outdoor Display

Representative &/or support:

Reginald Mims 633 Eden Boulevard, Shreveport, LA 71106

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MR. MORTON to approve this application with stipulations.

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, JOSEPH, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Mses. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Mses. JACKSON.

CASE NO. 21-30-P ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: SWEPCO
Owner: SWEPCO
Location: 5006 Jefferson Paige Rd (East side of Ratcliff Rd., approx. 400' south of S Roach Dr.)
Existing Zoning: C-1
Request: C-1 to I-1
Proposed Use: Vehicle Operations Facility

Representative &/or support:

Brian McNew 3556 Youree Drive, Shreveport, LA 71105

Mr. McNew stated he was present on behalf of SWEPCO, sharing he was the project architect submitting the rezoning application for this property. He shared this property was originally a par three golf course then rezoned to an I-zoning with a 650 feet buffer. He explained there was going to be a dirt pit possibly and a rock crusher operation put in place, which is why the large buffer district was agreed upon with the residents that are on the street immediately to the north end.

Mr. Jean corrected his previous statement; the dirt pit was withdrawn and the zoning in place was at the request of the current owner.

Mr. McNew stated SWEPCO purchased the property to use it as an operation facility and recently acquired the adjacent former school which is a small parcel to the east of this location. He shared a PUD was submitted which showed the lay down yard as well as the training center and a vehicle maintenance building. Mr. McNew stated this request was to reduce the rear end buffer to 150 feet to allow maximum use of the lay down yard. The property will be a location where they can stockpile either larger transformers, small transformers, or telephone poles for quick access to repair in case of a disaster or things to be needed

locally. Mr. McNew stated there will be a large building down the line which will house the large truck mounted generators and so forth, all of which will be contained inside of the building.

Ms. Neubert inquired about the closest resident to what Mr. McNew is requesting of the 150 ft.

Ms. McNew replied there is one right across the street in the northeast corner, which is a single-family ranch style house. Mr. McNew preceded to show the Board a picture of what was around the street from the property. He shared it looked like an old abandon school. Then down on the north end of the street there is a what appears to be a business, further explaining there is a lot with an abandon mustang and several trailers with debris and trash in them. He shared the Mustang has grass growing up to about halfway up the door and shoed the one single-family residential home with a motorhome parked in the ditch right beside the garage.

Ms. Neubert inquired about the requirements of a NPP meeting for this request.

Mr. Mohler stated since it is a parish property one was not required.

Mr. McNew stated he asked about a requirement of a NPP meeting early on and anticipated on doing one, but there was one resident that called, and he spoke with.

Ms. Neubert asked if Mr. McNew were to back up 500 feet on this boundary would that property be open for visibility.

Mr. McNew responded it is all opened on the north end, stating he would maintain the trees that are still along the north side.

Ms. Neubert inquired about there being a requirement for additional barrier.

Mr. Jean stated there was no recommendation from staff, being very satisfied the 150 feet was still a significant buffer. He explained when doing planned unit developments, having 150 feet buffer is usually very large.

Ms. Neubert stated it is not the footage that raised a concern, rather the visibility. She inquired about any barrier between the property and the one resident that is nearby. Ms. Neubert asked Mr. McNew about what the property looks like currently with the trees there now.

Mr. McNew stated there might be 10 large trees and his grading plan is behind all those trees.

Ms. Neubert inquired about removing some of the trees from the perimeter for the laydown yard.

Mr. McNew stated he would not remove the trees around the perimeter, but within the property there were not many trees due to it being a golf course between the lanes.

Opposition:

Glen Gifford 3426 Gifford Drive, Shreveport, LA 71109
Becky Gifford 3426 Gifford Drive, Shreveport, LA 71109

Mr. Gifford voice concerns about what is to be seen when looking out from their property, as well as sound abatement. The residents inquired about access being given from Jefferson Paige solely or will it include South Roach or Ratcliffe.

Ms. Gifford wondered if SWEPCO could build on the other side of those trees that are already in place.

Rebuttal:

Mr. McNew pointed out the 150 feet buffer and the existing lake that would become the storm water detention. He stated the existing trees within the buffer zone that will stay.

Ms. Neubert inquired about the number of trees along the buffer line.

Mr. McNew stated about 15 trees and the ones on the site plan, not in the zone would be the ones to come down.

Ms. Neubert asked Mr. McNew about the percentage of coverage the trees offer.

Mr. McNew stated he was unsure on the matter.

Ms. Neubert inquired about the requirement of a buffer in I-1.

Mr. Jean stated there is a requirement and it would be required in the site plan to provide the buffer. Further explaining it must be about 15 feet with plantings that has to be in there, as well as a screen fence. Mr. Jean then corrected his statement, saying it would be a requirement for screening if it were residential, but it is commercial.

Mr. McNew stated in essence the 150-foot buffer is the screening and reassured Ms. Neubert that the development was not a noise producing facility.

Ms. Neubert stated she would like to see some type of trees required for this applicant, something that buffers the residents from having to look out into the yard.

Mr. McNew stated he would like to acknowledge he conversation with Mr. Gifford. He stated Mr. Gifford did explain to him that he and his wife just sold 50 acres in Bethany, and they had moved to the area and being worried about his property value going down. Mr. McNew mentioned he asked Mr. Gifford what it is he would like to do, is he requesting additional landscaping, or requesting a larger buffer. He mentioned the original plan for the land was supposed to be a dirt pit. He stated Mr. Gifford was not opposed to the dirt pit and thought the 650-foot buffer was a little excessive and he would like for SEPCO to possibly buy him out of his property. Mr. McNew further explained he passed that information along to Mr. Rinaldi and Michael Corbin at SWEPCO. He mentioned he was unaware if anyone reached out to Mr. Gifford due to him repeatedly stating he has about 10-15 acres and if SWEPCO would buy him out, he would not come out to oppose the project.

Mr. Robertson inquired about room for compromise by enlarging the buffer area by 150 to 200 feet.

Mr. McNew reassured Mr. Robertson that the current buffer is already 150 feet. He stated that if the Board would like to see additional trees put up that would be fine, stating that is what he asked Mr. Gifford about.

Mr. Robertson stated he looked at the drawing of the property after development by SWEPCO further explaining there appeared to be a healthy number of trees that are close to the buffer but outside of it and wanted to know if SWEPCO could move the demarcation line a little to the south, it would better accommodate the needs of SWEPCO as well as the needs of the community.

Mr. McNew stated SWEPCO's desire is the get as much usable property in there as possible because the facility will be used as an emergency center for things such as a hurricane, explaining they must have a stockpile.

Mr. Clarke stated while listening to the discussion he was uncomfortable with the recommendations the staff has made with this application and inquired the Board to allow more research on the project and come back to address some of the issues that were discussed in reference to the buffering and protecting the residents. He stated all residents of the parish has the right to be protected from the over intrusiveness of industrial uses.

Ms. Neubert inquired about Mr. Clarke about his concern from the staff point of view, simply regarding the visibility, stating the buffer is not what she is questioning rather the visibility into that buffer. She inquired about not approving the application with the stipulation of some type of buffer that would be a compromise that the applicant can agree to, and the staff would say that is within good standing.

Mr. Clarke reiterated he would like to defer until next month to give the staff an opportunity to look more in depth into the property and attempt to come up with ways to protect the citizens in the area.

Mr. McNew stated he did ask about a community meeting, further explaining that this is putting a very large project behind for a month with somebody that is coming in to invest a good bit of money into the area.

A motion was made by MR. ROBERTSON, seconded by MS. NEUBERT To defer and continue this application to the next regularly scheduled public hearing.

The motion was adopted by the following 8-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, ELBERSON, JOSEPH,

draft

MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER and Mses. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Mses. JACKOSN.

CASE NO. 21-165-C CODE TEXT AMENDMENT

Applicant: SHREVEPORT CADDO METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION
Owner: To amend various sections of the City of Shreveport UDC

Representative &/or support:

Adam Bailey 505 Travis Street, Shreveport, LA 71101

Mr. Bailey stated these code text amendments would affect Article 6.2, temporary use standards, adding garage sales under that subsection of seasonal sales. He stated currently there is no language that requires a permit to be obtained for a garage sale and no such use standard exist. Mr. Bailey stated this amendment does both, adding similar language from the old zoning code. He stated that his code text amendment was before the Board last month but there was an error. He specified that a temporary use permit, issued by the zoning administrator would be required for any garage sale within the city. He stated a property could not have more than three garage sales per year, totaling more than three days per each garage sale.

Mr. Elberson mentioned in the work session Ms. Neubert brought up the potential blow back from residents on this matter and he shares that concern. He questioned if the staff worked through other ideas as to how to address the real problem which are the people that are chronic garage sellers going overboard as opposed to making someone coming to get a permit every time, they hold a garage sale.

Mr. Clarke state this is not the first time they have had a garage sale ordinance. He specified the reason the Council did not want a fee charge was because this was just to deal with problems that they were having in that district with residents conducting garage sales. Mr. Clarke clarified the zoning inspectors are not going to be out looking for garage sales to cite people who are conducting one. He stated it was an opportunity for the Council members, who receive all these calls, to have something to use to stop residents who have a garage sale every day or week. He stated this was a way to do enforcement for the chronic violators. Mr. Clarke shared it is a tool for requiring that person to obtain a permit. He stated if they don't get a permit then they could cite them in city court and file criminal charges against them for violating the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Neubert commented looking at the new website coming on, acknowledging the good work of the website. She inquired since this is a no fee permit, would residents be able to apply for the garage sale permit online.

Mr. Bailey clarified yes it would be the same process as it is now, stating they would be able to go to MGO, apply for a special use permit, they would be able to select it, and it would go before the zoning administrator.

Ms. Neubert wondered what that would look like in reference to timeframe.

Mr. Bailey explained once the application comes in, the zoning administrator is notified.

Mr. Jordan clarified the application will go into the permits queue. He stated it is already set up in MGO for a garage sale, there just wasn't an ordinance for it.

Ms. Neubert asked if there was any way to make it an automatic approval and how the MPC was tracking it. She inquired about if it was being tracked by location or by name. She stated there are businesses that do estate sales and if they are to track it by name what if they have 12 sales that they are representing.

Mr. Bailey stated it is being tracked by property. He stated the property would not be able to have more than three garage sales.

Mr. Clarke reiterated inspectors would not go out to cite those who have garage sales other than someone that is a flagrant violator. He explained the tool is to say the resident must have a permit and if they do not obtain a permit they are in violation and after three times, enforcement actions can be taken against that resident. He stated that has never happened.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

draft

A motion was made by MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MR. ROBERTSON to recommend this application for approval.

The motion was adopted by the following 6-2 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ANDREWS, BALDERAS, JOSEPH, MORTON, ROBERTSON, & SATER Nays: Messrs. ELBERSON and Mses. NEUBERT Absent: Mses. JACKSON.

END OF PUBLIC HEARING

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Clarke shared with the Board once more the upcoming Louisiana Chapter American Planning Association Conference that will be held in Lafayette on October 27th-29th. He stated the Planning Commission Training will be held on the 29th. He clarified the standard mileage cost per the city will be covered. He encouraged the Board to attend the training. He stated the training would give the Board the opportunity to get an idea of what the responsibilities are for the planning commissioners and the ethics involved in being a planning commissioner.

NEW BUSINESS

OTHER MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE COMMISSION

CHAIR/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Elberson mentioned the school board issue, stating he had the opportunity to speak to a school board member. He inquired if staff would entertain some effort to work with the school board with planning with these schools in helping them work through their process.

Mr. Clarke stated the MPC will go into a study of repurposing the schools as they are being done around the country.

Mr. Robertson stated before the meeting he dropped letters off on behalf of the neighborhood association Broadmoor to the school board members, inquiring to hire professional planning consultants to guide them in the disposition of their closed campuses throughout Caddo Parish. He stated he was inspired by the Arthur Circle closure that occurred last year. He further explained the school board publicly assured the neighborhood association they would listen to the concerns of the citizens. Mr. Robertson stated the school board has a public responsibility to not only guard its treasury, but to guard the public interest.

Mr. Clarke expressed he had the opportunity to employ extremely brilliant individuals. He stated the staff are truly trained and well adverse at doing the things that requested from the board members to do.

Mr. Robertson inquired that Mr. Clarke copy all the members of the commission on the email that was sent to him and Mr. Jean.

Ms. Neubert asked about the number of campuses being discussed in the area for Caddo.

Mr. Clarke stated the staff will know for future reference.

Ms. Neubert mentioned one of the things she noticed that these schools would make a great facility for senior living. Stating there are many uses for these properties, and it is quite shocking that they sit there abandoned. She stated she appreciates the staff for getting involved.

ADJOURN 5:18 p.m.

Winzer Andrews, Chair

Chris Elberson, Secretary