

**SHREVEPORT METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION OF CADDO PARISH
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING NOVEMBER 3, 2021**

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

Members Present

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

Staff Present

Alan Clarke, Executive Director
Stephen Jean, Deputy Director
Reginald Jordan, Zoning Administrator
Adam Bailey, Community Planning & Design Manager
Jasmin Samuels, Executive Assistant
Manushka Desgage, City Attorney's Office

Members Absent

Rachel Jackson

The hearing was opened with prayer by **MR. ROBERTSON** . 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 MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MS. NEUBERT, to approve the minutes of the October 6, 2021 public hearing as submitted.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

CASE NO. 21-3-CAC CLOSURE & ABANDONMENT

Applicant: **City of Shreveport Engineering**
Owner: **City of Shreveport Engineering**
Location: unnamed dedication (located between Adrian Street and Pixley Drive, approx. 506' west of Rufus Drive.)
Existing Zoning: **R-1-5**
Request: **Closure and abandonment**
Proposed Use: **Single Family Residential**

Representative &/or support:

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

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

draft

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

PUBLIC HEARING

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

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

Representative &/or support:

Michael Kelsch 4913 Shed Road, Bossier City, LA 71111

Mr. Kelsch mentioned he was the engineer on behalf of the developer. He stated this was the next unit of Saint Andrews Subdivision, being a 19-lot unit. He stated the development would follow the original Master Plan from 2010.

Mr. Robertson asked for clarification on the appropriate number of acres for this land.

Mr. Kelsch stated there is 25.724 acres listed on the plat.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MR. SATER To approve this application.

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

Michael Corbin 428 Travis Street, Shreveport, LA 71101

Mr. Corbin stated he was present in support of case 21-30-P. He stated he worked with Mr. Clarke and understands the need to provide a greater buffer next to the residential properties and he agrees with the 200' buffer where the properties are adjacent on the backside of this development.

Ms. Neubert inquired about the 50' buffer that was discussed during the work session that took place the previous day.

Mr. Clarke stated after the pre briefing on Tuesday, Mr. Corbin and himself came to the agreement to provide he entire 200' buffer. He stated the discussion from yesterday was irrelevant to what was being presented before the Board at the present time. He reiterates that SWEPCO has agreed to the initial recommendation of the 200' buffer across the entire back property line.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

draft

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

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

CASE NO. 21-150-C SPECIAL USE PERMIT & SITE PLAN

Applicant: **Vintage Design Group**
Owner: **Assisted Family Services, LLC.**
Location: 1845 Line Avenue (East side of Line Ave. approx. 140' north of Olive St.)
Existing Zoning: **C-UC**
Request: **Special Use permit & Site Plan Review**
Proposed Use: Social Services Center

Representative &/or support:

Marcus Hobbs 417 Lake Street, Shreveport, LA 71101

Mr. Hobbs stated he was the applicant representing the Vintage Design Group and was the one who did the site plan submission.

Ms. Neubert inquired about a requirement of a NPP meeting.

Mr. Clarke stated he saw no indication that a NPP was conducted, so it was no required.

Mr. Joseph asked Mr. Hobbs if he was aware of the staff recommendation relative to the stipulations.

Mr. Hobbs replied he is aware and has no issue with the recommended stipulations put in place.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

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

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

CASE NO. 21-158-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: **Robert Johnson**
Owner: **George & James Johnson**
Location: 2443 Hawkins St. (SE corner of Legardy St. & Hawkins St.)
Existing Zoning: **R-1-5**
Request: **R-1-5 to R-A**
Proposed Use: Dwelling- Single-Family

Representative &/or support:

Robert Johnson 2619 Legardy Street, Shreveport, LA 71107

Mr. Johnson stated he was present in hopes to get the property rezoned to keep his horses where they are currently located.

Ms. Neubert inquired about how long Mr. Johnson lived at the property and if the horses were there the whole time he was at the property.

Mr. Johnson responded 21 years and the horses have been there since he was a kid.

Ms. Neubert asked if the property was family property and how many horses he currently had.

Mr. Johnson replied yes, and he had four horses currently.

draft

Ms. Neubert stated if Mr. Johnson was aware of the request in reduction in the number of horses if the application is recommended for approval.

Mr. Johnson stated his daughter involved a place in Grand Cane and this is where some of his horses are going to be moved to. He stated he wants some of the horses to stay with him, but majority will be going to Grand Cane.

Ms. Neubert clarified the total number of horses he could keep at his property were two. She stated it is a little over an acre of the property.

Opposition:

Linda Sylvie 2121 Ruby Street, Shreveport, LA 71107

Lillian Washington 2108 Ruby Street, Shreveport, LA 71107

Ms. Sylvie stated she owned property at 2109 Ruby Street, and she owned two vacant lots. She is in opposition of the horses because they could not get suitable zoning. She shared there was zoning for double wide homes once before. She stated it was changed without any notification. Ms. Sylvie stated they cannot get double wide homes, but they are putting horses everywhere they tear a house down. She expressed it is not fair that a horse can be placed where people want to put homes. She clarifies that the horses have not been there for 21 years. She shared that some people did have horses there every so often, but there were only one or two. She stated now they must wake up every morning to run horses out of their yards. She ends with the neighborhood really does not want the horses there. She pointed out on a map where she wished to put a double wide home, which she can no longer afford to do because of the zone change to a singular manufactured home.

Ms. Neubert inquired if anyone else in the neighborhood had horses.

Ms. Sylvie replied they do not. She stated there are horses down Narcissus Drive that get out as well and are in her yard every morning. She shared that she does not know who they belong to.

Mr. Clarke shared with Ms. Sylvie that the staff listened to the concerns of the citizens in the neighborhood in the City of Shreveport and she was right. The ability to request approval for manufactured housing was repealed and it has been reinstated. He shared that every lot in the MLK area is eligible to apply for manufactured housing.

Ms. Washington stated she was against the rezoning because 40 years ago she lived in that same house, and it was clean. She further states that now it is not clean and needs to be cleaned up. She inquired about the economical impact would the zone change bring to the area. Ms. Washington reiterated that she lived at the property before and there were no horses, and it was clean. She presented to the Board where she lived currently which was behind Hawkins and stated there are only four houses on the street she lives on now. She shared she grew up in the area and has been there for 69 years.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Johnson stated he agree with the citizens about the horses getting out, but as long as he can remember, his grandparents and himself have had the horses and they have never got out. He shared with the Board that a fellow neighbor also has horses, and they often get out and wander to the school. Most of the time it is him who gathers them up and gets them back home. He states that people see his face and assume they are his horses. He stated he runs the horses back and that they are back in the woods as well. Mr. Johnson shared with the Board that he tries to help the neighbor keep his horses up, but it is a full-time job.

Mr. Chairman inquired about Mr. Johnson's recommendation on what he think should be done in cases where some people have horses that just roam the neighborhood.

Mr. Johnson replied his neighbor is at the age where he is unable to ride anymore, and he was thinking he would sell the horses. He reiterated he has tried to help him a couple of times, going back there to check on the horses and keep them fed, but it was a wear and tear on him because he works everyday as well. He stated he could not do it anymore and that he has tried for two years to help keep them from getting out, but they get out anytime they get ready. He explained the horses would get not the new neighborhood and they would come to his house about the horses, and he would make it very clear they weren't his horses, but he would get them out the yard. Mr. Johnson stated he lived across from the school and would see the horses. He would get on his four-wheeler to pick them up to keep the peace with everybody.

A motion was made by MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MS. NEUBERT 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 Ms. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Ms. JACKSON

CASE NO. 21-164-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: William L. Gary, APAC
Owner: KSLA, Inc./Gray Media Group, Inc.
Location: 1812 Fairfield Avenue (SW corner of Fairfield Ave & Dashiell St.)
Existing Zoning: C-UC
Request: C-UC to IC
Proposed Use: Broadcast Facility w/ Broadcast Tower

Representative &/or support:

Bill Gary 1812 Fairfield Avenue. Shreveport, LA 71101

Mr. Gary stated he was an architect with William L. Gary APC, an architectural firm in Shreveport, Louisiana and he was representing KSLA Channel 12 and the potential rezoning of the property.

Mr. Robertson inquired about a change of appearance of the TV station.

Mr. Gary responded no. He further explained the reason for the zone change was to allow KSLA to put an antenna in the back on the west side of KSLA on their existing property that is much like the other antennas that is there except that this one is 100 ft. He stated they have an antenna that communicates with Morningsport broadcast antenna that takes Channel 12 all over, but basically this antenna is a relay one. Mr. Gary stated this antenna will allow modernization and improve the communications with the KSLA broadcast tower and the broadcast tower that is up in the North Shreveport area

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

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 Ms. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Ms. JACKSON

CASE NO. 21-166-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: Alphonso Williams
Owner: Alphonso Williams
Location: 0 Ferrara Dr. (NW corner of Baird Rd. & Ferrara Dr.)
Existing Zoning: C-2
Request: C-2 to R-3
Proposed Use: Dwelling- Multi-Family

Representative &/or support:

Alphonso Williams 2410 Windbrooke Court, Shreveport, LA 71118

Mr. Williams stated he currently purchased a property on Ferrara Drive and anticipates putting multi-family townhouses on the property.

Mr. Joseph inquired about Mr. William having the opportunity to discuss this development with citizens in the neighborhood.

Mr. Williams stated he gave the opportunity, and no one had any opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Neubert asked if a NPP was required.

Mr. Clarke replied one was required and it was held on October 18th with no one in attendance.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

A motion was made by MS. NEUBERT, seconded by MR. JOSEPH 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. 21-167-C ZONING REQUEST

Applicant: **Key Legacy Investment Group, LLC**
Owner **Key Legacy Investment Group, LLC**
Location: 106 E Boulevard St. (North side of E Boulevard St., approx. 140' east of Alexander Ave.)
Existing Zoning: **R-1-5**
Request **R-1-5 to R-2**
Proposed Use: Dwelling-Two Family

Representative &/or support:

D'Andreas Clark 8304 Creekdale Street, Shreveport, LA 71107
Arielle Clark 8304 Creekdale Street, Shreveport, LA 71107
Lisa Hayes 1025 Shreveport Barksdale Highway, Shreveport, LA 71101
Ronnie Sibley 124 Boulevard Street, Shreveport, LA 71104
Ruthie Sibley 124 Boulevard Street, Shreveport, LA 71104

Mr. Clark stated he and his wife are the co-owners of Key Legacy investment and they were present to submit their request of rezoning of 106 Boulevard from a R-1-5 zoning to R-2. Mr. Clark recited a statement for the Board that read he and his wife purchased 106 Boulevard earlier this year while fully rehabbing another property on the 100th block of Merrick St. in the highland area. He made it very clear that when they bought the property it was and currently still configured as a duplex. He shared there was a fire at the end of 2019 to the second story unit, which led to the previous owners listing the property for sale as a two-unit property. He shared the affidavit stated that the property marketed and listed in the MLS as a duplex by a licensed real estate agent. Around late August they began to pull permits and were made aware by zoning that while the property is configured as a duplex and they bought the property with the intentions of completely revitalizing it as such, it was however zoned as a R-1-5, single-family residential zoning. He stated they also found out that the second meter that he believed to be there the entire time, was put there without a permit, four years before they bought the property in 2017. Mr. Clark shared he stopped all other major work on the property and began to apply for the rezoning of the property to R-2. He stated the property is one block west of a large R-2, multi-family zoning district and two blocks south of a large R-3 multi-family zoning district. He mentioned the drive-by site visit which was conducted on the 13th of October. Mr. Clark shared they hosted a neighborhood participation meeting October 6th at 6 pm with 11 people in attendance. He answered questions concerning parking, noise, property value, lawn maintenance, types of tenants, due diligence prior to buying the property, and the type of work being done to the property. In closing, he asked the MPC to approve the zone change.

Mr. Robertson stated he looked at a spreadsheet of nearby neighbors and it appeared there were a few LLCs on the list which he presumed that area of Highland was an area of business investment which would be rental properties.

Mr. Clark replied yes, they were.

Mr. Robertson commented he supported those who wanted to rebuild Highland and make their investments in Highland and want to bring good people to the neighborhood. He wished Mr. Clark best of luck.

Ms. Neubert inquired about any information Mr. Clark might have from a realtor or someone that he possibly worked with on this development on what the expected value of the property after completion.

Mr. Clark stated that they have been in communication with an appraiser, he restated that they have ceased everything, and the last conversation had with the appraiser was based on the pretense that the property would be a duplex. He stated expected value would range from 160,000 to 170,000.

Ms. Hayes stated she has been working with Mr. Clark for a minute and this property is in her are where she has to inspect. She shared she used to get numerous complaints about the property. She stated it stayed vacant for a long time and the city itself

had to board and clean it up. She mentioned there was a care premise on it and she currently had it in for demolition. She shared with the Board it is on the docket to go to environmental court. Ms. Hayes stated since Mr. Clark has taken over, he has done a total revolation of the property which is really good. She shared there are a lot of properties in Highland that are horrible and end having to be torn down. She stated she would rather see a house that's been done over than a vacant lot there. She stated there were vagrants and homeless people staying there and it was a danger to the neighbors that were staying around the property. Once Mr. Clark bough the property it has totally changed, and he has started cleaning up. Ms. Hayes mentioned she is in favor in Mr. Clark continuing what he is doing. She stated she does not want to see him stop working on the property. She explained the other property on Merrick Street was a burned house and it was in demolition. She shared Mr. Clark took that house and turned it all the way around. She shared it is now being rented out and made the property on that street better.

Mr. Elberson thanked Ms. Hayes for her testimony. He inquired about her experience in dealing with rental properties in the highland area versus single family homes. He asked what she sees just in terms of the upkeep and maintenance in rentals versus homes that are owned and if she notices a big difference.

Ms. Hayes explained what she sees are people out of town buying properties in the Highland neighborhood and they don't live there, and they don't care. She stated when they rent it out, they have no clue as to what they are renting to. She stated with Mr. Clark he is here, and he is looking at it and he is investing in it. She shared she gets people who want to be tax sale buyers and they don't care what they have, so the rental properties are horrible. She stated unless you are here and investing back into the community and to the city you have no clue. She shared she has cases now that she is trying to have demolished because they are tax sale buyers. She elaborated that yes, the homeowners will take care of their property and she has a lot of rental property. She stated if the rental company is in Shreveport, then she is able to reach out to them quickly so they can come and perform the proper maintenance on the property.

Mr. Robertson asked Ms. Hayes to elaborate more on the term tax sale buyers.

Ms. Hayes explained tax sale buyers will see a property and put an investment in tax sale buyer. They will never come to check on the property, they just own it by buying the taxes on the property for a tax write off. They never come to the city or are out of state.

Mr. Robertson clarified they are absentee.

Ms. Hayes agreed.

Mr. Sibley stated he wanted to commend Mr. Clark because he believes it is a good thing he is doing. He explained he and his wife have the same vision to do the same thing for their property which is in the next block at 124 Boulevard. He stated he was present learning from Mr. Clark's experience. He shared he did not know the questions to ask and the actions to take, so they are currently in the learning stage. He explained he and his wife are both retired, and they have a property, they have resided there since 2010. Mr. Sibley proceeded to ask if they would have to go through the same problem or go through the same motions in order to widen their driveway.

Mr. Jean stated the best thing to do is to get with staff and the staff would be glad to help them on this situation. He stated it doesn't appear they would have to go through a rezoning process just to do a driveway. If they were to change the occupancy of the property, then maybe, but if it is just the driveway they could come visit with staff and they would look at the code to see what is needed from Mr. Sibley.

Ms. Sibley stated that she was in agreeance with what Mr. Clark is trying to do and believes they are bringing a positive to the community. She stated she remembered the day it caught fire and she know the condition the house was in and wondered what was going to the property, but now she has her answer.

Opposition:

Deborah Coleman 102 E. Boulevard Street, Shreveport, LA 71104

Sherrie Gammage 104 E. College Street, Shreveport, LA 71104

Jimmy Randle 101 E. Boulevard Street, Shreveport, LA 71104

Madison Poche 262 Wilkinson Street, Shreveport, LA 71104

Those in opposition did not agree with the zone change from a single-family to a duplex. They believed there was not enough accessed information, and they would like to keep the neighborhood zoned as a single family residential.

draft

Mr. Joseph asked for clarification on Ms. Poche's position of opposition whether she was opposed to exactly what the Clarks were trying to do. He wondered if the opposition was to the overall process in general.

Ms. Poche responded if every investor could be like the Clarks, then the city would be in good hands. She stated continuing to increase the density at the expense of neighbors such as Ms. Coleman is admirable, but not the best strategy to get towards that particular future goal. She stated the process concerns her.

Ms. Neubert inquired about how well she has studied what is occurring. She also inquired about how many duplexes she believed to be in the vicinity.

Ms. Poche responded she believed there to be about five on two blocks. She stated you could go down any road on Highland and it'll be more than one illegal duplex.

Ms. Neubert stated they may or may not be legally zoned but what was being proposed today was not really a new concept. Those homes do exist now.

Ms. Poche stated yes and that her greater point is that the neighborhood has been zoned single-family for a purpose. She stated the process of it being illegally turned into a duplex, it is sitting empty for a year, and therefore it is just a non-compliant duplex. She stated it really plays into the hands of people who do not live in the area and are trying to maximize profit off the neighborhood. It is just a bad precedent.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Clark stated he wanted to make it clear that it is not him versus the neighbor, like he explained to Mr. and Mrs. Coleman they are just as invested in seeing this thing in long term not in short term. He stated they are intentional in revitalizing the neighborhood. As he mentioned before with the zoning current configuration of the property, they are not saying just because these people are illegal, they should be able to do the same thing. He stated they are trying to do it through the proper channel and the proper way. He mentioned this request is compatible with the current structure of the neighborhood and there are at least five duplexes on the same block being illegally occupied or used at that current moment. Mr. Clark showed the Board that the Caddo assessor still showed the property as a duplex. He stated a lot of the concerns were pretty much before they bought the property, and they are willing to work with Ms. Coleman in any way to make her feel comfortable. This is why they proposed installing a higher, privacy fence. They addressed the parking situation, explaining there is a two-car garage in the back and the 20x 20 slab is off to the east side of the property. He mentioned the firewall was included in their scope of work to be done. He stated again they are highly invested in the area, and they are very proud of the work they have done.

Mr. Joseph mentioned Ms. Poche raised an interesting issue and wondered if there were any metrics on illegal duplexes.

Mr. Clarke stated he wanted to follow up at the end and shared there will always be an illegal; something if nobody reports to the proper authorities. He stated there is a zoning enforcement section. He explained Mr. Jordan was present and if persons are interested in reporting every illegal duplex there is in Highland, then Mr. Jordan and his staff will address those complaints and take the proper actions against them. He explained they have no information on what is legal and what is not legal right now as far as housing stock.

Mr. Robertson recalled someone mentioning the property had two electric meters.

Mr. Clark elaborated yes, in 2017 it was installed without a permit.

Mr. Robertson redirected to staff, when someone applies for an electric meter the utility company asks for certain documentation including an occupancy permit of a building permit.

Mr. Clarke stated the City of Shreveport does not presently have a residential certificate of occupancy process. He explained it is being suggested that one is adopted. He stated speaking in relationship to commercial location where SWEPCO requires documentation and approval from the city before it establishes electrical services.

Mr. Robertson reclarified whoever requested the second meter for this property did not have to supply information to SWEPCO or supply city documentation of proper zoning for two meters.

draft

Mr. Clarke confirmed his statement.

Mr. Robertson mentioned it was surprising to him and often hearing about the utility company being the enforcement agent for the local government to determine that person applying for an electrical service for the proper authority to put in the service.

Mr. Clarke agreed, stating there have been some service that have not been totally legal.

Mr. Robertson inquired about the difference in owning rental property as opposed to owner occupied property.

Mr. Jean stated there may have been different discussions about the issue in a lot of different cities but as far as empirical data, he could not confirm if there was anything conclusive on the matter. He further explained when property is looked over by staff, the regulations does not have differentiation between rental and whether it's homeownership.

Mr. Joseph mentioned it would be entirely case specific to whoever the owner or renter was.

Mr. Clarke stated that the MPC has been in discussion with the City Council because the subject matter comes up quite often in relationship to how properties affect the value of properties next door to them. He mentioned the MPC is in the process of trying to have the ability in the next year's budget to contract with an appraisal to provide the empirical data to the Board.

Mr. Morton inquired about the number of weather heads attached to the house.

Mr. Clark stated there are currently two.

Ms. Neubert stated based on the document presented how was it designated a duplex from the tax assessor's office.

Mr. Jean stated they make their determination on information they receive when they are dealing with the tax and their own visits to sites or what they observe. HE explained it has nothing to do with the what the right is regarding to land use.

Mr. Clark stated as a fellow investor what was learned from this process that before purchasing property they would go starting to zoning.

Mr. Elberson stated he appreciates the staff's comments toward the Master Plan. He stated he would love to see the city incentivize local ownership for multifamily in all aspect.

A motion was made by MR. ROBERTSON, seconded by MS. NEUBERT 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 Mses. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Mses. JACKSON

CASE NO. 21-69-C CODE TEXT AMENDMENT

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

Representative &/or support:

Adam Bailey 505 Travis Street, Shreveport, LA 71101

Mr. Bailey presented new code text amendments that are related to a rental registration ordinance.

Ms. Neubert inquired about if it is determined at the time of inspection that the renter is responsible for damage.

Mr. Bailey stated the way it was envisioned is if someone calls in about unsafe conditions, it comes to the MPC, and an inspection is set up. He mentioned before the inspection takes place there are several steps that need to take place. He stated the owner has to be there. Mr. Bailey continued, stating if it is a properly registered unit, that registration gives inspectors the authority to go in. They will set up a time and based on the information from the complaint they will go in and go through their checklist. If the owner can provide evidence that they are compliant, then the tenant is the next person to be looked at and take it into account on what the next steps will be. He mentioned it is not the process just to give a fine, but more of the process

afterwards in getting the complaint in and getting it fixed.

Ms. Neubert asked about the actions taken if the renter is at fault, how is that compliance enforced. She gave an example if a tenant broke a brand-new water heater, what would be the next step of action.

Mr. Clarke stated with rental property there is a lease agreement that details the responsibilities of the tenants. He mentioned the code is more of a protection for the tenants due to the negative that are done by landlords and the tenants have no recourse. Mr. Clarke mentioned landlords have recourse, they can charge it in the next rent payment for the fees in repairs that must be done. He reiterated the rental code is more of a protection for the tenants than landlords.

Ms. Neubert stated the rental code was complaint driven and inquired if they get to the property and there are other violations what are the next steps taken.

Mr. Bailey stated through the rental code there will be a checklist that the renter and owner would have to follow. He assured Ms. Neubert that they will not just look at the one thing the complaint was for, they will examine everything thoroughly, going through the checklist.

Mr. Sater inquired about dealing with the absentee landlord.

Mr. Bailey stated with the same mechanism which the property standards deal with it presently. He stated they would try their best to get in contact with them, potentially go through that enforcement, place a lien, and move forward with that.

Mr. Clarke stated he believes the long arm of the law can reach out to these locations and site the property owners of absentee landlords from the City of Shreveport.

Ms. Manushka stated normally that is the procedure to get in contact with a landlord that is out of state. She mentioned sometimes there are complications with this and sometimes they won't respond depending on the severity of the charge they are receiving. She stated it would really be a case-by-case determination.

Mr. Clarke added as with any other ordinance, this is the foundation stage of the ordinance, which is why other ordinances are amended as you find that other processes are needed. He mentioned the City of Shreveport has no process in place to address the things that are happening with tenants throughout the city, and it is seen on the news all the time and they have no resources to contact in relation to the negative things that are happening. He stated this is just the beginning. He stated if the Board find there are modification amendments that need to be done, they will be seeing those amendments.

Ms. Neubert stated the \$25 for a missed appointment seemed awfully low.

Mr. Bailey stated usually when fee studies are researched, they look across the board at what other cities are doing, but consider the dynamics, demographics, and the economy of scale of those cities. He stated when it came to a registration fee per unit, he has seen them as high as \$75 per unit and he has seen them lower than he was currently proposing. He stated when it comes to inspection fees they are across the board, but one of the constants was for the missed appointment it was always between the \$20, \$25, \$30 scale.

Mr. Sater commented it needs to be higher to compensate for the inspectors doing the job.

Mr. Bailey stated he could adjust it.

Mr. Sater stated if people were to see the price, they would want to fix the issues without inspectors ever being called.

Ms. Neubert agreed.

Mr. Clarke stated if the Board would allow the MPC to use the National Dawns to start with and as things grow, and as the ordinance proves to be effective, the community and the governmental agencies would be more receptive in increasing those fees.

Opposition:

There was no opposition present.

draft

A motion was made by MR. JOSEPH, seconded by MS. NEUBERT 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 Mses. NEUBERT Nays: NONE. Absent: Mses. JACKSON

END OF PUBLIC HEARING

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

OTHER MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE COMMISSION

CHAIR/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMENTS

Mr. Clarke stated the City Council did pass a resolution at the last meeting encouraging the MPC to place a moratorium on the issuance of any occupational license and certificated of occupancies for liquor for liquor stores. He stated this becomes effective November 5th, so the Board would not be able to take any actions on the moratorium today, but they will be able to vote on accepting or rejecting the moratorium at the December meeting. He stated there was a response from the new Board members on the MPC Board. They received training at the Louisiana APA Chapter Conference in Lafayette. He was proud to share at the state level that the Board is determined to be in compliance with the laws of the state of Louisiana. He hopes they gained valuable information.

Mr. Chair took the time to recognize those who attended the training.

Mr. Balderas mentioned Mr. Clarke was the recipient of a Lifetime Achievement Award during the luncheon at the APA Conference.

Mr. Clarke mentioned the second recipient was Steve Villabasso and to be mentioned in the same sentence with him was a humbling experience for him. He thanked Mr. Balderas for the mention.

Mr. Chair stated on September 22nd the Executive Committee met and did a performance evaluation of the Executive Director and would like to present to the Board at the December meeting, the findings and make recommendations following the presentation. He wanted to make note to the Board information regarding a nominating committee for officers will be shared during the December meeting.

ADJOURN 5:02 p.m.

Winzer Andrews, Chair

Chris Elbersen, Secretary