

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CADDO PARISH COMMISSION'S
LONG RANGE PLANNING/SPECIAL PROJECTS COMMITTEE
HELD ON THE 20TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2020

The Caddo Parish Long Range Committee met in legal session on the above date, at 2:00 p.m., in the Government Chambers, with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson, Chairman, presiding, and the following members in attendance: Commissioners Lyndon B. Johnson, Hopkins, Young and Chavez (4). ABSENT: Commissioner Jackson (1).

Also, in attendance were Assistant Parish Administrator Erica Bryant, Assistant Parish Attorney Henry Bernstein, MPC Director Alan Clarke, MPC Zoning Administrator Reginald Jordan, MPC Community Planning and Design Manager Adam Bailey, MPC Deputy Director Steven Gene, and Commissioner Burrell.

Invocation was led by Mr. Hopkins, and the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Young.

Mr. Johnson opened up the floor for Citizens Comments:

Mr. Bill Weiner foresees a situation for Caddo Parish that should be addressed now for a positive outcome otherwise it could be very destructive. He explained his involvement in the global change since 1991. He states that the temperature of the oceans are rising and when there are warmer oceans, there is more evaporation. The water vapor goes in the sky and makes clouds and when it moves, especially in cold area, the clouds release rain. He further explains that the extra rains cause coastal cities to flood and disappear. He thinks we will get a large migration of people from the coast and we must be ready for it. And if we are ready then Caddo Parish will be the prime location for people to come. Mr. Weiner continued to explain that at the end of WWII when London needed to rebuild because of bombed out residential areas, they made a decision not to rebuild in London. They used rail lines that go out from London to build new towns around it, which became commuter villages. He also mentioned later in Portland, they put a boundary around the city and said they cannot annex or expand outside of that boundary. He stated that their infrastructure was good. In conclusion, Mr. Weiner shared that Caddo, which should include Bossier Parish, Bossier City and Shreveport, needs to, like London, look at the interstates and set up the little villages within the area to become a town and then they can come into Caddo Parish. He encouraged the Committee to start planning in the Parish to identify potential sites for transportation and utilities. He stated that the areas could host schools, parks, fire station and law enforcement that need to be in place and ready before we get all the people coming in destroying what we have now, causing an imbalanced community.

Mr. Johnson requested that all cell phones be silenced at this time. Then, he introduced the next citizen to speak.

Mr. Randy Rasmussen discussed that he is against not having codes. He states that what is needed are basic building codes that should be applied parish wide, because the UDC is killing entrepreneurs. He states that he went through the MPC years ago to start his wood shop business from home, which is a lot easier to do then than now with people so concerned about what others are doing around them. He clarified why he is the classic case of why the UDC needs to go away. He was lucky that his neighbors were agreed to him running his wood shop business since the previous owner was into race cars. There wasn't a noise ordinance at that time, so he was always running his race car and his neighbors were happy for him to have his business. He further discussed during the summer he needed an air conditioning man, and before there were notices that business vehicles could not be parked at homes, and a guy had his business truck and trailer at his house. He would have called his neighbor, but he saw the truck and trailer was moved, apparently because he received a notice about the MPC, and he probably wouldn't have known the man worked in air conditioning. Mr. Rasmussen stated that someone with a tool truck doesn't need a business address, especially if the property is more than an acre in size. He clarified that in the Broadmoor area the MPC codes are understandable because the streets wouldn't allow room to park a big truck. However, he concluded that the MPC should be pulled away and let the city concentrate on redeveloping because the population density per square mile are lower than Tyler, TX and Marshall, TX. Lastly, he stated that when there is all that area there are miles and miles of pipe but

no one there to keep it up.

Mr. Brian White pointed out that America is not solely at fault for climate change. That we should be concerned with it and, as individuals, we need to accept responsibility for. He also mentioned that it should not be dictated to the people by a government entity and enforce without everyone agreeing to. He discussed that people in the Parish want their property rights. He stated that Title 50 was a very restrictive code that was not enforced outside of city limits. He also stated that the codes need to reflect the property right freedoms that should be given to homeowners outside of the city because there are no benefits of the city that come with it, such as the Shreveport Police Department or Shreveport Fire. He says that people purchased outside of the city limits to be able to enjoy certain property freedoms that are different that inside the city limits. He suggested the 5-mile line should be brought back or rewritten with UDC codes for both inside and outside the city.

Mr. White revealed that there was an event that occurred for a zoning change that he was against and it did not go well, even under the title 50 codes. He defined that there is a difference between homeowner associations and there is a group that is dictated to homeowners across the board by regulatory compliance by the Parish. He encourages the committee to allow those who purchase property to agree to a homeowner association. Furthermore, Mr. White mentions the 5-mile radius was not agreed upon by the people who purchased property there and has limited the property amount of value of their homes and what they intended to do with it. He stated no one is ready to enforce this and that they store some of their business property at these locations and it is their staging area. It isn't something that they could say they can change the way they operate or gain additional property in order to store equipment. He encourages that this needs to be enforced better inside the city. He elaborates that the city has not seen what this consists of otherwise it wouldn't be just the parish sitting before the committee asking for this to be rewritten. He doesn't agree that the city understands the implications because they are far from compliance as well. He concluded that to re-district the parish is not all about what the corporations want, but also the incorporations, as well.

There being no one else to speak, Mr. Johnson close public comments and moved onto New Business:

- Presentation by MPC staff on review of current codes and Master Plan

Mr. Alan Clark introduced that they needed to review how the MPC has evolved into Metropolitan Planning limits and the different codes. Mr. Clark listened to Commissioner Young's question to do an orientation for him and Commissioner Burrell on what they have done and how they have reached their point. He stated that the staff, Zoning Administrator Reginald Jordan, Community Planning and Design Manager Adam Bailey and Deputy Director Stephen Gene, will address zoning enforcement, Unified Development Code proposal, the Master Plan, and the 5-mile code. He stated that they have received invites to go out into the Parish and meet with citizens to discuss the code with the hopes that different individuals will engage with them for a true feel of the citizens outside of the Parish.

Mr. Reginald Jordan addressed that they do enforce heavy inside the city, as well as, outside of the Parish. He summarized that between April 26, 2019 and February 20, 2020, they have received 235 violations. He stated that they receive calls from city and parish citizens. Then, he clarified that they received 40 calls of complaints from concerned citizens, which they investigate if there are compliance violations of the UDC. Mr. Jordan stated that when there is a violation, an inspector is sent out to investigate the violation and a letter is sent out to notify the citizens what the violation is, how to correct it and the time frame to correct it. He mentioned that 172 of the violations were for parking of recreational vehicles such as RVs, 4-wheelers, jet skis, boats, or cargo and utility trailers. Out of the 172 violations, 50 of these violations came into compliance. There were 23 miscellaneous violations, such as business operating without COs, auto repair from their houses and other home businesses or horses being stored improperly. Since there was a large concern from the citizens, the commission has placed a pause on violations of recreational vehicles, but they are still receiving calls of complaints.

Mr. Chavez stated that they put a freeze on enforcing payment for citations and wanted to know whether the freeze was still in effect. Mr. Jordan answered that the only payment they received were for paying for permits such as building a fence. There would be three notices before a violation is

turned over to the parish attorney's office. Otherwise, no fees were paid or given out, unless they were permit fees.

Mr. Hopkins wanted to know if there was a grandfather clause going from Chapter 54 to the UDC. Mr. Clark responded that if there was an ongoing violation when Chapter 54 transitioned to the UDC then those violations would be considered non-conforming. He also explained that they had no knowledge of how long some of those violations had been out there, so they could not be considered grandfathered in. Mr. Hopkins stated the disconnection with the citizens is that since they've changed from one code to another code the citizens believe they should be grandfathered in. Mr. Clark concludes that as the process continues, they are still looking at the UDC and grandfathering has been mentioned quite a bit.

Mr. Johnson wanted to know what the process was under the old code and what the process is for enforcement. Mr. Jordan explains that he only came into the UDC, and Mr. Clark was the Zoning Administrator at the time. Mr. Clark described that at the time of Chapter 54, the process functioned under a complaint driven process. If someone called in a complaint, then they would investigate and take action to resolve the complaint. They would receive three letters, and if there was still no compliance, the violation was forwarded to the District Attorney for prosecution in District Court.

Mr. Johnson also wanted to know if the Justice of the Peace and Constables were involved in the process. Mr. Clark explained that they were involved in property standards issues. He also said that the zoning administrators could not enforce property standards issues. If there was a combination of both then they would coordinate with the appropriate Constable. Mr. Jordan clarified that the new process is the same as the old process. Previously they were call driven and recently they go out to give the parish more attention as much as the city.

Mr. Johnson asked if they had the resources at the time. Mr. Jordan explained that they did not have the resources at the time, but now they are fully staffed and have the resources to be more proactive than reactive.

Mr. Johnson questioned were they fully staffed then could there have been more proactive measures taken. Mr. Jordan agreed that with limited resources and being under-staffed during that time they were limited with what they could do.

Mr. Jordan also pointed out the location of the most call-ins and inspections on a map of the Parish, which were evenly distributed throughout the southern and northern parts of the Parish. Mr. Johnson wanted to know if call-ins inspired their random inspections. Mr. Jordan agreed that he was correct.

Mr. Burrell also wanted clarification whether the 235 were all call-ins or whether the 40 call-ins triggered them to go out and see, while they were out there, that is what generated the 235 violations. Mr. Jordan explained that with their fully staffed team of three inspectors, each have a zone to cover, that went out into their zone to investigate the call-ins and observed other violations while they were there. They had technology that allows their inspections to input a violation on the spot which could be part of that 235 total violations.

Mr. Young inquired whether the 172 recreational vehicle violations were not complaint driven. Mr. Jordan stated that those violations received complaints after they had received the notice. And while they were out on the 40 complaint calls, the inspectors looked for all and any violations, such as a fence being too tall. The 172 violation letters was the main catalyst to let the citizens know the UDC exists and how they were not in compliance with it. Mr. Young requested to know of the 40 call-ins how many were regarding recreational vehicles.

Mr. Johnson stated that due to time restraints the next speakers will have 12 minutes to discuss their representation.

Mr. Stephen Gene explained the 2020 Master Plan of the MPC is a process and a document about the future of the community and a guide for decision-making to achieve goals. He

discussed the Louisiana Revised Statute 33:140.10 Master Plan states "It shall be the function and duty of the commission to make and recommend to the City Council and the Police Jury a master plan for the physical development of the municipality, including any areas outside of its boundaries which, in the commission's judgment, bear relation to the planning of the municipality." In 1956-1957 the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) was commissioned the area's first comprehensive plan by planner Arch R. Winter. In 1978, Mr. Winter was invited back to prepare and update the 1957 plan. In 2008, The MPC held a public forum to promote the idea of doing a comprehensive update to the plan. In 2009, Goody-Clancy, a planning consultant, was hired to lead the effort in creating a new plan that was later branded as the *Great Expectations Plan*. In 2011, The Shreveport-Caddo Great Expectations 2030 Master Plan was approved by the MPC Board on December 01, 2010 and was adopted by Resolution by the Caddo Parish Commission on April 21, 2011.

Mr. Gene shared points from the Resolution 16 of 2011 by the Caddo Parish Commission:

- A Resolution to adopt a new Master Plan for Caddo Parish,
- A shared vision and principals developed through a public planning process by the citizens of Caddo Parish and Shreveport,
- Strategies and actions to achieve the goals, and
- Shall be considered a guide for future ordinance amendments and future land use decisions.

Mr. Gene further elaborated that the Master Plan contained numerous subject areas such as Population & Land Use, Natural Heritage, Cultural Heritage, Neighborhoods & Housing, Economic Development, Transportation, Public Systems, Focus On Downtown, City Revitalization, and Future Land Use. This was heavily driven by citizen involvement through community survey area wide meetings, neighborhood meetings, providing comments on line through website, citizen advisory group and various subject specific working groups.

He provided a public opinion survey which points out that 82% participants were city residents and 18% were parish residents. The population currently is 23% living outside of the city area, which Mr. Gene stated is really close the survey percentages. He also shared that important issues were identified from the survey including reducing crime, adequate water supply and good water quality, improving public schools, access to excellent health care, diversifying industries and promoting job growth and improving neighborhood quality of life.

He discussed the following public meetings and outreach with their participant counts to include: Public Opinion Surveys there were 1200 participants (216 parish participants), Citizen Advisory Group Formation Meeting with 75 participants, Vision Forum with 500 participants, Speak Out Visioning Meetings in 9 area Public Schools with 325 participants, there were nine Neighborhood Workshops with 200 participants total, and six District Open Houses. They also held Revitalization Strategies Workshops, Open House for Solutions Meeting, seven Scenarios Public Meetings, Draft Master Plan Meeting with over 200 participants, three MPC Evening Public Hearing and MPC Public Hearing for Adoption. Mr. Gene concluded that the Master plan is required by state statute, has been around since the 1950s, includes a wide variety of subject areas, is a guide for decision makers and included extensive citizen involvement in its creation.

Mr. Hopkins wanted to know if the Parish could have its own master plan to look at the rural area separate of what the city has. Mr. Gene does not believe that there is anything in state statute that prohibits that. He also mentioned that there have been discussion regarding having a separate chapter that focuses on the rural area, since they have a separate chapter in the plan that focuses on downtown area. They have discussed having an entirely different plan, all of which they hope to get feedback on as they engage with the citizens.

Mr. Burrell is interested in knowing the breakdown of the urban and rural counts of the people on the panel that worked on the master plan. Mr. Gene stated that he does not have an exact number of where the citizen's advisory group are located to determine representation between rural and urban at the moment.

Mr. Burrell posed that there are citizens from outside the city limits concerned about fair representation in certain things and he is concerned that on a large board with only a few representing outside the city limits may not be a good proportionate share of influence from outside the city. Mr. Gene confirmed that on the board their role is to support services and facilitate discussions. He recalled going to a meeting at LSU where there were 15-18 people who were outside the city limit who discussed their concerns regarding the rural areas. He offered to do more research for more raw figures on the number of participants that represent citizens outside the city limits.

Mr. Adam Bailey opens with the statement that experience has shown him that ordinances can go out of date. He stated the rise and fall of the zoning code in Caddo Parish, the Chapter 54 of the Caddo Parish Code of Ordinances was the main tool that the MPC used for regulating and directing land development. He stated that over time, it became clear that Chapter 54's development requirements-many of which were written in the 1950s and 60s- were outdated and resulted in inconsistent decision-making.

Mr. Baily further elaborated on how the Caddo Parish UDC was not written for a rural lifestyle or to reflect a rural atmosphere for rural land development. He pointed out that while the current Caddo Parish UDC gets away from the antiquated zoning laws of the past, new amendments are needed to better protect "country living" in a rural area – all providing an appropriate transition from agricultural areas to urban development. He described the main benefits of updating Chapter 54 was to assure consistency among development requirements and to make sure that the review and approval processes was efficient. Likewise, rural communities that have no development standards typically find themselves at a competitive disadvantage because many businesses do not want to invest in a community that does not have regulations. He compared that San Antonio, TX, Durham, NC, Baton Rouge, LA, Lafayette, LA, Tyler, TX and Bossier City, LA all have successfully adopted UDCs. The UDC is a unified code that is used for land development. The Caddo Parish needs one because failing to plan means planning to fail with outdated codes. The citizens should care because it affects citizens within MPC planning limits. Not affected by the Caddo Parish UDC includes Vivian, Oil City, Odessa, Dixie, Blanchard, for example.

He explained the UDC strives to be more user-friendly by making information more prominent by employing a variety of page formatting techniques which can more quickly alert the reader as to where they are in the document. He clarified that new definitions have been provided to address contemporary uses and existing definitions have been updated to assure they are appropriate, used consistently, and avoid conflict with the terminology of other documents, which is a key issue with the outdated Chapter 54. The design guidelines and standards are in the UDC but they are only for commercial and industrial properties. Mr. Bailey clarified that grandfathering does exist. It balances the private property rights of land owners against the public need to regulate land use. Both the Louisiana Constitution and land use laws protect property owners by prohibiting the government from unreasonably depriving them of a vested right to use their property. In other words, zoning ordinances and land use regulations are not supposed to be retroactive; they ordinarily apply only to new or altered uses of land.

Mr. Bailey continued to discuss the Recreational Vehicle Storage in the UDC 8.10 provisions have been temporarily removed from the UDC and enforcement has been suspended. Chapter 54 states that no person shall permit any recreational vehicle, commercial vehicle, or trailer, other than a passenger vehicle to permanently park within the first 15 feet behind any property line adjacent to any street of any residentially zoned property. The UDC states that commercial vehicles are not permitted to be stored or parked outside overnight on a lot in a residential district. He explained that a plumbing van or someone's work vehicle is considered a Passenger vehicle and usually by weight over 10,000 pounds. The UDC states that passenger vehicles, which would include a vehicle used for business purposes, are not regulated by this provision. Chapter 54 states that no commercial vehicle, or trailer, other than a passenger vehicle permanently park within the first 15 feet behind any property line adjacent to any street of any residentially zoned property. He further discussed that in the UDC, manufactured homes are limited to R-A, R-MHS, and R-MHP zoning districts. This is a use-by-right. Existing, non-conforming units are permitted to remain until such time they are removed or no longer occupied as a residence. He also confirmed that a damaged manufactured home can be replaced.

Mr. Bailey stated that the keeping of livestock does not apply to lots that are in use for

agriculture as a principal use. The UDC permits the keeping of horses, as well as cows, chickens, goats, etc., is only permitted as an accessory use in the R-A, R-E, and R-1-12 zoning districts. A minimum lot size of one acre is required to keep livestock. However the term "horse" is not mentioned anywhere in the Chapter 54 of the Caddo Parish Code. The raising of "livestock" is mentioned several times, mainly pertaining to accessory structures and/or required enclosures. The UDC states air conditioner window units are an architectural feature that are allowed to encroach into all setbacks. No building permit is required. The only restriction is that the unit has a maximum projection of 18" from the building wall. The purpose of this rule is for safety and to eliminate noise onto surrounding properties.

Mr. Bailey pointed out, in the UDC, the total length of a carport is limited to 20 feet. The height of a carport is limited to 10 feet. Mr. Gene explains that a quick 'Google' search indicated that the most common length for a prefabricated carport is 21 feet. Updated language can be added to address this issue. The UDC landscape requirements were added to make for a greener, more attractive community aimed at beautifying property, providing shade, and screening vehicular areas. These landscape requirements are for commercial and industrial properties only. In both the UDC-as well as in Chapter 54- landscaping provisions do not apply to single-family properties.

In the UDC Timeline Moving Forward, Mr. Bailey stated that they have contacted the committee for meetings to sit down with citizens regarding the UDC. In February, the Long Range Committee Meeting with MPC staff occurs. Scheduled during February-April are Caddo Parish public forums/town hall meetings to discuss UDC concerns with Caddo Parish residents and stakeholders. During May-June, MPC deliver first draft UDC amendments based on public outreach efforts. In July, MPC staff will present UDC amendments to MPC Board for recommendation. In August, Caddo Parish Commission is to vote on UDC amendments.

Mr. Chavez agreed the UDC is not written for a rural lifestyle. He brought forward Act 34 from Chapter 54 which states the Commission came make the changes. He presented a memo from the Parish Attorney that this shall receive a favorable vote of not less than 2/3s of the entire membership of the city council and police jury. Basically, the Commission cannot enact or amend the UDC without getting recommendations from the MPC. He states that Chapter 54 did not work and the UDC did not work and it is time to retool. He suggested having a Parish Development Code, where the people in the parish dictate a lifestyle for themselves and how they would like to develop a code. A code is needed, but the citizens should also be able to keep and enjoy the rural lifestyle. Mr. Chavez announced the first town hall meeting is schedule on February 25th at Bill Cockrell Park, and the second one is on March 10th at 288 East Flournoy Lucas. He hopes in conjunction with different parish members coming out to get the citizen's expectations and that if there is something drafted that the MPC can present it to the committee. Mr. Chavez then called on Mr. Clark to thank him for his management on working on the UDC.

Mr. Clark elaborated that they wanted to inform the committee of what they were doing, what was in place at the present time and what changes were considered and present the information in the meeting today. He also mentioned how they wrestled with the idea of what they would call a code outside of the city of limits of Shreveport. They have noticed the Unified Development Code eludes to where the restricted areas or the jurisdictional areas are within the Parish. That's why they thought that Caddo Parish Unified Development Code within the required MPC was official but they are not closed to any ideas to what needs to be the name. Lastly, he mentions how glad he is to hear that Mr. Chavez believes there needs to be protection in place.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned.

Michelle Nations
Deputy Commission Clerk