

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
CADDO PARISH COMMISSION'S  
LONG RANGE PLANNING/SPECIAL PROJECTS COMMITTEE  
HELD ON THE 23rd DAY OF JULY, 2020

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

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

**CERTIFICATE OF TELECONFERENCE**

WHEREAS, the Governor of the State of Louisiana has issued Proclamation Number 33 JBE 2020, stating that, due to the current Public Health emergency declared in the Governor's Proclamation Number 25 JBE 2020, and citing the provisions of La. R.S. 29:721, et seq., granting him the authority to control the "ingress and egress to and from a disaster, the movement of persons within the area, and the occupancy of premises therein; and,

WHEREAS, the Governor, in Proclamation Number 33 JBE 2020, has limited all gatherings of 10 or more people, for public safety purposes; and,

WHEREAS, Governor has issued a general stay at home order "unless performing an essential activity," 33 JBE 2020, Section 3; and,

WHEREAS, attendance at a Caddo Parish Commission Long Range Planning Committee meeting is not stated in the list of essential activities, listed in 33 JBE 2020, Section 3; and,

WHEREAS, the usual conduct of the meeting would require travel and the presence of a number of persons in excess of ten (10); and, WHEREAS, the Governor of the State, in Proclamation Number 30 JBE 2020, Section 4, issued on March 16, 2020, has invoked the aforementioned statutes authorizing him to allow attendance at essential governmental meetings via teleconference or video conference during the pendency of this emergency; and,

THEREFORE, the Caddo Parish Commission hereby certifies that it will not be able to obtain a quorum and convene a meeting in a public forum on July 23, 2020 due to the Governor's proclamations, and will be required to meet by video conference, and, if necessary teleconference, on that date as allowed by law and the Proclamations of the Governor listed above.

Date: July 20th, 2020

/s/Mario Chavez  
Caddo Parish Commission President

**CITIZENS COMMENTS**

James Brown submitted the following statement:

We want to remind you that those 697 had a majority vote in the Louisiana House of Representatives and full support in Louisiana Senate. This was due to our lack of representation, with an appointed MPC board. This needs to be understood when moving forward as Caddo Alliance for Freedom pushes to have the appointed board removed completely. We believe in planning and zoning regulations that will stand strong and reflect our way of life in the rural area, and they're not constantly reshaped and amended to fulfill city's ongoing struggle to survive.

Randy Rasmussen submitted the following statement:

HB 697— PLEASE STOP amending UDC codes— PLEASE move to revert to the CURRENT Caddo parish codes and Ordinances as they have been for years!! WE DO NOT WANT UDC ordinances, PERIOD!! This is why we pushed for HB 697!!!!

**NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Johnson welcomed everyone to today's meeting and said that the following items will be discussed:

- Continued discussion and action regarding Ordinance No. 5939, *an ordinance to amend Volume II of the Code of Ordinances of the Parish of Caddo, as amended, the Caddo Parish Unified Development Code, by amending Section 2.3 Definition of General Terms; by amending Section 5.3 Use Definitions, by amending Section 6.1 Principal Use Standards, by amending Section 7.3 Accessory Structures & Uses, by amending Article 8 Off Street Parking & Loading; by amending Article 9 Sign Regulations; by amending Article 16 Zoning Application Approval Processes; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto*
- Discussion regarding HB 697

It was **moved by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *to recommend to the full body*

*to suspend amending the UDC, suspend enforcement of the recreational vehicles section of the UDC until a new code is developed and approved.*

He noted that this motion does not include enforcing oversized vehicles for business purposes, nor does it include zoning from one category to the next.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know if this apply to areas that are not in the Parish, but are adjacent to the city limits. Mr. Johnson clarified that an area will either be in the Parish or the City. Mr. Jackson would like to see an amendment with regards to lot sizes. He said that he can support the suspension in the Parish where the lot sizes are larger, but is not sure if he can support it where the lot sizes are smaller.

Mr. Clark asked for clarification regarding the neighborhoods in which Mr. Jackson was referring. Mr. Jackson gave examples of Timberline, Dixie Gardens, and Windermere Estates. He said that those neighborhoods are not in the rural areas of the Parish, but are considered in the Parish. Mr. Jackson further explained that those neighborhoods are geographically inside the city or abuts to the city limits.

He said those are the neighborhoods he would like to be exempt from the suspension of the enforcement. Mr. Jackson said that the lot sizes in those neighborhoods are small, so an RV or recreational vehicle in the middle of the yard is not appealing to the character of the neighborhood.

**Amendment by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *to enforce recreational vehicles in the neighborhoods that are geographically positioned inside the city limits, but are considered in the Parish only if a complaint is made.*

Attorney Bernstein pointed out that the ordinance before the Committee exempts R-A and R-E from the recreational vehicle provisions. It proposes to add language and says that the storage of trailers and recreational vehicles shall not apply to operational recreational vehicles located in the R-A or R-E Zoning Districts.

Attorney Bernstein further explained that the MPC “paused” any further amendments to the UDC.

The Clerk of the Commission repeated the motion to suspend amending the UDC and to suspend the enforcement of the Recreational Vehicles section unless it is initialized by a complaint from the neighborhood.

Mr. Johnson clarified that his motion is *to suspend amending the UDC until the new code is development and approved.*

Mr. Jackson wanted to know if a citizen complains about a recreational vehicle in the areas that he mentioned, there would be enforcement. Attorney Bernstein stated that the Zoning Administrator is responsible for zoning enforcement. Mr. Clark said that if this amendment is not adopted, the Zoning Administrator would have the authority to go out and take whatever actions are necessary.

Mr. Hopkins wanted to clarify that if Ordinance No. 5939 of 2020 is not moved forward, the Zoning Administrator would only come out if a complaint is made. The Committee stated that was not the case. Attorney Bernstein explained that R-A and R-E zoning would be exempt from the Recreational Vehicles section if 5939 is advanced. He further said that if the ordinance is not advanced, it would be back to the old way.

Mr. Chavez said that he would not like to see someone receive a citation for storing their operational RV in their driveway. Mr. Clark reiterated that this ordinance would exempt R-A and R-E zoning districts from the prohibition of recreational vehicles in their driveway. If this ordinance is not moved forward, then R-A and R-E zoning districts would not be exempt from storing recreational vehicles in their driveway.

Attorney Bernstein further explained that the ordinance before the Committee makes minor changes to throughout the whole UDC. It includes the concerns regarding operational recreational vehicles parked in citizens’ front yards. He also pointed out that everyone in the same zoning districts should be treated equally and enforcement should not be done in a discriminatory manner.

Attorney Bernstein also pointed out that you cannot amend this ordinance in the way that Mr. Johnson’s would like because this is a law. If it his desire to not have the MPC on its own initiative enforce the zoning ordinance with regards to recreational vehicles, that can be communicated without addressing it in this ordinance, he said.

Mr. Johnson suggested that he could make a motion to suspend the UDC, and from the floor stop all citations with regards to recreational vehicles within certain areas of the Parish. Attorney Bernstein suggested considering postponing indefinitely Ordinance No. 5939. With regard to the other issue, they will have the status quo with regard to recreational vehicles.

Mr. Johnson also suggested to keep this UDC as is until a new code is created unique to the Parish. He also suggested that enforcement be on a complaint based system, rather than the Zoning Administrator go out and issue citations.

Mr. Jackson pointed out that HB 697 was a response to the cognitive assessment of the

Caddo Alliance for Freedom. He said that it was rushed to the legislature during a time when people could not effectively rally or organize against it.

Mr. Jackson also said that he is in support of more lax RV requirements in the rural settings where the lot sizes are bigger. He said that there are instances where the RVs are parked in a yard, and the neighbor gets tired of looking at it. We cannot inconvenience other property owners just to be able to convenience someone else, he said.

Mr. Jackson wanted to know if the neighborhoods that are in the Parish but geographically in the city limits be labeled as a different category. He said that there needs to be a way to ensure they have the zoning protections that they originally sought when building on that property. Mr. Johnson explained that those citizens have protections through their covenants.

Attorney Bernstein pointed out to accomplish what Mr. Jackson is suggesting is to rezone those neighborhoods, which will be an amendment to the UDC. Mr. Jackson asked that this be reviewed when creating the new code.

**Substitute motion by Mr. Johnson**, seconded by Mr. Chavez, *to postpone Ordinance No. 5939 of 2020. Motion carried*, as shown by the following roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Chavez, Hopkins, Jackson, and Johnson (4). NAYS: None (0). ABSENT: Commissioner Young (1). ABSTAIN: None (0).

At this time, the Committee moved onto the next New Business item, *discussion about HB 697*.

Mr. Johnson said that he would like something put together as quickly as possible, but also to be "measured many times, but cut once".

Mr. Hopkins wanted to know if the Commission would need to create a board. Attorney Bernstein agreed. Mr. Hopkins then wanted to know if, by state law, the Commission has to create a Master Plan for the unincorporated areas of the Parish. Attorney Bernstein agreed.

Mr. Jackson suggested that no less than four or five public hearings be held in the affected areas. He would also suggest to have as much public outreach as possible.

Mr. Johnson mentioned that there were several public meetings held for the UDC, but people did not attend them because they thought it did not pertain to them. When it did affect the citizens, that is when the uproar and concern came about. Mr. Johnson suggested that it be known to the citizens that the new code will affect them.

Attorney Bernstein explained that the format needed would be a Zoning Commission/Board to administer a Zoning Land Use Plan for the unincorporated areas of the Parish. Mr. Jackson wanted to know if the Parish could contract with the current zoning commission. Attorney Bernstein said that effective January 2022, the Commission could do anything it wanted in regards to a zoning commission. He said that there could be a CEA with the City to have the MPC administer it, or the Commission could create its own in house "as a blank slate". Attorney Bernstein suggested that those structural decisions should be made sooner rather than later.

Mr. Clark agreed with Attorney Bernstein's statements. He also requested that those structural decisions be made sooner than later. He said that he has the staff to invest the time and effort in developing this new code, but it would be courteous if the Commission would let them know if they would like to go in a different direction. He does not believe it would be fair to them to invest all of the time and energy if they Commission decides to create a whole new board. Mr. Jackson and Mr. Johnson agreed with Mr. Clark.

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



Michelle Nations  
Deputy Commission Clerk