

**CADDO PARISH PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING MARCH 25, 2026**

A regularly scheduled public hearing of the Caddo Parish Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Wednesday, March 25, 2026 at 3:00 p.m. at Government Plaza Chamber, 505 Travis Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA. Members met in the MPC Conference room prior to the hearing for case manager presentations.

**Members' Present**

Lauren Marchive, III, Chairperson  
Jake Brown, Vice Chairperson  
Calvin Presley, Secretary  
Laura Neubert  
John Dansby

**Staff Present**

Stephen Jean, Interim Executive Director  
Emily Trant, Senior Planning Coordinator  
Cytheria Jernigan, Caddo Parish Assistant Attorney  
Jomari Smith, Planner I  
Christian Terrell, Planner I  
Nikolas Holt, Planner I  
Myldred Ingram, Executive Assistant

**Members Absent**

None

The hearing was opened with prayer by Calvin Presley The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Lauren Marchive, III

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 Caddo Parish Planning and Zoning Commission are subject to appeal to the appropriate governing body, the Caddo Parish Commission. Appeals must be filed within 10 days from the date a decision is rendered by the Caddo Parish Planning and Zoning Commission.

**A motion was made by Laura Neubert, seconded by Jake Brown, to approve (with the stipulation that Mr. Humphries' name be removed from attendance) public hearing as submitted.**

**The motion was adopted by the following 5-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. BROWN, MARCHIVE, DANSBY, PRESLEY and Meses. NEUBERT. Nays: NONE. Absent: NONE**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**CASE NO. 26-4-P SPECIAL USE PERMIT**

Applicant: **DMR MECHANICAL**  
Owner: James Casey Olden  
Location: 2000 blk N Cross Cir (E side of N Cross Cir, approx., 1, 3154' SE of N Lakeshore Dr)  
Existing Zoning: R-1-7  
Request: Special Use Permit (SUP) for Dwelling – Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)

**Representative &/or support:**

**James Casey Olden 611 Ibis Ct., Shreveport, LA 71115**

Mr. Olden is here representing himself. He is requesting an ADU on the property. Both his home and the ADU would be built at the same time. He states that his HOA has approved the plans he presented to them.

**Opposition:**

**Robert Brown 2340 N. Cross Dr, Shreveport, LA 71107**

Mr. Brown is representing the HOA Board and members of the neighborhood. There are very expensive properties at N Cross subdivision. Mr. Brown states that there should only be "single family" residences per lot. He does not want to challenge what Mr. Olden is saying. However, the lots are for "single-family" dwellings per the covenant. He states that Mr. Olden presented plans to the HOA Board for a "house". The plans were submitted to the architectural committee for the house and not any other adjoining structure. We have a copy for the record. The plans say that the ADU was a pool house. A pool house is not a residence. Not even a temporary residence. According to the plans that were submitted, the floor elevation is lower than the flood plane. The HOA board is asking if a permit was even asked of the City of Shreveport yet for approval, because we do not have that jurisdiction, but we certainly question it. If there was a Variance, people at the end of the peninsula would be affected by any change in property value or variances in the covenants, to both people inside and outside the notification areas. We had some questions for the applicant regarding his plans for the ADU. Short- term and long-term use. They would like to see a proposed plan that supports a pool house, as opposed to a mother-in-law or temporary residence and documentation related to the elevation. There are others in the audience who oppose this application as well.

**MARCHIVE** You have concerns regarding permitting process and FEMA requirements for flood elevation.

**BROWN** In performing our own research, a zoning cannot supersede our covenant, no matter how strict.

**MARCHIVE** As far as this commission is concerned, the covenant has no bearing on the zoning ordinances of the parish whatsoever. Covenants are a legal document and are only between the property owners and must be dealt with in a legal manner, not here in a public hearing under zoning rules.

**BROWN** Does the Board not take into consideration the effect on the surrounding community (when they make a zoning variance? (Archive starts to respond.) That was a question.

**MARCHIVE** My first question would be, you have no objection to a pool house?

**BROWN** No. I'm not on an architectural committee. I know that I was told by the president of the HOA that the only approval needed of the architectural committee was on the main structure. And really, the architectural committee only wants to make sure that the square footage is correct and allowed, and the color scheme matches consistency of the neighborhood.

**NEUBERT** Mr. Jean, could you re-educate us on how does this application for an ADU in R-1-7 fits in with this Special Use Permit request?

**JEAN** Accessory Dwelling Units are not by right and do require a Special Use Permit. They always accompany a site plan. Then we review that. In the code there is a set of standards that make sure it's not seen recognized easily as an additional dwelling but more subordinate to the principal dwelling. It cannot be built beyond a certain size, required square footage. It has to be at the rear or attached to the building. It cannot look like duplex or anything that might look different than another accessory-type structure, i.e. storage. There's an extensive list that we go through. We also look at the way it lays out on the property. It meets all the required setbacks. Own legal means of ingress and egress, provisions for sleeping, eating and living. They should have some type of kitchen or kitchen to prepare food, bathrooms for sanitation, etc. An ADU may be completely detached. And should be visibly subordinate to the principal dwelling. Other units that might be allowable. That they are visible from the public "right of way." They should have architectural features like windows and doors and other things of that nature that help it blend in with the community. It cannot exceed 60% of the gross floor, the principal dwelling or 1,800 square feet. They may only be in the rear yard. The staff report clarifies what the parking requirements are and things of that nature. So, this Board makes sure that the applicant is compliant with those standards. And it seems to be compatible with the neighborhood. This is eligible for you to decide on it today.

**MARCHIVE** Any other comments?

**BROWN** No. Thank you.

**REBUTTAL:**

**Robert Brown 2340 N. Cross Dr. Shreveport, LA 71107**

(MARCHIVE States that addressing the commission about the architectural review board would help.) OLDEN The plans that I turned in, were sent to Ricky Hall, who is on the ACC. It had the main home and what was the "pool house." My wife and I thought of making the structure as a dwelling with living quarters, instead considering my mother age and health. Mr. Olden works in the field, so he knew that permits were needed. States, he didn't want any issues down the line. That's when he and his wife were told that they would have to go through this process. He found out what an ADU was. I met with an MPC planner. He didn't think it would be a big deal because he's seen a for sale listing recently for property with a similar 20x30 guest house on it. Says he's almost positive that the listing is on North Cross and Squirrel Point. Regardless of that house, this has been in the works for weeks and weeks. I don't know the difference between calling it a pool house or an ADU, it's just a building. The building matches the home colors. The windows with match and the roof will match. The driveway dead ends into it. Most of it is hidden behind the home. Neither the house nor the ADU will be small. I don't think it would affect the value of the homes around it; that's what he believes even though he is not a realtor. As far as the flood elevation goes after reaching out to the city and they said that the base flood elevation is 177. He's had a surveyor go out and give him that information. A neighboring home was found to be at 178.5. He said we needed to be at least 1ft above the 177' flood zone baseline. I have not pulled a permit for the main home yet because when we started this process and found out that we needed to have this meeting for the ADU. The plans that were originally turned in to the architectural committee now need to say something else. Then I'll turn the plans in for the main home.

MARCHIVE Our task today is to rule on whether or not you are allowed to have an ADU in this application. Your floor plan seems to be a bit misleading. It appears to be more like that of a pool house because there is no bedroom; it shows an office.

OLDEN So, I didn't have it redrawn yet because I have to pay the gentleman that has to (alter) rewrite the names on it. What shows as the office will be a bedroom, attached to a full bathroom, full closet and another ½ bathroom, pantry, playroom, living and kitchen, laundry room. I didn't want to spend more money having plans drawn and it not be approved.

MARCHIVE It is strongly advised that you resolve any issues regarding the neighborhood covenant before you start construction.

NEUBERT Just so that this is on the record. The finished floor elevation throughout these plans read 171.8. You will be addressing that? OLDEN Yes, Ma'am. The 177 is what the city says the floor has to be above. That will be part of the changes as well as making changes to the names in the plans? OLDEN Yes, Ma'am.

**MARCHIVE** In order to get a permit, he's going to have a civil engineer give him a certificate showing what the flood plane is. That's just part of the process. Thank you for your time, Sir. If we don't have anything else.

**A motion was made by Jake Brown, seconded by Calvin Presley to approve this application.**

**MARCHIVE** Any discussion?

**BROWN** People are getting older and costs are getting more expensive. This is happening all over the parish. I strongly believe if he wants his mom there, we should allow it. People who live in that neighborhood do have the covenants to go back on because he bought the property with those restrictions. I think it's something that he should be able to do.

**NEUBERT** I made a comment 2 years ago about this same type of case. These ADU's are becoming more commonplace to come before us. We've had one in each of the last few meetings. Jake is right. Aging parents, cost of living, cost of care in a facility. The lack of quality care in facilities is driving people to make decisions to build an ADU or some type of accommodation which would fall under an ADU. I believe we're going to see these types of cases come before us.

**The motion was adopted by the following 4-0-1 vote: Ayes: Messrs. BROWN, MARCHIVE, HUMPHREY, and PRESLEY and Mes. NEUBERT. ABSTAINED: Messr. DANSBY Nays: NONE. Absent: NONE**

**CASE NO. 26-5-P ZONING REQUEST**

Applicant: **SIGHTLINE CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT LLC**  
Owner: **WICKER CONSTRUCTION INC**  
Location: **9640 Wallace Lake Rd (W side of Wallace Lake Rd, approx., 1,415' N of Mayo Rd)**  
Existing Zoning: **R-E**  
Request: **R-E to C-1 and I-1**

**Representative &/or support:**

**Ashley Powers 1065 Providential Place Blvd, Ste. 126, Shreveport, LA 71106**

I'll be happy to answer any questions on the zoning request.

**MARCHIVE** We understand this is simply, hopefully correcting an old map issue.

**POWERS** We're reverting. Correct. It didn't come up until they were looking to do an office extension and during the permitting process, they made us aware of it.

**INAUDIBLE**

**Ron Wicker 10326 Ellerbe Rd, Shreveport, LA 71106**

I got the property zoned 20 years ago. I didn't know they changed it back. My office looks like me, like a house. Most of my work is out of town anyway. So, I just came here in case there are any questions.

**Opposition: None.**

**A motion was made by** Laura Neubert **seconded by** Jake Brown **to** recommend this application for approval.

**NEUBERT** During today's work session trying to figure out how this happened to cause the rezoning from the old zoning to the one that is most current, basically down zoned from the UDC process. It was said that there were no complaints. I commend Mr. Powers and especially Mr. Powers for being a good neighbor.

**The motion was adopted by the following 5-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. BROWN, MARCHIVE, DANSBY, PRESLEY and Ms. NEUBERT. Nays: NONE. Absent: NONE**

**CASE NO. 26-6-P ZONING MAP AMENDMENT (REZONING)**

Applicant: **"BYN LLC"**  
Owner: **YOKEM LAND SERVICES, LLC**  
Location: **8600 blk Box Rd, approx., 1,700' S of Mt. Zion Rd)**  
Existing Zoning: **C-4**  
Request: **C-4 to I-2**

**Representative &/or support:**

**Michael Kelsch 4913 Shed Rd, Bossier City, LA 71111**

I am the engineer representing the landowner. The landowner is wanting to sell these 5 acres to the adjacent neighbor, which is Testament Construction. It used to be SI Pre Cast. They are going to make that a part of their existing site. So, we're here to answer any questions.

**MARCHIVE** I'd like for you to point out where Testament Construction is on the map. Are they east, west, north or south?

**KELSCH** They are to the east. **MARCHIVE** The primary reason for rezoning is because C-4 doesn't allow for construction companies? Is that correct? But an I-2 does?

**JEAN** No. A C-2 does but there was a warehouse component, I think. One other issue with this. It's to match the existing zoning that is there, so that once they combine the lots there's no split zoning.

**Opposition: None.**

**A motion was made by** Laura Neubert **seconded by** Jake Brown **to** recommend this application for approval.

**The motion was adopted by the following 5-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. BROWN, MARCHIVE, DANSBY, PRESLEY and Meses. NEUBERT. Nays: NONE. Absent: NONE**

**END OF PUBLIC HEARING**

**OLD BUSINESS**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**NEUBERT** May 15 is the deadline to complete the financial disclosures. If you miss that deadline, you will be fined.

**MARCHIVE** As well, your Ethics training can be done online, also and must be completed by a certain time each year, through the Ethics Board.

**JEAN** There's no Director's Report today. I would like to mention that the Chair will be officially facilitating the meeting during the pre-briefing. Laurent and I talked about this recently. I will continue to function in calling the cases, but this hearing and the pre-briefing is your meeting. This will begin next month.

**MARCHIVE** What we talked about was, it's our meeting. It's not the MPC's meeting. So, we'll run the meeting.

**NEUBERT** suggested the vice chair or other members could facilitate the "pre-briefing" as a means of training, as a way to get their feet wet.

**MARCHIVE** That's good.

**OTHER MATTERS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE COMMISSION**

**CHAIR/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMENTS**

**BROWN**, we call this meeting adjourned.

**ADJOURNED 3:38 p.m.**

---

**Lauren Marchive, III, Chair**

---

**Calvin Presley, Secretary**