

**SHREVEPORT METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION OF CADDO PARISH  
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING APRIL 1, 2026**

A regularly scheduled public hearing of the Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission of Caddo Parish was held on Wednesday, April 1, 2026 at 3:00 p.m. at Government Plaza Chamber, 505 Travis Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA. The members met in the MPC Conference room prior to the hearing for case manager presentations.

**Members' Present**

Rachel Jackson, Vice Chair  
Chris Elbersen  
Bill Robertson  
Fred Moss, IV  
Rose Wilson McCulloch

**Staff Present**

Stephen Jean, Interim Executive Director  
Reginald Jordan, Zoning Administrator  
Emily Trant, Land Development Coordinator  
Jomari Smith, Planner I  
Christian Terrell, Planner I  
Nikolas Holt, Planner I  
Myldred Ingram, Executive Administrative Assistant

**Members Absent**

Winzer Andrews, Chair  
Gabriel Balderas  
Harold Sater

The hearing was opened with prayer by Rose Wilson McCulloch The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Bill Robertson

The meeting was called to order & the procedure for hearing the applications on today's agenda was explained. Speakers should speak clearly in 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, the City Council. Appeals must be filed within 10 days from the date a decision is rendered by the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

**A motion was made by Fred Moss, IV, seconded by Rose Wilson McCulloch, to approve the minutes of the March 4, 2026 public hearing as submitted.**

**The motion was adopted by the following 5-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ELBERSON, MOSS, ROBERTSON and Meses. WILSON MCCULLOCH & JACKSON Nays NONE. Absent: ANDREWS, BALDERAS, and SATER.**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**CASE NO. 26-20-C ZONING REQUEST**

Applicant: NXT LEVEL CONSTRUCTION, LLC  
Owner: NXT LEVEL CONSTRUCTION, LLC  
Location: 6200 blk Bert Kouns Industrial Loop (N side of Bert Kouns Ind Loop, approx., 570' NW of McGoldrick Dr)  
Existing Zoning: C-3 & R-E to C-4  
Request: Contractor Office or Warehouse and Storage Yard – Outdoor

**Representative &/or support:**

**Kurt Nixon 1628 Benton Road, Bossier City, LA 71111**

Mr. Nixon, of Nixon Engineering Solutions, is here on behalf of the Applicant who is looking to grow a permanent home for his site construction company. Most of his client base is in DeSoto and Red River Parish, however, he prefers to plant his company in Shreveport, his home. This parcel might be difficult to develop for other owners; however, the client has the means to provide upfront costs that will be needed to overcome both a 2,100' access road to get to the usable portion of the property. In addition, level a very large hole on the property, due to there being a dirt pit there at one time. With the help of his in-house staff, he is able to overcome those challenges. Mr. Nixon doesn't agree with the Staff Report that says: The proposed zoning transition also does not align with the prevailing development pattern in the surrounding area. Within a 1,500-foot radius, most properties are actively used or developed for residential purposes. He believes a more accurate picture is that the property on 3 of 4 sides is simply undeveloped agricultural land. It's zoned RE with no homes on it. There's been no development in the last 40 years on the north, east or west sides. The south side has seen some zoning changes, mostly to C-3 and C-4. It seems that the prevailing development pattern is for commercial, particularly C-3 and C-4 and not Residential, according to the changes in zoning in the surrounding neighborhood businesses. So, with that they would prefer the C-4 zoning that was in our initial application. This allows his client to conduct his planned use on the property by right versus the C-3 designation which requires a Special Use Permit. The client would then have to come again before this board and having to do this adds a hurdle and further delay to the project. Mr. Nixon has asked for C-4 approval today.

**Sean Madden 404 Jann Dr., Shreveport, LA 71106**

Mr. Madden opens with appreciation for the invocation and states that he has a lot of respect for the way the meeting was opened, asking for guidance from the Lord. Mr. Madden is 31 years old. He had a very humble start, purchasing one piece of equipment at a time from the time he was 20. More than anything he just wants a home for his business. He has lots of dreams and vision for this property and is asking that the property be zoned C-4 versus C-3. He'd like a nice driveway with a gate and garden. He asks that the Board approve a C-4 so he can finance this project on his own. If he is approved for a C-3 only, he would then have to get bank financing to start the building. Mr. Madden wanted to introduce himself and let the Board know why he's applying for the C-4 zoning.

ROBERTSON Thank you for coming. I assume you are the owner of NXT Level Construction, LLC. MADDEN Yes. I should have made that clear. ROBERTSON, I appreciate you being here and your statements. We do not always follow the recommendation of the staff. But it is my understanding that a C-3 is a bit lighter than the zone you're requesting. The C-3 will give you the ability to do what you want to do on your property, but it will have less impact on your neighbors. That's one of the foundational concepts of planning and zoning, which is that we protect our neighbors. With all due respect to you, Mr. Nixon and your comments. That's the direction I would like to go here. The concern is much broader than that has to do with the city and surrounding areas. MADDEN Okay. I understand. JACKSON You are aware that the recommendation is for denial of the C-4 but suggested that you have the C-3 zoning. Are you okay with that? MADDEN, I know, per me and Mr. Nixon's conversation, I trust him. He feels it would be better for me to have C-4 to make my life easier. But if I'm able to do the same thing with C-3, then I'm going to get there. There's no failure in my mind. McCULLOCH Did I understand you say you would have to borrow money? MADDEN Yes, and I might have to borrow money either way. But (with) C-3... am I correct by saying, I would basically have to build the building up front? Yes, correct? So right now, if I was able to get C-4, it would be easier for me if I could go in and store my equipment without a building, level the land and install some gravel. Currently, without having to just jump straight into building a building. Maybe I could get through this first year before I did that, but if C-3 is the recommendation that's what I'll have to do. I'll be okay with whatever you decide.

JACKSON asks JEAN what the time frame was for "immediately" referring to Mr. Madden stating that he would have to build a building "immediately."

JEAN says that the applicant couldn't store his equipment outside in a C-3 zoning but could with a C-4 zoning by right, without the building. That's what the applicant is contrasting. If he did C-3 he would come back with a special use permit, submit a site plan that would include a building and the storage area, and he would be required to operate within the plan that was submitted to you.

Mr. Madden says he would be okay with whatever is decided.

**A motion was made by Bill Robertson, seconded by Rose Wilson McCulloch, to recommend approval.**

**The motion was adopted by the following 5-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ELBERSON, MOSS, ROBERTSON and Meses. WILSON**

*draft*

**MCCULLOCH & JACKSON Nays NONE. Absent: ANDREWS, BALDERAS, and SATER.**

**CASE NO. 26-1-CTAC CODE TEXT AMENDMENT**

Applicant: METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
Request: CODE TEXT (ORDINANCE) AMENDMENTS TO THE SHREVEPORT UDC

**JEAN states that TRANT will be presenting the information in the Code Text Amendment.**

**TRANT gives a high-level overview of the specifics of the proposed Code Text Amendment stating that its purpose is to bring more uses into the downtown commercial mixed-use zoning district in effort to attract more entrepreneurs or business owners into some of the buildings in the district. The hope is that it will stabilize the buildings and mitigate losing them to blight deterioration. TRANT says they have met with the downtown development authority director, and he is supportive of the code text amendment.**

**JEAN says that he too has heard the support of the code text amendment from the downtown development authority director, and that he intended to be present at the hearing but got busy with work. He ends with the staff recommendation to approve the application.**

**Representative &/or support: None.**

**Opposition: None.**

**A motion was made by Rose Wilson McCulloch, seconded by Fred Moss, IV, to recommend approval.**

**The motion was adopted by the following 5-0 vote: Ayes: Messrs. ELBERSON, MOSS, ROBERTSON and Meses. WILSON MCCULLOCH & JACKSON Nays NONE. Absent: ANDREWS, BALDERAS, and SATER.**

**END OF PUBLIC HEARING**

**OLD BUSINESS**

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

**DIRECTORS REPORT**

**JEAN There were two cases, both involved gas stations. That case was appealed to the City Council and was heard on March 24, 2026. The City Council unanimously voted to remand it back to the MPC Board, for consideration of a traffic study. It would be prepared by the developer, submitted to the city traffic engineer who would then provide comments to Staff and there could be a potential change in the site plan, if that happens. We would bring that back to you. It could be May, it just depends. We will schedule for May in hopes that they get the traffic study done in time for us to make a recommendation. The case on Linwood Ave for a gas station with beer/wine sales will be heard at the next City Council meeting.**

**We announced last month that we would be bringing a Code Text Amendment to you in May for the landscape ordinance. Many in the development community have asked us to look at the code we first spoke with those who would be proponents of a greener environment, we met with design professionals and others who represent the development community. We have more meetings set up between now and when we present it to you. It's been extremely well vetted and will be presented at the next meeting.**

**JEAN adds one other topic that he and attorney YELLDCELL want to discuss regarding special use permit and conditional zoning district cases. Typically, these cases have stipulations associated with them. We want to make sure that we have**

*draft*

a clear public record of what those stipulations are.

**YELDELL**

This came up on the case for Kings highway when it went to council. And there was a request to see what the stipulations were in the minutes which weren't very clear. So, moving forward for clarity, we ask for the person who makes the motion to read the stipulations when voting for the record. This way the minutes will reflect it, and if it's appealed council will know exactly what the stipulations were so that they can approve or add their own stipulations at that level.

**ROBERTSON** asks **JEAN** regarding the king's highway case is there a cost associated with a traffic impact study?

**JEAN**, I'm not sure and have been advised not to give estimates as that is outside of my specialty.

**ROBERTSON**, so does this case come back to us and go back to city council?

**JEAN**, it only goes back to city council if it's appealed again, but it would be a final decision at your level. But it does not automatically go to city council.

**ROBERTSON** Concerning the landscape ordinance, are you contemplating anything regarding the preservation of trees?

**JEAN** Yes, as matter of fact we are beefing that up quite a bit. Currently the only thing we have for tree preservation is voluntary. But tree credit is not much of an incentive. We are basically saying it's a one for one you can have a large heritage tree which has a diameter of 36 inches, and you'll get credit for one tree. That doesn't work, so we are scaling it so that if you're 10 inches or below you get one, and then if you're 10 to 24 you get two and so on. The first thing we wanted to look at was giving incentive for preservation.

**ROBERTSON**, you mentioned input from the development community, can you characterize what they're saying?

**JEAN**, so far what we are hearing is that they're supportive in the direction we're headed.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

**JACKSON** asks if there is any new business or research.

**JEAN** states that we will not be having the "Research" portion of the agenda moving forward. If anything, it will be added to the agenda on a case-by-case basis.

#### **CHAIR/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMENTS**

**ROBERTSON** Mr. Jean, do we have anything new from the mayor on what he is contemplating regarding this board?

**JEAN** No, we do not.

**ADJOURN 3:40 p.m.**

---

**Winzer Andrews, Chair**

---

**Secretary**