

**SHREVEPORT METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION OF CADDO PARISH  
SUMMARY MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING MAY 6, 2026**

A regularly scheduled public hearing of the Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission of Caddo Parish was held on Wednesday, May 6, 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  
Gabriel Balderas  
Harold Sater  
Rose Wilson McCulloch

**Staff Present**

Stephen Jean, Interim Executive Director  
Emily Trant, Land Development Coordinator  
Tanner Yeldell, City Attorney's Office  
Reginald Jordan, Zoning Administrator  
Nikolas Holt, Planner 1

**Members Absent**

Winzer Andrews, Chair  
Fred Moss, IV  
Bill Robertson

The hearing was opened with prayer by Rose Wilson McCulloch The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Harold Sater

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 Harold Sater, seconded by Rose Wilson McCulloch, to approve the minutes of the April 1, 2026 public hearing as submitted.**

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

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**CASE NO. 26-8-C SPECIAL USE PERMIT & SITE PLAN**

Applicant: iARCHiTECTURE  
Owner: M & M CAPITAL INVESTMENTS, LLC  
Location: 3100 Highland Ave (SW corner of Kings Hwy & Highland Ave)  
Existing Zoning: C-2  
Request: Special Use Permit for Gas Station & Retail Sales of Alcohol – Beer/Wine

**Representative &/or support:**

Jeff Spikes 4740 Richmond Ave, Shreveport La

SPIKES mentions how he understands that his case I back in front of the Board due to being remanded back from city council. He states that the Bard may remember their initial request for rezoning at the end of 2025. It was rejected; they then came back and completely redesigned the site and had a second NPP meeting which was better received by the community. They came back in front of the Board for a second time and were approved, they took all the stipulations and applied them to the C-2 portion of the site. After that approval they had an appeal filed for the case, it went to city council and was remanded back to the MPC Board due to the council wanting a traffic impact report. The traffic report was completed and shared with the MPC Board in the pre briefing. Spikes says that the study shows that there is no significant adverse impact on the traffic pattern of the intersection for the Kings and Highland development. The study shows that there are new trips generated with the biggest impact being a bit of a wait time when leaving the development to get back out on Kings. The study showed there were no further modifications needed to the site.

One of the big changes was mitigating the inlet and outlet onto highland to prevent traffic from pushing back into the neighborhood.

**JACKSON** asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the agenda item. No other support or favor was present. She then asked if there was any opposition to the application.

**Opposition:**

John B Atkins 235 Kings Highway Shreveport, La

This is his 3<sup>rd</sup> time Infront of the Board in opposition of the application. He along with his partners are the second largest private landowners in the Highland area. Atkins says he's in the area daily and sees what transpires, He says there is a population on the north side of king's highway, homeless, transient, whatever you desire to call them is a threat to their community. The homeless have set trashcans on fire, been caught squatting etc. he says he bring up those issues because the circle k across the street, which is the other large gas station in the area, has been a magnet for that demographic. He believes that this development, no matter how nice it may be; will be a magnet for transients that will only bring the community further down.

Atkins says highland is a very delicate area, many people have given up on the area and moved south so that they don't have to deal with such things that the highland community deals with. He says there needs to be more homeownership in the area so that people care more about the property they're living on. If people continue to flee the area due to the surroundings, the highland community will go further south. That is the number one reason he is against it, and he doesn't live in the area, but does own property in the area that he tends to quite often. He states that the others waiting to speak against the application do live in the neighborhood, and that do not want business being presented. They take care of their homes, love the neighborhood and have improved their street and do not want anything to challenge their progress. Atkins adds that he urges the Board to vote against it, but if it were to happen, he hopes there's no encroachment into the neighborhood. He ends saying he understands what the books say about the difference in C-1 and C-2 but he doesn't see much of a difference.

Ian Cairns 507 Atkins Ave Shreveport, La

He and his wife Patricia have been living at their home in highland for 25 years, and he votes against the application. He states that he's picked up the masterplan for the city of Shreveport, and that he sees that the plan elements are strong neighborhoods, transportation choice, healthy people and environment, artistic, historic and cultural wealth thriving economy and workforce, quality services and whole community implication. He says, no one that lives in this community is for the project and has been since day one. He will be disappointed if the MPC votes for the application because he feels they do one thing and say another.

Graham Todd 503 Atkins Ave. Shreveport, La

Todd lives in the area of the development he says he's sure the master plan does not include excessive gas stations or beer and wine sells. He says the MPC staff report doesn't mention the Brookshires across the street or the liquor store in the area "beer and wine sells do not help domestic situations". He says the traffic study in the report indicates a 5-10 second delay in traffic in

*draft*

that area. Todd says driving down King's Highway can be very much like a sporting adventure. There are narrow roads, people move at definite speeds and adding a 5-10 second delay within a few couple hundred feet at most of an intersection will not make drivers happier or safer, there's also a bus stop at the corner. Mr. Todd shares an area markup that he drew showing the vicinity of the proposed project and what's already there saying that it would add to traffic congestion and he feels that was not addressed. He says the community does not need the extra gas station.

Andia Augustin Billy 521 Atkins Ave. Shreveport, La

She has lived in her home for 7 years and that Centenary college brough her to the area as she is not from Louisiana. Billy says that she's a mother for a 10- and 6-year-old, she walks the area as much as possible and generally feels safe. She states that she has also been before the Board to testify against this project 3 or 4 times. She feels the project makes no sense having 3 gas stations back-to-back and for people to have access to so much liquor. Her home shares a border with a group home and that they've been great neighbors and feels this severely impacts them as well. She says the community has been consistent in their opposition and isn't too sure who in the community has supported because she feels the community has been consistent in the opposition. Billy feels that it is a safety concern to add a business such as this to their community and that it will not advance their community.

Pam Todd 503 Atkins Ave Shreveport, La

Todd mentioned that once the application was denied last time, she made a petition and 10 people signed two of which were Frank and Mary Hughes, who she says have been forbidden to speak about the case. She didn't bring the petition with her.

Todd says the agreement says the Hughes can maintain their property rights if they do not speak in opposition to the application. She says they are the house right beside the property.

**JACKSON** says she wants to address the comment of those who are forbidden to speak and asked the MPC to address that comment.

**YELDELL** says he knows they had an attorney representing them and if that was advice from their attorney or not. He is unaware of any rule that this body would have to prevent them from their position on this application.

**JEAN** states that it was not a requirement of this staff or the MPC Board, and that it may have been a private agreement and we don't get involved in private agreements.

Todd says the agreement is in the staff report for public view and then asked to have her time reset since it ran out.

**A motion was made by** Rose Wilson McCulloch, **seconded by** Harold Sater, **to give the speaker 3 more minutes.**

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

Todd, thanks the Board for more time and says she didn't bring the petition with her, but it had 39 signatures and she did turn it into city hall, they took her only copy. She says within the 300-foot range of giving notice, there are 29 residencies within that given range, more residences than businesses and everyone she spoke to is against it. Theres a sober living facility nearby that's less than 70 feet from the property, and a home 4 doors down from hers that feels they are unable to sell their home due to the cost of the proposed development.

Todd quoted some language from the last time this application was in front of the Board. Also adding that when asked whoever else in the room was in opposition 23 additional people that did not speak stood up. She asks, why did the Board approve the application last time if the community was against it?

**JACKSON** deferred to the MPC staff to answer her question.

**JEAN** When the case came before the Board the first time, the gas station was not what was in front of the board, whether to change the zoning on the corner from C-1 to C-2 was. We knew people were opposed to the gas station, but that was not what was in front of the Board at the time. We as staff did not want to see what's called commercial creep begin to go further into the neighborhood. We did not believe approval was warranted, and the MPC Board denied that application.

The gas station came in front of this Board for the first time at last month's meeting, and the reason we were looking at whether this use has had mitigation to deal with negative impacts. The applicant did quite a few things to mitigate those impacts, there were still people, still today, who are opposed for two primary reasons, the gas station and for fuel sales, those can be approved, if there's a site plan that mitigates those uses, the staff and board voted that those issues had been properly mitigated to the point that this is not a typical gas station or convenience store.

The design is radically different than what you would normally see, we do not agree that it is a highway type but more of a neighborhood corridor type design. Had a neighborhood plan been done where we could really work through this, because you talked about the master plan which does talk about neighborhood plans then there might have been something where the neighborhood could craft something where those uses weren't allowed in the C-2 district. There's an ability for applicants to have some of those uses allowed by presenting a properly designed site plan. It is staff opinion that it was a properly designed site plan that mitigated enough of those uses that could be allowed, the Board made that decision and that's what we're looking at today.

I know it seems that it was denied, then approved but only going further into the neighborhood with commercial use was denied. It went to council, they were not comfortable with the traffic, there was a traffic impact study conducted the results have been presented this Board now has the decision after hearing all information.

Todd The special use permit... when did that go into effect? My understanding is that they were created because I believe Tabitha Taylor said they were tired of seeing so many gas stations and liquor stores popping up in neighborhoods so were implementing special use permits to evaluate each project on an as need basis. Did I misinterpret that?

**JEAN** Yes, you misinterpreted. You put the gas station in the mix again. It was beer and wine that the city council did not like the fact that it was by right and that the neighborhood did not have a chance to have any input on it. What would happen if that wasn't put into place then the neighborhood wouldn't even know about it until it was already built. They wanted to interject this public discourse, which is what we're doing today, it gives the community the opportunity to express themselves, its due process. The C-2 district has always been a special use permit area, and when we look at the difference between C-1 and C-2 or C-2 and C-3, for C-3 it is allowed by right, but as a transitional district between C-1 and C-2 there are some circumstances related to the location and whether or not the site plan tries to mitigate the impact.

Graham Todd 503 Atkins Ave. Shreveport, La

The agreement between Frank and Mary Hughes was on page 3 of the staff report.

**JEAN** that was a civil agreement, is not an agreement that we're imposing. It's just giving acknowledgement that there is one.

### **Rebuttal**

Jeff Spikes 4740 Richmond Ave, Shreveport La

This is the second time I have endured untrue statements directed at me and his client regarding the case. The first being about gas tanks taken out of the ground at another site. The second being about Mr. and Mrs. Hughes. The Hughes came to the client in which they said they would honor all that they said they would. They decided to hire Mr. Miciotto, he prepared the statement, my client signed it with no change. He doesn't appreciate being accused of doing something just to make a production out of it. He has 112 signatures on a petition, and if the addresses are compared to those who stood up to speak in last month's public hearing, the 112 live in the neighborhood. For the record his client has done everything to make the project more palatable to the neighborhood. They did hear that they had more positive reception at the second NPP meeting, John Paul Young sent him an email that sounded like he was in favor of the project and then went the other way, so that is where we are. There's more to the neighborhood than just one street. We've done a lot of restructuring that's really a detriment to this development as being a money-making feasible operation. But we want to fit in this neighborhood, and we have conceded as much as we can to make it palatable. I'm not from Shreveport, but I've been here for 25 years, and more of that time than not there has only been a concrete whole in the ground. I own a business not far from here as well, I turned down the guy that was going to expand the liquor store because I didn't think that was good for the neighborhood, because it's not just about money, it's about what fits in this neighborhood. And my job is to make sure that what I'm putting before y'all, I can stand behind. Although it may not be the

*draft*

most desired thing, I feel that it can get the area back in commerce.

**JACKSON** Mr. Spikes are you aware that the staff recommended approval with stipulations? Are you aware of what they are? Staff, can you read the stipulations?

**TRANT** Reads the following stipulations to the public:

1. Address outstanding site plan review comments before building permits can be released.
2. Trash pick-up cannot occur between 7:00 PM – 7:00 AM.
3. Honor the agreement with the adjacent property owner to the west regarding the preservation of the existing brick wall and driveway.
4. Hours of operation will be from 6:00 AM to 10:00 PM.
5. A real-time video monitoring system will be provided for 24-hour surveillance.
6. Exterior lighting will be building mounted only. No additional pole mounted security lighting will be provided.
7. The final design of the driveway on Kings Highway must be approved by the City Engineer prior to issuance of building permits.

**TRANT** states that number 6 was discussed in the pre- briefing and deferred to JEAN to further explain.

**JEAN** I think we originally stated incorrectly, because what was presented was that the lighting could still be pole mounted, but created to be lower intensity to not create any spillover. Did I state that correctly?

Spikes yes, thank you I was concerned about that one because the stipulation said it could only be mounted on the building, and in my opinion that is more of a nuance light, I'm trying not to shine back on the neighbors and have most of the light shining down and away from the neighbors which would require a 12-15 floor pole at the point of use. We are fine with all stipulations.

**JACKSON** Asks if there's any discussion from the Board members.

**MCCULLOCH** spoke on why she voted the way she did in previous public hearings regarding this application and why she will vote how she will vote for the current hearing for this same application.

**A motion was made by Rose Wilson McCulloch, seconded by Harold Sater, to Approve the application.**

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

**CASE NO. 26-34-C ZONING REQUEST**

Applicant: Jackie Maiden

Owner: The Church of the Living God, Pillar Ground of Truth

Location: 100 Lynbrook Blvd & 9055 Pradd St (E side of Lynbrook Blvd at the Intersection of Pradd St)

Existing Zoning: R-1-7, I-2

Request: R-1-7 & I-2 to C-4

**Representative &/or support:**

Jackie Maiden 1050 Woolworth Rd Keithville, La

He is requesting a rezoning from R-1-7 & I-2 to C-4. He gave the background of the land, how his family went about purchasing it and the growth of the area over time. In 2018 his family invested in an RV park and have been taking care of the property for 74 years. He says that the RV park is a safe place to live and offers its tenants water, sewage and sanitation all up to speed. Utilities are included and they're completely furnished, well-lit with free lawn service and garbage pickup. He believes they have completed a comprehensive plan to receive the rezoning approval.

*draft*

Stacie Higgins 100 Lynbrook Shreveport, La

She lives on the proposed property and feels the owner does a good job maintaining the property.

Jerry Maiden Sr. 5628 Lakeside Dr Bossier City, La

He states that he was born on the property, and that when his brother brought the idea of creating an RV park with their property, it was in terrible condition because of surrounding occupants. He says that the RV park has provided shelter for those who may otherwise have been without a home. He asks for favor to be able to continue the work that allows them to continue providing this shelter.

Arnold Loud Jr 100 Lynbrook Blvd Rv-D Shreveport, La

He lives on the property, and says that given his medical condition, he didn't think that he would be able to find a place such as this to live. He says that the owners treat him like family and helps assist in some of his daily chores such as taking out the trash and getting the mail. He feels safe, and that's why he's been there as long as he has, which is about a year. He says it's a peaceful community and he would like to continue to stay there.

Krystal Smith 100 Lynbrook Blvd Rv-35 Shreveport, La

She's new to the community, has been living there for two months. Krystal feels that the area is nice and safe, she likes her neighbors and hopes it's able to get reapproved.

Jack Brown 101 Braswell Rd Shreveport La

He owns one of the facilities behind the property and had since 2016. He agreed with Jerry Maiden that in 2018 the property was unkempt but has been cleaned up and well maintained since then. His facility has cameras, so he's able to see a lot of what happens in surrounding areas and there haven't been any issues from tenants. He says Mr. Maiden seems very honorable and they've done what they said they would, and that what they're doing is for a great cause providing homes to those who are less fortunate. He and his business will continue to support their efforts.

Jason Williams 100 Lynnbook Blvd Rv-K

Williams lives on the property and has been in Shreveport for a year. He says there's no issues at all in the RV park and that it's truly been a blessing for him. The owners have been very helpful to him.

**Opposition:**

N/A

**A motion was made by Rose Wilson McCulloch, seconded by Harold Sater, to Recommend Approval of the application.**

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

**CASE NO. 26-2-CTAC CODE TEXT AMENDMENT**

Applicant: METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION

Request: CODE TEXT AMENDMENT

**Representative &/or support:**

**Emily Trant MPC:** Emily gives a high-level overview of the Landscape ordinance explaining how it dramatically changes the

landscaping requirements for the city of Shreveport and that article 10 is mainly where the changes were made. The goal was to try and better align our landscape ordinance with development community concerns while maintaining high quality design standards that were desired by the residents of Shreveport. "We believe that we've struck balance, we've removed a lot of things that we thought were impractical so you will see a lot of red strike through. She speaks on partnerships with Shreveport Green to try and preserve existing trees and use native planting species, helping to further their mission. "We think what's left over is a practical landscape ordinance".

**JEAN** wanted to touch on the process that staff takes when creating code text amendments. He wanted to emphasize this amendment was announced 2 meetings prior to its actual introduction. He wanted to assure the community that although there's no requirement for shrubs it will not prevent ornamental landscaping.

William Hartman 1031 Dudley Dr Shreveport La

Fred White 722 N. Ashley Ridge Loop Shreveport, La

Mr. Hartman is a landscape architect, and states that he's one of the very few landscape architects working in Shreveport. He wondered why he had not been contacted about the ordinance. He feel that the changes made in the ordinance are good, namely the requirement for shrubs between different uses was onerous and he had to prepare plans wondering why they had to specify all the shrubs. White is happy to support many of the changes proposed, but there are a few details he wanted to point out which was an error in the tree credit calculations.

**TRANT** states that Mr. White is looking at an older copy of the ordinance, the MPC received these comments from a member of the 100 and have since been rectified.

Mr. Hartman then went on to speak about the buffer yard part of the landscape ordinance; he feels that trees do more than screen but provide air quality amongst other things and that eliminating the tree requirements for a buffer yard more than twice the specified width is not a positive change. For interior parking lots, he believes the change for large and small parking lots is fine, but not for the medium parking lots he recommends scaling the parking spaces to 15 per tree than 20 per tree.

**TRANT** reiterates what the buffer yard is for more clarification.

**JEAN** you have to understand what the buffer yard is there for. If you had similar uses the trees wouldn't be there anyway, the trees aren't there for the heat island effect and those other benefits but to create a buffer. Buffering isn't needed when the distance goes further. That's where the logic came from and why we don't recommend changing it.

Mr. Hartman Feels that if the landscape ordinance is to improve the quality of the city, then heat island and air quality is more important than just screening.

Jeffrey Goodman 3018-Winged Elm Dr Shreveport, La

Is the president of the Committee of 100, he speaks about his collaboration with the MPC as the ordinance was being crafted and how he appreciated being apart of the process. He fully supports the ordinance.

Fred White 722 N. Ashley Ridge Loop Shreveport, La

Owner of Commercial Construction and Development He supports the Landscape Ordinance and says he and his co-worker Mr. Watley met with Emily and Stephen and went over the details of the ordinance; he has since gone over them again to make sure he thoroughly understood. Since the UDC was put into place in 2016 he thought it was a bit burdensome to business owners. He things the ideas are good namely removing the shrubs requirements Infront of all the screening fences as he feels they don't benefit the adjacent property owners.

Mark Sealy 623 Lake Fouhing Dr Shreveport, La

He's a local realtor and developer, He says he felt that the UDC seemed impractical when adopted in 2016. He felt that other smaller cities did not have the sophistication of requirements that we had being a small city and it holds us back. It costs more to

*draft*

build here than Houston and Dallas, even though we have much cheaper land. He believes that the ordinances are making the UDC more practical and he supports it.

**ELBERSON** Says he appreciates the staff for their work regarding the landscape ordinance.

**Opposition:**

**N/A**

**A motion was made by Gabriel Balderas, seconded by Chris Elberson, to Recommend Approval the application.**

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

### **END OF PUBLIC HEARING**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

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

**JEAN** fuel station on Linwood was appealed in city council, city council voted to uphold the decision of the MPC. He attended the Southern Hills Business Association meeting it was their 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary meeting with the keynote speaker being Mayor Tom Arceaneux. It was well attended and informative.

We were invited by the Shreveport economic development team to assist with work that is already underway for Texas corridor revitalization. It's primarily led by SPORTRAN, the effort is complimentary to the code text amendment that you just passed that's the D1-CMU that was recommended by this body in April and adopted by the city council on April 28<sup>th</sup>. We are at the beginning stages of this further work and will keep the Body updated on that periodically. As a result of the work on the landscape ordinance, we were invited to work on a project spearheaded by the committee of 100 called operation front door... it was a sweep that took place in the city of Shreveport. Zoning Administrator Reginald Jordan will give details.

**JORDAN** as Stephen was saying we did a sweep on the monk house corridor April 28<sup>th</sup> it was various city departments such as property standards, SPD, MPC and fire prevention. The sweep took place from the Airport on Hollywood to Greenwood Road it's the first step in trying to make some improvements to that corridor. That corridor is the first thing you see when you get off the plane, and we need to improve it because it says a lot about a city. **JORDAN** gave the list of companies they found in violation in the corridor stating that they need to properly maintain their properties whether operating outside the scope of their CO or property maintaining the physical qualities of the property.

**JACKSON** what happens if they do not come into compliance?

**JORDAN** Tanner would pursue prosecution against them. The timeframe is usually a 30-day notice to come into compliance if they don't, we'll give them a second notice then 10-15 days to come into compliance. After that it get turned into the city attorney's office.

**JEAN**, I want you to hear some of this because this is not the first time these sweeps have been done, how many have been done over the past years?

**JORDAN** we've conducted plenty of sweeps, at one time we were doing 2 a month. Usually, it's in the neighborhoods, but this one was more focused on businesses than residencies. They're typically just to get the neighborhoods cleaned up.

*draft*

**JEAN**, we are in the early stages of discussion of the committee of the 100 and other departments of the city about the corridor, doing a corridor study of some options we may take, there are a lot of moving pieces. It's very positive and we're forming a partnership with business and city departments. He also connected with Jarvis Morgan, the head of public works about improving the permitting process. From that, we started having meetings and still have meetings regarding that topic. If you go on our Facebook Page, you will see a PowerPoint that Jarvis and his team made that alerts the public when there are things they need to do with the MPC and what the importance of those items are. It's very important that we collaborate with people, its important to the future of this city.

**ELBERSON** We are in good hands with our interim director, and I'm pleased to see all the action that's taking place right now.

**JEAN**, we had a meeting on Friday, the entire team, everybody on the tram participated in that meeting and it was really good to see. I say team means Together Everyone Achieves More.

**CHAIR/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMENTS**

**ADJOURN 4:53 p.m.**

---

**Winzer Andrews, Chair**

---

**Secretary**