

**Livingston Parish Master Plan Review Committee**  
20355 Government Boulevard, Livingston, Louisiana, 70754  
**Regular Meeting - July 9, 2024**  
6:00 pm

Pursuant to notice duly posted in the public lobby of the Livingston Parish Governmental Building, the Livingston Parish Master Plan Review Committee met on July 9, 2024 at the hour of six o'clock (6:00) p.m. in the Parish Council Chambers, located in the Livingston Parish Governmental Building, 20355 Governmental Boulevard, Livingston, Louisiana with the following members present:

Jamey Sandefur  
Coley Johnson  
Zabrina Pitre  
Gerald Burns  
Merrill Hess  
Brian Clemmons  
Steve Larkey

Absent: Julie Dyason-Norris, Steven Smith, Zach Thomas

1. Call to Order by Brian Clemmons
2. Roll Call - Zabrina Pitre  
(Absent: Julie Dyason-Norris, Steven Smith, Zach Thomas)
3. Invocation - Brian Clemmons
4. Pledge of Allegiance - Coley Johnson
5. Approval of June Minutes
  - a. Motion by Sandefur
  - b. Second by Burns
  - c. Yays: Sandefur, Johnson, Pitre, Burns, Hess, Clemmons, Larkey
6. OLD BUSINESS:
  - a. Setbacks
    - i. Sandefur: Explain the reason that it has been returned
    - ii. Pitre: Paraphrase of recommended adjustments
    - iii. Burns: "WHEREAS, the purpose of the ordinance(s) is to "reduce future rights [...] should remain and not be removed.
    - iv. Public Comment: Scott Jones
      1. Protection of people's property is vital
      2. It is not necessary to create a "blanket" ordinance. The ordinance should be backed up with a traffic study and implemented in the most congested areas. (ex: 190, Walker South, and Juban)
      3. Property Value will decrease
      4. The road is not always centered at the back of the right of way
    - v. Public Comment: Lisa Cothorn
      1. Do not have the authority to make these ordinances.
      2. Clemmons confirms, "This body has 0 legislative authority. This is a citizen's committee."

3. Imminent domain is strict
- vi. Public Comment: Gus Holden
  1. What is the existing right away from the back of the state right away?
  2. Committee begins to answer Gus, but Gus proceeds, "You're taking it because you're telling them they cannot build on it. They pay taxes."
  3. Committee member makes an attempt to answer, but is cut off by Gus. Clemmons corrects the interruption.
  4. Gus repeats, "How much back do ya'll want to take people's property where they cannot build or do anything with?"
  5. Pitre: Clarifies, "You're asking what we want to take? [...] It's not what we are wanting to take, but we're trying to take suggestions from ya'll as well as each other to make sure we have best decision [...] that is well informed."
  6. Gus: "The issues are in the municipalities, [...] that's where ya'll have the issues of having to buy stuff." ...not in rural areas.
  7. Clemmons: "We're not making recommendations on what the setbacks would be. What we're doing is recommending that the council follows the master plan."
  8. Sandefur: Footage would be 71 feet from the center of the road.
  9. Gus: It should be the center of the right of way.
  10. Sandefur: I believe that is one of the changes.
  11. Burns: On every state highway there is a building line setback on the front for 25 feet. On Florida Boulevard there's 25 feet on each side, that's 150 feet. This ordinance is only requesting 142 feet. One example is the new homes across from Gator Mills. They are about 6 feet. The homes are probably a good \$300,000. Now, in order to continue to build, the homes will have to be bought out. We're trying to prevent that.
- vii. Public Comment: Wade Holden
  1. Small businesses and investors rely on this land for their investment rather than 401Ks. This ordinance takes away from that value.
- viii. Public Comment: Caleb Atwell
  1. Are setbacks considered a taking?
    - a. Clemmons: It is not considered a taking, but a restriction of use.
  2. People don't get compensated until the DOTD purchases it, but people still have to maintain it?
    - a. Clemmons: Permanent structures are not allowed.
  3. Is this recommendation for all state highways?
    - a. Burns: No
    - b. Larkey: Does it not state it in here?
    - c. Burns: This ordinance did not pass last Thursday night.
    - d. Larkey: The rewrite states all state highways.
    - e. Burns: If we decide to go forward, it won't be all state highways.
    - f. Caleb: Do we have any idea of what they are trying...
    - g. Clemmons: I can read it to you from the Master Plan. "Page 58, How much servitude should be reserved? 60 feet up to 5 lanes a rollway or 4 lanes with a median; 16 feet to 5 t-7 ft shoulders; 30 ft 2 15 foot swells and a 40

ft canal... It lists all of them and initially recognizes a servitude of 142 feet.

- h. Caleb: Does the parish have an idea of where they expect growth to take place?
- i. Clemmons: We're looking at different companies to update this document.
- j. Caleb: How can the general public stay involved and updated with this?
- k. Clemmons: There will be numerous public hearings involved with the process.
- 4. Public Comment: Scott Jones
  - a. Scott: "Mr. Mangus and I were just looking at this [...]. Skip down to 142 feet right away. [...]The question that he and I have is the intent to add an additional 41 feet on each side to the 142 feet or is 142 feet encompassing?"
  - b. Clemmons: "That's everything."
  - c. Burns: Only applied initially to Florida Boulevard.
- 5. Public Comment: Melissa Jones
  - a. Rural land owners -> When highway 16 became wider, nothing stopped the state from buying it up. The ordinance will depreciate the land's value.
- 6. Public Comment: Wade Holden
  - a. We need to put out a moratorium on all ordinances until the UDC gets worked out.
- 7. Public Comment: Lisa Cotharn
  - a. States Constitutional Right
- 8. Pitre: Reminder to stay with the agenda
- 9. Sandefur: We agree with a majority of what has been said today. Our goal is to make sure this is right where it works for everybody or as much as possible. There are problems with this currently, and it needs to be addressed and fixed.
- 10. Public Comment: Melissa Jones
  - a. We're trying to stop over development. We need protection for small, rural areas.
- 11. Erin Sandefur:
  - a. Three ordinance revisions from Goff - The purpose was to be in complete compliance with the Master Plan, 142 foot setbacks on parishwide state and federal highways, not including Interstate 12. In my ordinance, I did not include the 25 setbacks for commercial, residential, and industrial. That would negate the confusing verbage of the side and front yard footage.
  - b. Clemmons: Could we sit on this until we have new traffic plans from the new firm?
  - c. Sandefur: I agree with you on that. There is an urgency with setbacks in areas that have rapid growth. The commercial has figured out a loophole.

- d. Burns: Will the firms that will be hired complete a parishwide traffic study?
- 12. Mangus: I looked at how other states handle this. Texas has service roads. The businesses are not on state highways, which takes out most of your problem. We need the master plan and to identify the growth corridors.
  - a. Larkey: Do we have an updated parish map of the state highways that would show what the right away is?
  - b. Burns: We've had several meetings with a few engineers. We spoke with McLin Taylor and we have to request that information from DOTD or go to Hammond.
  - c. Larkey/Mangus: There's none in the master plan.
- ix. Approval to table the ordinance
  - a. Sandefur: Motion to table the ordinance
  - b. Burns: Seconds the motion
  - c. Yays: all

#### 7. New Business

- a. Brian Clemmons: Discussion of MPRC purpose and path forward
- b. Zabrina Pitre: Population Chart Updated
  - i. Approval to present to Planning Commission
  - ii. Sandefur: Motion to send to Planning Commission
  - iii. Johnson: Second the motion
  - iv. Yays: all
- c. Transportation Maps
  - i. Brian Clemmons - Wait until more studies come in
  - ii. Clemmons - Zach Thomas is compiling recommendations

#### 8. Adjourn

- a. Clarification to stay along with the agenda and public hearings must remain respectful
- b. Pitre: Motion to adjourn
- c. Burns: Second the motion