

PUBLIC NOTICE

Livingston Parish Master Plan Review Committee
20355 Government Boulevard, Livingston, Louisiana, 70754
Minutes for April 7, 2025 6 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 April 7, 2025 at the hour of five o'clock (5:00) p.m. in the Parish Council Chambers, located in the Livingston Parish Governmental Building, 20355 Governmental Boulevard, Livingston, Louisiana with the following members present:

Gerald Burns
Brian Clemmons
Ralph Burgess
Julie Dyason-Norris
Coley Johnson
Steve Larkey
Merrill Hess

Absent: Steven Smith, Zach Thomas, Zabrina Pitre

1. Call to order - Burgess
2. Prayer - Clemmons
3. Pledge of allegiance - Johnson
4. Roll call - Burgess
5. Old Business:

Larkey: I haven't received any information from WSP regarding drafts of the Master Plan.

Burgess: We have not received anything.

Burns: I spoke to Nathan Lipson from WSP and he said that it was sent to the parish council last meeting.

Clemmons: Information should be sent to the Planning Commission, not to the council. We get it to review. Then, we send it to the Planning Commission.

Ralph: Correct. We've had this discussion.

Burns: Ultimately, it'll have it to go the the council.

Clemmons: Legally, it must start with Planning & Zoning.

Julie: What is the purpose of this committee?

Clemmons: We review and make recommendations to send to the Planning & Zoning to help lighten their workload.

Dyason-Norris: Doesn't it seem appropriate prior to Planning & Zoning to make a decision, the Master Plan Review Committee review it.

Burgess: Correct. Also, our review would also assist as an additional public platform.

Clemmons: Sending it directly to the council is not proper.

6. Ongoing Business:

a. Update on the Priority List being sent to Transportation Master Plan

i. Burgess: It's been forwarded to Goff, Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee.

ii. Dyason-Norris: How will it be official?

iii. Burgess: It will be in their master plan.

7. New Business:

a. Transportation Master Plan - Ralph Burgess

i. Needs a little refinement

b. Recommendation for the Master Plan to have a codified plan on dealing with legacy drainage issues (ex: detention ponds)

i. Clemmons: Current subdivisions prior to the ordinance has drainage plans failing. Development in the area has overwhelmed the drainage plan. For example, in Collin's place there's a corner towards the front of the neighborhood that if it rains more than an inch, it is completely inundated. The parish has already looked at it. Nobody actually owns that 10 acre detention pond. Nobody's paying taxes? So nobody claims they own it. So, what are you going to do to solve it? Oak Place and Easterly Lakes. Talk to the HOA, they'll say, "We don't have the money. And the parish doesn't want it." So if we establish a procedure and it's codified whenever a problem turns up, just pull out the sheet and it shows the order. I've wanted to include this in the Master Plan and let the parish develop their own ordinance.

- ii. Burns: I want to echo your thoughts. It's been a problem. Who owns it? Who maintains it? Drainage doesn't want it? HOA doesn't want it? Something that I've pushed for years is to install a dry detention? Is Collins Place overflowing? Is that the problem?
- iii. Clemmons: The drainage detention pond is in the center of the neighborhood and they're using it like a water feature. When there's 150 people in a HOA and only five people are being affected, nobody wants to come with \$5000 ahead to fix it?
- iv. Burns: So, what is the answer to fix it?
- v. Clemmons: Probably a dry detention pond...
- vi. Burns: Do you recommend the parish come in to set up a dry detention pond?
- vii. Clemmons: No. What I suggest is the parish decides between the HOA and the parish, who is responsible. Once that decision is made, if the parish takes responsibility, the homeowners are no longer involved. Parish will do an engineering study and follow that path, where it takes us up to and including creating a dry retention pond or doing away with it. Whatever the engineering studies say need to be done.
- viii. Julie: It's very important. I'd be happy to make a motion or second a motion to be entered into the Master Plan. In addition, I would like to ask, have you spoken with your councilman about moving forward with an ordinance now?
- ix. Clemmons: No, its starts with the Master Plan.
- x. Larkey: What is a legacy neighborhood?
- xi. Burgess: An older subdivision that has gone out of compliance.
- xii. Julie: Should this be addressed by the council members?
- xiii. Ralph: #1 if it needs to, we want to try to push it to move it forward, codified immediately by an ordinance. The other part is the council is not ready for it, we can "somewhat" codify it into the Master Plan so when they do get ready to codify it, there's a footprint written in the Master Plan.

- xiv. Clemmons: My plan here is to present this as is to the Planning & Zoning. Then, at Planning & Zoning ideally pass a resolution to involve it in the Master Plan.
- xv. Julie: Is this complete?
- xvi. Clemmons: Pass a resolution and add on changes. I hope the council asks why WSP needs another 1/4 million.
- xvii. Hess: The contract should be itemized in detail.
- xviii. Ralph: Professional service contracts... if there's an overage usually you have to have a justification of overage. Justification has to be because it went out of scope. I have not seen any justification from that.

7. Extra Business:

I. Burns: I'm proposing that we put these things in the Master Plan.

27 pages in the Master Plan cover the Economic Corridor, which is from the Canadian National RR and South I12 approximately 2 miles. These are suggestions that WSP concurs with. It also brings in taxes.

II. Ralph: Yo listed what was in the corridor. And when I think of economic development, I think of industrial, business, and tourism. I noticed that you mention high density residential. Why would you want a high density residential in an economic developmental corridor?

III. Burns: ...because of the proximity to infrastructures, highways, the sewer systems. Especially on the west side of the parish, expand the sewage district to handle high density living. You don't really want it North and South, if it's major projects. I'm not saying you shouldn't have high density in other parts of the parish. Concentrating it will allow the corridor to grow with people, then if you keep it within the corridor.

IV. Ralph: I guess my thoughts with that is the high density would be an infringe of the economic corridor, where it feeds into rather than on the inside of the corridor.

V. Burns: There's massive opposition putting the density living outside of the economic corridor. We've had opposition for years.

VI. Ralph: At Satsuma we have the North Medical Plaza, at Juban we have the General Medical Plaza, and at 447 we have the Lake Medical Plaza.

VII. Dyason: Those are discussions with the zoning. If it lists what is not allowed, by default does it mean that everything else is allowed? And with the things that you've listed, what if we missed something?

VIII. Burns: You cannot include everything that should be in the corridor, you cannot include everything that shouldn't be in the corridor. If we're going to increase a tax base, we need to build more houses. Growth brings prosperity.

IX. Clemmons: I don't think it's a question of saying what we want to have in the Economic Corridor, so much as saying what we don't want to have in the corridor. A hospital is going to want to be right there with infrastructure, but if we let people have 1 acre lots from here and beyond that land is no longer available for industrial activity. It's more of a question of discouraging use that is low density and encouraging high density. We don't want low density use in the economic corridor, like R-1.

X. Burns: Zoning should be implemented or put in place to do that. That was not done.

XI. Clemmons: What do we want to discourage because the things that we want there want to be there already.

XII. Dyason: So your saying to revise what should not be in the plan?

XIII. Clemmons: Do a good job with exclusions and let the people that want to make money figure out the best way to do it.

XIV. Burns: I do like Mr. Brian's idea about prohibiting low density within the corridor.

XV. Dyason: Would doing that address the "what you don't want"? Could we move forward with that?

XVI. Larkey: The zoning map should take care of not having low density inside the economic corridor. Not the written words in the Master Plan, but if I own 100 acres in the economic corridor, I'm the one that should say how it's zoned. The owner has got to voice his opinion on how he wants his property to be zoned. So you're going to tell someone how they can zone it?

XVII: Ralph: There's actually a court case in LAke Charles that went to the Supreme Court and is now law. The government has the authority to rezone property as they see fit for their economic development.

XVIII: Clemmons: If you want to change zones, we have to have a plan... a master plan. Once it gets into the master plan, it goes into the council and they can write ordinances and send it back to Planning & Zoning to rezone an area.

XIX: Burns: I will have this sent to you all so we can modify and have a print out for the next meeting.

8. Adjourn - Burgess