



**OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING
CITY OF THIBODAUX
THIBODAUX, LOUISIANA
October 7, 2026**

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Thibodaux assembled in regular session at its regular meeting place, City Hall, 310 West 2nd Street, Thibodaux, Louisiana, on Wednesday, October 7, 2026 at 5:00 P.M.

There were present: Clay Breaud, Mark Kearns, Drew Andrews, Thomas Shanklin, Trey Ledet
Absent: None

Breaud spoke about a request that was reviewed by Planning & Zoning six (6) months ago, but only voted on by City Council last month. When he questioned why it took so long, he was told that there was a communication issue. Breaud requested that the Planning & Zoning meeting minutes be done to ensure that they are very clear on what has been voted on and what if any conditions are set upon approval of an item by Planning & Zoning.

Upon a motion by Kearns, seconded by Andrews, the minutes of the September 2, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commission Meetings were approved as written.

....upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: Breaud, Kearns, Andrews, Shanklin, Ledet
NAY: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: None

Breaud introduced Item #5 - a request by Joseph Doiron to amend and re-enact Article 7, Section 704.A of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

"The off-street parking spaces required for each use permitted by this Ordinance shall not be less more than that found in Table 7.1. For uses not mentioned in this Section, the Zoning Administrator or his/her designee shall determine the requirements for off-street parking. Off-street vehicle parking may be provided at the discretion of the property owner or developer. Where parking is provided, it shall comply with applicable design, accessibility, drainage, landscaping, circulation, and safety requirements of this Article. The determination shall be based upon the most comparable use listed, AASHTO or ITE standards, and/or the specific needs of the development as determined by the City.

Joseph Doiron, 216 Rienzi Drive, was present to represent his request. He stated that he would like to amend the parking ordinance to no longer have a minimum number of off-street parking spaces required. He would

like the business or property owners to make the decision on how much parking to have, but have the City set a maximum number of spots allowed. Doiron added that he feels the City should mandate the risk of parking spillover, but not mandate the cost. He referenced various businesses in the city including the Dansereau House and the old Ice House, both of which have very limited space for off-street parking. Doiron explained that there are risks to having large areas of paved parking, such as flooding and increased costs for maintenance and drainage.

Breaud asked Doiron if he felt the City has wasted space. Doiron said no, but he thinks the rules cannot be “one size fits all”. Breaud then asked if he was trying to cut costs for developers and questioned if he would be okay with eliminating handicap parking. Breaud noted that there are many ways to reduce costs by eliminating parking spots, signage, drainage, painting of lines, and handicap spots. Doiron said no, he thinks accessibility requirements should still exist. He explained that the increase of paved areas increases a risk for the City, as it can cause more flooding.

Breaud explained that, in his career, there has always been minimum design standards for things like off-street parking, drainage, lot size, water line size and sewer line size. He noted that without these minimum standards, developers would install services and utilities much smaller at a lower cost, which can then cause issues like flooding or disruption of service. Doiron and Breaud discussed previous zoning reviews done in Thibodaux and other areas around the country. Breaud commented on several businesses within the City that always have full parking lots. Doiron noted that he is not trying to remove parking spaces in the City, just remove the minimum off-street parking requirement. He added that if a property cannot meet the minimum off-street parking requirement, then it may remain abandoned for an extended period of time and become blighted, which can negatively affect the area, and also would reduce sales tax revenue for the City. Doiron discussed shared parking agreements, and felt these could help. Breaud gave the example of the Foundry, and questioned whether people would want to park a quarter of a mile away and walk there to attend events. Breaud then mentioned a traffic study that was recently done in Thibodaux, and found that over 30,000 vehicles commute through the City. He questioned where these vehicles would go if they removed minimum off-street parking requirements.

Kearns stated that he appreciates Doiron’s passion and imagination, but that they have to vote on what is presented, not on his intent. He added that he did not want their comments to dampen Doiron’s passion.

On call for public comment, Jeremy Landry, 314 Arlington Drive, stepped forward to speak. He stated that he agreed with Doiron that “one size fits all” regulations do not work. Vic Palazzo, 305 E 2nd Street, stepped forward to speak, and stated that he also agreed with Doiron. On call for City comment, there was none.

On motion by Kearns, seconded by Ledet, the Board voted to approve Item #5 - the request by Joseph Doiron to amend and re-enact Article 7, Section 704.A of the City of Thibodaux’s Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

“The off-street parking spaces required for each use permitted by this Ordinance shall not be less more than that found in Table 7.1. For uses not mentioned in this Section, the Zoning Administrator or his/her designee shall determine the requirements for off-street parking. Off-street vehicle parking may be provided at the discretion of the property owner or developer. Where parking is provided, it shall comply with applicable design, accessibility, drainage, landscaping, circulation, and safety requirements of this Article. The determination shall be based upon the most comparable use listed, AASHTO or ITE standards, and/or the specific needs of the development as determined by the City.

....upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: None

NAY: Breaud, Kearns, Andrews, Shanklin, Ledet

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

Item #5 was denied with a 0-5 vote.

Breaud introduced Item #6 - a request by Joseph Doiron to amend & re-enact Article 7, Section 704.E of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

"b. The shared parking facility is located within ~~three hundred feet (300')~~ of each use a reasonable walking distance of 1 quarter (1/4) mile or one thousand three hundred twenty (1320) feet of each use, and is accessible by a dedicated pedestrian route. The Zoning Administrator may consider the quality and safety of the pedestrian connection when evaluating whether a shared parking arrangement serves the intended purpose."

Breaud explained that they touched on this request earlier and noted his example of the Foundry. Ledet asked if the City was aware of any shared parking agreements in place right now. Breaud stated that he knew of one (1) between a bank and a shopping center on St Mary Street.

On motion by Ledet, seconded by Kearns, the Board voted to approve Item #6 - the request by Joseph Doiron to amend & re-enact Article 7, Section 704.E of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

"b. The shared parking facility is located within ~~three hundred feet (300')~~ of each use a reasonable walking distance of 1 quarter (1/4) mile or one thousand three hundred twenty (1320) feet of each use, and is accessible by a dedicated pedestrian route. The Zoning Administrator may consider the quality and safety of the pedestrian connection when evaluating whether a shared parking arrangement serves the intended purpose."

....upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: None

NAY: Breaud, Kearns, Andrews, Shanklin, Ledet

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

Item #6 was denied with a 0-5 vote.

Breaud introduced Item #7 - a request by Leonard Chauvin P.E., P.L.S on behalf of Grace Investments to be granted sketch and final plat approval for the re-division of the property located at 219 N 12th Street into Lots A&B, located on the North side of N 12th Street, approximately 150ft East of the intersection of N 12th Street and Coulon Road in Section 40, T14S-R16E, City of Thibodaux, Louisiana.

Nic Billiot, 627 Jackson Street, was present to represent this request on behalf of Leonard Chauvin, P.E., P.L.S. Breaud noted that this request went to Board of Adjustments twice and was granted all required variances. Kearns questioned the small size of proposed Lot A, and Breaud confirmed that a variance was granted for that.

On call for public comment, there was none.

On motion by Shanklin, seconded by Andrews, the Board voted to approve Item #7 - the request by Leonard Chauvin P.E., P.L.S on behalf of Grace Investments to be granted sketch and final plat approval for the re-division of the property located at 219 N 12th Street into Lots A&B, located on the North side of N 12th Street, approximately 150ft East of the intersection of N 12th Street and Coulon Road in Section 40, T14S-R16E, City of Thibodaux, Louisiana.

....upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: Breaud, Kearns, Andrews, Shanklin, Ledet

NAY: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

Item #7 was approved with a 5-0 vote.

Breaud introduced Item #8 - a request by Councilman Ben Harang to amend and re-enact Article 2, Section 202 -Definitions of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

-“Family - One (1) or more persons occupying a single dwelling unit, provided that unless all members are related by blood or marriage, no such family shall contain over ~~five (5)~~ three (3) persons, but further provided that domestic servants employed on the premises may be housed on the premises without being counted as family or families.

Ben Harang, 515 Blake Court, was present to represent his request. He explained that he had a constituent contact him about concerns on a neighboring property on Goode Street that was housing five (5) college students. Breaud asked if this was an isolated area where the issue exists, and Harang stated that it is a one (1) block area. Breaud noted that sorority/fraternity homes are not allowed in R-1 zones and the City enforces that regulation. Harang explained that this is not a sorority house, it is the daughter of the property owner and her friends. He noted that they are not breaking the zoning ordinance as it is written, but they are living in a de facto sorority home.

Breaud stated that he does not think changing this definition is the way to solve the issue, but rather enforcement of existing regulations. Andrews noted that changing this definition would affect all areas of the City. Ledet stated that he felt this definition was flawed from the start. For example, if he had three (3) people in his family, and decided to foster two (2) children, he would not be able to do that, because those children would not be related to him by blood or marriage. Kearns agreed that the definition is flawed, and discussed whether Harang should have specified that he wanted this proposed change to be specifically for R-1 zones.

Breaud stated that he thinks enforcement is the answer to the issue the constituent is having. He suggested the City verify the number of residents during the permitting process. Ledet stated that he did not feel that permitting is the issue. Shanklin asked Harang how would he determine who is related.

On call for public comment, Tom Blanchard, 128 Goode Street, stepped forward to comment. He explained that the property in question was his neighbor. He added that they have had issues before with this type of situation before. He also stated that they were told it was going to be two (2) people living in the neighboring home, but now it is five (5). He believes the definition of single-family is not correct. Harold Block, 515 Canal Boulevard, stepped forward to speak on this request. He explained that he interpreted the definition to mean that twenty (20) people who are related could live together. He noted that he thinks the whole definition needs to be redone.

Harang stepped forward to request that this change be approved while the City works on re-writing the entire definition. Suzy Blanchard, 128 Goode Street, stepped forward to speak. She stated that no other homes have that many college-age girls living there. She noted that their neighborhood is full of family homes that have been passed down over several generations.

Breaud read Article 8 (Use Standards) and referenced the enforcement procedures. Harang asked what these residents are violating, because as written, he does not think they are violating the regulations, which is why he wants to change the definition. Ledet stated that the definition in its entirety is a problem, and Kearns agreed. Harang stated that he has no problem re-writing this entire definition, but would like this specific change to be approved while they work on the rest of the definition. Shanklin noted that he could easily find five (5) relatives,

and that how he determines who is a family member of his may be different then how other people make that determination for themselves. Breaud explains that their options are to table this request, or vote to approve or deny it as written. He then asked the City what they think. Public Works Executive Secretary Monique Reulet stated that she had concerns about the ethics of regulating what constitutes a family.

Tommy Blanchard, 128 Goode Street, stepped forward again to speak. He noted that before these students moved in, a lot of work was done to the home. He asked if final inspections were ever done. Reulet confirmed that all final inspections had passed and a Certificate of Completion was issued.

On motion by Kearns, seconded by Andrews, the Board voted to table Item #8 - the request by Councilman Ben Harang to amend and re-enact Article 2, Section 202 -Definitions of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

-“Family - One (1) or more persons occupying a single dwelling unit, provided that unless all members are related by blood or marriage, no such family shall contain over ~~five (5)~~ three (3) persons, but further provided that domestic servants employed on the premises may be housed on the premises without being counted as family or families.

...upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: Breaud, Kearns, Andrews, Shanklin, Ledet

NAY: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

Item #8 was tabled with a 5-0 vote in order to revise the definition of family in its entirety.

Breaud introduced Item #9 - a request by Monique S. Green to amend and re-enact Article 5, Table 5.3 - Residential District Permitted Uses and Special Exceptions of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Add “Group/Community Home, Small” as “Special Exception” in an R-2 zoning district.

Monique S. Green, 270 S Sugarfield Road, was present to represent her request. She explained that they are trying to get this use added to an R-2 zone as a Special Exception so that they can request the Special Exception for her property.

Breaud noted that the previous request to add this use as Permitted in an R-2 zone was denied. Ledet noted that this use referred to six (6) residents maximum. As discussed with the previous agenda item, the number of people in one (1) home is currently limited to five (5). For this reason, Ledet felt like this use would not be appropriate for this zoning district. Shanklin stated that this would affect the R-2 zone in North Thibodaux. Reulet confirmed this, and explained that if this zoning amendment was approved, anyone in North Thibodaux who wanted to operate a Small Group Home on their property would have to go before Planning & Zoning to request a Special Exception.

Breaud read the definition of a Group/Community Home and Ledet read the definition of R-2 zone. Ledet added that he is not against what the applicant is trying to do at their property, but that this request would contradict the definition they just tabled.

On call for public comment, Beth Hodnett, 322 E 2nd Street, stepped forward to speak. She asked about what uses are allowed in an R-2 zone. Breaud read the items from the ordinance, including an Adult Day Care Home. Hodnett asked why that would be allowed but not a group home. Ledet explained that the Adult Day Care Home

is just during the day, whereas a group home is twenty-four (24) hours. On call for City comment, there was none.

On motion by Kearns, seconded by Shanklin, the Board voted to approve Item #9 - the request by Monique S. Green to amend and re-enact Article 5, Table 5.3 - Residential District Permitted Uses and Special Exceptions of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

Add "Group/Community Home, Small" as "Special Exception" in an R-2 zoning district.

....upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: Shanklin

NAY: Breaud, Kearns, Andrews, Ledet

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

Item #9 was denied with a 1-4 vote.

Breaud introduced Item #10 - a request by Vic Palazzo to amend and re-enact Article 5, Table 5.1- Residential District Permitted Uses and Special Exceptions of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:

-Add "Personal Services Establishment" as "Special Exception" in an RB zoning district.

Vic Palazzo, 305 E 2nd Street, was present to represent his request. He explained that this home has been for sale, but the majority of the interest has been for commercial uses. He has had a physical therapy office inquire about the property, as well as a hair salon. He added that the RB zoning district is very restricted, so he would like to add Personal Service Establishment as a Special Exception in this zone.

Breaud noted that this use is allowed in all commercial zones, as well as an R-3 zone. He added that Palazzos property is located between two businesses. Breaud then asked Reulet how they would classify a physical therapy office. Reulet stated it would be a medical clinic, as physical therapists are doctors. Ledet question Palazzo about his property, noting that he is aware that several renovations have been done. He added that in Palazzo's email to the Board, he noted major renovations were done. Upon being questioned about the scope of work at his property, Palazzo stated that he did re-roofing, insulation, framing, re-wiring, and a new kitchen. Ledet stated that the original building permit did not indicate all of those items in the scope of work. Ledet and Palazzo discussed the property and permitting discrepancies.

Breaud called the meeting to order. Palazzo noted that the neighbors may be in objection to his request, but he just wants to add another option for potential buyers. Breaud stated that the RB zoning district was created as a compromise between the residents and the business owners in the area. Ledet read the definition of Personal Service Establishment.

On call for public comment, Carrie Goodrow, 304 E 2nd Street stepped forward to speak. She explained that she did appreciate the work that Palazzo did to clean up his property, but that the residents in the area feel that this request would be detrimental and not compatible to the area. She noted that there are several properties in the area that are vacant and up for sale. She added that she has concerns about traffic and density. Ben Borne, 234 St Charles Street, stepped forward to speak, stating that he agreed with Goodrow. He noted that the existing businesses co-exist well with the residents, but he does not agree with expansion.

John O'Rourke, 313 Narrow Street, stepped forward to speak. He asked the Board to deny this request. Harold Block, 515 Canal Boulevard, stepped forward to speak. He explained that the RB zoning district was a very difficult discussion between the residents and the businesses. Breaud asked what type of businesses they have in the RB zone, and stated that this zone was created for both residential and business uses.

Ledet stated that he felt Palazzo's property was still up for sale because it is next to Burger King. Malcolm Hodnett, 322 E 2nd Street, stepped forward to speak. He commented about low-impact businesses and asked the Board to deny this request.

Breud noted that business hours in RB zones are limited to 6am to 6pm. Palazzo stated that selling his property as a residence is his preference, but he just hasn't had that type of interest. Andrews noted that according to the zoning ordinance, an urgent care could be opened at Palazzo's property. Goodrow stepped forward again to speak about Palazzo's property, and Breud reiterated that this request is not for Palazzo's lot but for all of the RB zoning districts.

**On motion by Kearns, seconded by Andrews, the Board voted to approve Item #10 - the request by Vic Palazzo to amend and re-enact Article 5, Table 5.1- Residential District Permitted Uses and Special Exceptions of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance as follows:
-Add "Personal Services Establishment" as "Special Exception" in an RB zoning district.**

....upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: Breud, Andrews

NAY: Kearns, Shanklin, Ledet

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

Item #10 was denied with a 2-3 vote.

Breud introduced Item #11 - a request by Paige Stuart & Courtney Lirette to amend and re-enact Article 3, Section 308.A of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning ordinance as follows:

-"2. A variance is authorized only for height, area, *operational hours* and size of structure or size of yards and open spaces; establishment or expansion of a use otherwise prohibited shall not be allowed by variance, nor shall a variance be granted because of the presence of nonconformities in the zoning district or uses in an adjoining district."

Paige Stuart, 906 Canal Boulevard, was present to represent her request. She explained that she represented Hotworx, a business that was trying to open a location in Thibodaux. She stated that the company typically has operation hours between 11am and 7pm, but with members only access after that timeframe. She noted that they would like to amend the ordinance to include operational hours as something people could request variances for. This would allow Hotworx to go to the board of Adjustments to request a variance to extend their operational hours.

Breud asked how this process would work if the request is approved. Reulet explained that a business would have to go to the Board of Adjustments to request a variance to expand their operational hours, and the Board of Adjustments would vote on the request for a specific property. She added that variance approvals are typically indefinite unless subsequent variance requests were approved to rescind them.

Ledet explained that he had concerns about how broad the change would be and that Board of Adjustments decisions are final.

On call for public comment, Taylor Brown, 113 Meadowbrook Lane, stepped forward in support of this request. She explained that she is a member of this business and had used the member's key card access to go into the space after hours when she works late.

Breud asked if there is another way to allow this business. He added that he felt like the current restrictions would allow them to operate 11am to 6pm, and that the general public would comply with this regulation. He

also stated that he believed limited member access afterhours would not be a problem, noting that the Post office lobby is open twenty-four (24) hours a day for residents.

On motion by Kearns, seconded by Andrews, the Board voted to approve Item #11 - the request by Paige Stuart & Courtney Lirette to amend and re-enact Article 3, Section 308.A of the City of Thibodaux's Comprehensive Zoning ordinance as follows:

-“2. A variance is authorized only for height, area, *operational hours* and size of structure or size of yards and open spaces; establishment or expansion of a use otherwise prohibited shall not be allowed by variance, nor shall a variance be granted because of the presence of nonconformities in the zoning district or uses in an adjoining district.”

....upon roll call the vote was as follows:

YEAS: None

NAY: Breaud, Kearns, Andrews, Shanklin, Ledet

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: None

Item #11 was denied with a 0-5 vote.

There being no further business, this meeting was adjourned.