



# City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center  
300 S. Church Street  
Jonesboro, AR 72401

## Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, March 26, 2024

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

---

### 1. Call to order

### 2. Roll Call

**Present** 7 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

**Absent** 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

### 3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-24:027](#) MAPC Minutes - March 12th, 2024

**Attachments:** [3.12.24 MAPC Minutes](#)

**A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Monroe Pointer, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

**Absent:** 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

### 4. Miscellaneous Items

### 5. Preliminary Subdivisions

[PP-24-06](#) Preliminary Subdivision: Farmer Hills

Alec Farmer is seeking preliminary subdivision approval for 3 lots on 8.9 acres. This property is zoned C-3, general commercial and located west of 3501 Southwest Drive.

**Attachments:** [21104-SDP-R3](#)  
[Application](#)  
[21104 - Farmer - Drainage Report](#)  
[21104 - SWPPP - Signed](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

**John Easley (Proponent):** John Easley with Associated Engineering, on behalf of Alec Farmer asking for a preliminary approval, this is a 3 lot commercial

subdivision with 2 large lots along the front of Southwest drive and then a large one along the back, we're asking for preliminary approval. The storm water requirements will be on each lot along with landscaping and everything that's associated with it. We'll put the street in, and the drainage for the street, we talked to the city yesterday and we're gonna make an adjustment to the roundabout and push it to the west and put it fully on lot number 3.

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): Okay, city planner do you have staff comments?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir we do, we reviewed it, it does meet the requirements of the subdivision code, we would make the one stipulation that the cul-de-sac entirely be placed on lot 3 and with that we would recommend approval.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, I'll open up for any commissioner questions or comments, for the applicant or city staff. Or I'll entertain a motion.

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Did they agree to move that to lot 3?

Lonnie Roberts: Yes

John Easley: Yes

Paul Ford (Commission): You said roundabout someone said cul-de-sac, not much of a difference but just curious.

John Easley: It's the same thing.

Paul Ford: It is?

John Easley: Yes, a point to turn around.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Paul Ford, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

**Aye:** 6 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

**Absent:** 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

## **6. Final Subdivisions**

## **7. Conditional Use**

## **8. Rezoning**

**RZ-24-04**

Rezoning: 607 Airport Road

MC Paperchase, LLC is seeking a rezone from R-1,single family medium density to RM-16, residential multifamily. This request is for 3.28 acres located at 607 Airport Road.

**Attachments:**

- Application
- Plat
- Deed
- Cert. Receipts
- Sign Photo
- Staff Summary

**John Easley (Proponent):** John Easley with Associated Engineering, on behalf

of MC Paperchase, LLC. Asking for a rezone as is described.

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): Alright, city planner do you have staff comments?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir we do, we have reviewed it and we would recommend that the zoning be downgraded to an RM-12 instead of RM-16 and with that we would recommend approval with the following requirements:

That the purposed site plan shall satisfy all requirements of the city engineer, all requirements of the current storm water drainage design manual and floodplain regulation regarding any new construction, a final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the planning department prior to any redevelopment of the property, and any change of use shall be subject to planning department approval in the future.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, and with this rezoning request is there anyone here to give public comments? If you would please come up to the mic and state your name and address for the record.

Gregory Smith (Opposed): My name is Gregory Smith at 3909 Marchbank Circle. This is the first time I'm hearing about it and I just wanted more information on it and just to know, it looks like it's gonna be right in my backyard, and just what was the plans for it, not really wanting anymore duplexes or apartments in that area, than what is already there.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, anything else?

Gregory Smith: And, I'm concerned about the safety there on Airport road. That is coming out there at the peak of that hill.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, traffic safety on the hill?

Gregory Smith: Yes, sir.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, is that it specifically?

Gregory Smith: That's all I can think of at the moment, yes, sir.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, Mr. Easley do you want to respond to that or provide any further information?

John Easley: In discussions with the city and the owner yesterday, the owner's also own the property north of Hill drive, discussions was made about having a second entry or exit, out across that property, that Hill drive, the Airport road entry the depth of it, is approximately 200 feet which will be mainly just the main entrance on airport, so it will be pretty well hidden, we're aware of the traffic potential on Airport road, which brought up the rear exit. As far as planning goes as far as building sizes, there's not one, developed yet.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, so I'll open up for commissioner questions or comments. Any questions on the comments made so far or for the city staff or the applicant?

Paul Ford (Commission): My question is when I reviewed the materials before the meeting, the staff comments were that this did not comply with the city's overall zoning plan and now the city's moving to say that something's changed, and I don't understand what was changed that made it now meet, from the staff comments perspective, meet the overall concerns of the planning, cause usually when you scroll on through and see red x's that means it doesn't meet the requirement of the overall plan and I don't know what's been changed from our RM-16 to RM-12 to remove any of those red x's cause I haven't had that explained to me.

Derrel Smith (City Planner): By reducing it 12 units per acre rather than 16, it matches the R-2 that's already in the area, because that's the same number of units per acre as R-2, and therefore it will comply at 12 rather than 16.

Paul Ford: But it's still next door to R-1 which was one of the red x's as well correct?

Derrel Smith: It is still next door to R-1.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, any other questions?

Paul Ford: Not from me.

Jeff Steiling (Commission): I have one question the property to the north, that is also owned by this property owner, yesterday we talked about it being zoned RM-12, on this map it says, RM-8 LUO. So, I'm interested in what the RM-8 and the LUO was for.

Lonnie Roberts: The R-2 was what we were saying was the equivalent of the RM-12.

Jeff Steiling: Yeah, but I'm talking about the property that they own directly to the north.

Lonnie Roberts: Yeah it is RM-8

Jeff Steiling: It's an RM-8 LUO, so I'm wondering what the limited use was on that, did it limit it to a certain number of apartments below the RM-8, or what was that? I didn't see that label on the map yesterday so I couldn't ask that question. Why they're looking that up, Craig, that existing drive that shows to be 607 North Airport road, is that drive if this is rezoned is that drive the right amount of distance from the drive to the plan view north? Do we have enough spacing or is that, because Airport road is state highway correct? I should have asked that yesterday but it didn't dawn on me till now, but we're gonna have a problem on the location of a drive.

Craig Light (City Engineer): We'll look at the site plan when it's actually submitted, on the exact location of any driveways and what sort of spaces there are, typically on a collector street, it's 100 to 200 foot spacing, for a driveway, so I don't know where the spacing's are but we will look at that as part of the site plan.

Unable to transcribe

Jeff Steiling: This one by the time you get drives and put access in you're gonna have about the same amount of buildable space left. Especially if they do a drive north across that property. We're limiting that north to 12 units but you said they're gonna develop 30 on this property?

Derrel Smith: It looks to me like that property is quite a bit bigger than that property to the north, if you just look at the parcel lines, it looks to be quite a bit larger.

Lonnie Roberts: It looks like we may have another question, yes ma'am please come up to the mic and state your name for the record.

Sandra Smith (Opposed): Yes, my name is Sandra Smith, and the question that I have is, it's kind of hard to look at the map from back there, Cricket lane is a street that literally backs up to our property line and I don't know, there was a house back there, and I'm trying to see if that is included in that area, and also if it is included, would that street be considered one of the entrances and exits? Because I mean, that is literally right on our property line.

Lonnie Roberts: When you say that Cricket lane backs up to your house, then do you live on Marchbanks?

Sandra Smith: Yes, Marchbanks, we live in a cul-de-sac and the reason that it's is cul-de-sac, is because of the traffic that was coming down, that was how they had to build it, they were not able to get another street, going out, at first they wanted to build it as a U, however it's a cul-de-sac and our back property line is right on Cricket lane, so I was just trying to, and I still can't really tell.

Unable to transcribe

Sandra Smith: Yes, it was at one point private property.

Unable to transcribe

Lonnie Roberts: So there is a parcel of property between your house and the development in question.

Sandra Smith: Yes, the private drive would then be the only thing that would be considered and a little bit of road, but still I was concerned about how many units and everything, and how I guess they said they didn't have the plans finished, as to what kind of buildings, they would be, so just curious about that.

John Easley: Yeah, the property the 3 parcels, north of Marchbanks is not included. So you have that depth between Marchbanks and this property. Like, I said Cricket lane to my understanding is a private drive.

Lonnie Roberts: Yes, it looks like there's one residence there.

Unable to transcribe

Lonnie Roberts: Commissioners have any questions, at this point or discussion to be made?

Monroe Pointer (Commission): So there was a mention that there could possibly be a drive, to help the traffic flow going out to the south. If I'm looking at that right?

Lonnie Roberts: To the north, towards that RM-8 property.

Monroe Pointer: Yes, to the north through that property so, if this were to be approved I think we should make a stipulation that has to be done, instead of saying it could possibly be done.

Derrel Smith: I don't think you can do that with a rezoning, you're just looking at the zoning of the property, not how it develops, right now. That's done through the site development process.

Paul Ford: Follow up question then, if that's what they're, that could be one of the things to consider in our vote, is that they're gonna consider a drive through the north, what does that do as far as impacting the previous zoning decision and the desire to limit, the number of units there, when you're actually just gonna be redirecting traffic through this other property, which really defeats the use of a limited use overlay, you're just gonna be running that traffic into another area. It's like diverting water, it has to go somewhere but it doesn't mean the water goes away, so that bothers me.

Kevin Bailey (Commission): I'll just make the statement that I may be more in favor of a RM-8 less density than RM-12, for rezoning. That would limit the quantity of the amount of the possible apartments back there.

Lonnie Roberts: What's your thoughts on that Mr. Easley?

John Easley: I really can't speak for the owner they already agreed to go from RM-16 to RM-12 that gives them their 30 units that they're going for. I'm not sure if I can agree to a RM-8 seeing at the most 25, 26 units, cause the RM-8 per acre, obviously you'd have to take out the drive way, parking and everything else. I don't know what RM-8 gross acres equates to in the bottom line.

Monroe Pointer: I was just gonna say when we were discussing this yesterday, we did say the reason we were trying to have it moved to an RM-12 is cause we were trying to match what was north of it, now it's not clear if that would even be matching that.

John Easley: You got some RM-8, you also got some RM-2, you also got R-2, you got R-2, and other similar developments in the area.

Derrel Smith: Yesterday, you asked what would match the R-2 zoning, and that's where we came up with RM-12.

Unable to transcribe

Kevin Bailey: So yesterday John, I thought that the area to the north was R-2, am I missing that or was that RM-8 not on the map yesterday?

Lonnie Roberts: I think that was on there, but it was so far way.

Monroe Pointer: I think Jeff asked that question right Jeff? And I think that's where the R-2 came from. I don't even think we spoke about that yesterday

about the LUO. When we were talking about that property.

Lonnie Roberts: Correct, that did not come up.

John Easley: But you got R-1 west and south, R-2 in the northeast corner, along with RM-8 LUO, like Derrel said the RM-12 matches the R-2 and gives the owner what their main plan is.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, anybody read to make a motion?

Carol Duncan (City Attorney): There is always the option to table it and talk to your client.

John Easley: I'd like to see what the motion is.

Carol Duncan: Well, the motion will be to approve because we always make them into positives,

Unable to transcribe

John Easley: I wanna see if it's for the RM-12 or the RM-8.

Lonnie Roberts: It'll be for the RM-12, we can't change it unless you agree to change it.

John Easley: I'd like to motion for a table, because I can't take that chance.

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey, seconded by Jimmy Cooper, that this matter be Tabled . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

**Aye:** 6 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

**Absent:** 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

## **9. Staff Comments**

**COM-24:011** Other Communication: Downtown Jonesboro Development Code (DJDC) Update

An update to the minimum building frontage requirement for general frontage lots in the Commercial Mixed Use District.

**Attachments:** Exhibit A  
Ordinance

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Paul Ford to Un-table the motion PASSED with all voting in favor.

Lonnie Roberts: So this is open for discussion now, do any commissioners at this point have any questions or comments?

Kevin Bailey (Commission): Just yesterday at the pre-meeting, there was some explanation of the change in the ordinance that's purposed and then there was some good clarity given, presented by Derrel, and Craig, and Monica, with a map, for those who weren't there yesterday, I'd like for that to be reviewed again. I would like that information shown on screen and then presented by either Derrel or input from Craig.

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Okay what we're looking at is commercial mixed use district. We have 4 districts in the redevelopment area as you can see industrial arts, neighborhood transition, core commercial and commercial mixed use. In 3 of the 4 on a general frontage street, the building width requirement is 30%, in a commercial mixed use it is 60%, it is our contention that it should be 30% in all districts, to be consistent. This is only on general frontage streets, not on pedestrian priority or pedestrian friendly streets. Those

are much greater, general streets are streets that are designed for the movement of vehicles, pedestrian priority and pedestrian friendly are pedestrian first streets. We try to keep the vehicles at a minimum on those.  
Lonnie Roberts: She has the map pulled up now, so as a point of clarity the greens are pedestrian.

Derrel Smith: Greens, are pedestrian friendly and red are pedestrian priority. Blues are general streets. This only affects the area along Gee Street, the areas along Johnson and a few areas along Matthews and Washington. That are in the commercial mixed use area.

Commission: Is there a way to lay over the boundary line of the California looking property? Over this street? Cause I can't tell, where all that is.

Derrel Smith: Not tonight there's not, I don't have that ability tonight, we can make that map for you.

Lonnie Roberts: I'd like to see that as well.

Commission: Mainly cause I own a property on Elm Street and that would, it's shocking to me that, it ain't pedestrian friendly. Cause it runs into a park as opposed to, but anyway just curious.

Derrel Smith: Like I said, we can get that next meeting but I don't have the ability to produce it tonight. So, this is only for the general frontage streets, and it's mainly gonna be Gee Street, It's gonna be Johnson, parts of Matthews and Washington. Everything else in a neighborhood transition, all the other pedestrian friendly and pedestrian priority, they're not gonna change, it's just Gee Street, Johnson, Matthews, and Washington.

Commission: That gave me clarity yesterday on some things, so I wanted to make sure that the other commissioners and the public that wasn't there had that information.

Lonnie Roberts: So would commissioners like to make any more questions or comments at this point before I open up for some public discussion? Derrel do you have anything else to add at this point?

Derrel Smith: Well, I wanna to make sure, they know the areas at Matthews and Washington are the commercial mixed use areas, not neighborhood transition areas or the core areas, it's just the areas out towards Astate, to the east.

Commission: The streets in the neighborhood transitional are already designated 30% on the general use correct?

Lonnie Roberts: So is everything in green right now, already 30%?

Derrel Smith: Yes.

Lonnie Roberts: And everything in blue, and everything in the brown core mix is already 30%?

Derrel Smith: On general frontage streets.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay

Commission: Pedestrian priority and pedestrian friendly those are the higher percentages.

Lonnie Roberts: Anyone else right now? Okay, I'll open up, anyone here from the public with questions tonight? Would you please state your name for the record and you're address?

Catherine Norville (Public): Hello, my name is Catharine Norville, I live at 636 West Strong, and if it matters I work at 920 Gees Street as well. I wanna thank you all for the codes involved in this because I feel like it has really helped our neighborhood, both in making it more desirable, lower in crime and overall improving our neighborhood. And I know there has been some discussion on whether the 60 should have even been in there if it's a typo or not on that and I understand that mistakes happen, but at the end of the day I feel like this is the

code we have been operating under for the last 4 years. And as someone who lives in the neighborhood, I have some concerns with that with changing it in this manner and what president it sets going forward, I guess for example in another 6 months there is an architect whose plans don't line up with something else, within the codes will we just you know go ahead and change that, what I'm afraid of it that it will open a door, to slowly dismantling our code going forward. And I just wanna know if we can have some protections on that because we really have seen some growth and development with that in our neighborhood and we would really like to keep moving forward in a positive direction.

Lonnie Roberts: That it, thank you for your comments.

Catherine Norville: Yes, thank you for hearing me.

Monroe Pointer (Commission): Can I ask her a question.

Lonnie Roberts: Yes, please.

Monroe Pointer: You're saying that you're thinking that the code as it is has made the neighborhood better?

Catherine Norville: Yes, I do. Thank you.

Monroe Pointer: Thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Anyone else have any comments, yes sir? Well, I'll let you both come up here and you can decide.

Unable to transcribe

Jeff Spencer (Public): I just have a couple questions, Jeff Spencer, 701 Floyd. My question was about the commercial use mixed district, is huge if you look at the red over 50% of the entire district, so there are lots of different street types in each district. I just want to point that out, the neighborhood transitional district does have streets that allow 30% but it also has several streets that require 50%. So, it gets pretty complicated when you got 4 different districts, 3 different types of streets, all different types of streets occur in different districts. My reading of the code is to create a different form in each district. Which one reason why the Industrial arts district will no longer allow single family homes. Sounds bizarre of course, but you'll get a different look and feel over there when that happens. And then they have 30% coverage, I don't know maybe on those streets, but I just wanted to point that out, that the commercial mixed use district is really big has many different types of streets in it and many residences are in that, you know Matthews up to Johnson tons of single family homes are already there. So you have to think about that, the way this is presented we're talking about 30% coverage you can build anything there from what I understand that you could build on Gee. So you got folks living there and we're looking at hey someone is going to build a 40 foot long building that's 30 feet wide right up against your property line. Those are things we need to look at. And also I'd be interested in you guys seeing what the code says about the streets, how it describes each type of street. It's short, and the introduction to the code itself is worth reading, cause it gives you feel of how it's trying to improve and not only preserve what we have downtown but in some senses enhance it. It's a transitional code it may take 50, a 100, 200 years. But for example, we love Sonic on Gee Street, if Sonic gets torn down they wouldn't be allowed to put it back by reading of our code, no drive-thrus are allowed. But Sonic may never go away from there, so this is not something that is going to jolt Gee Street, or jolt downtown or anything like that the way it's written. But those numbers are important and there's principles behind them and I just want to make sure we look at those principles. And make sure that we're following those if we're gonna get the desired results of the code. Thank you that was my only question.



Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for your comments. Yes Sir?

Bob Warner (Public): Bob Warner, 1003 West Washington, some you are probably sick of us and I apologize for that, but some people weren't here at the pre-planning so I thought I would make a couple remarks, a question if I could.

Lonnie Roberts: Yes sir.

Bob Warner (Public): Is it my understanding Derrel that this change as far as the west end goes would only affect Gee Street?

Derrel Smith: The west end? Yes.

Bob Warner: And so yesterday, we wrote down Gee Street and the very few properties, that this would effect, in future development as it stands right now, Is that also true? So what prompted this is an odd lot between two businesses that's really narrow, we talked about this yesterday, and so it brought it to your attention that it was 60 and not 30, really you can't apply this to any existing properties, I guess you would in redevelopment apply it, but there's gonna be very few properties. So in my mind, if there is a property that can't be developed because there's less than 60%, that's why we have a BZA and that's why we have you all as a committee, and it would be very isolated, and I'm speaking only to the west end, you'd have a letter in your packet, I hoped you received it, but it basically shows you the housing that has been developed in the west end. That's the exception of this code, so Derrel, congratulations for writing the code and helping us with it, it's been very effective, so I think that changing it as far as for the historical part of the city is a really big deal, so we're respectfully requesting that you leave it be, and do what you need to do on Johnson etcetera it's not gonna effect Gee Street one bit with rare exceptions, the rare exceptions can be handled through the process. But you don't change the whole code cause you got one or two buildings that can't conform, that's my logic. Appreciate you listening to me thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Thank you for your comments. Anyone else at this time? Yes sir?

Brian Richardson (Mayor's Office): Hey everybody its Brian Richardson with the mayor's office, I just wanted to point out and clarify a couple things, one that we discussed this with the planning and engineering in the pre-meeting yesterday and obviously again today, to clarify that this is not, you know obviously we don't want these to be non-serious conversations, cause we ultimately want to do is come up with solution that makes sense and works best for the city. And I just wanted to make a point and a comment, and I appreciate the work our planning department has put towards this and engineering. I didn't know a lot about this code until we started digging into this and there's obviously a lot of layers to unfold, and I appreciate y'all being willing to take this under advisement and anything we can do to help with those discussions, I'm happy to, but at this point I want to point out that obviously we want what's best for the city, and sometimes that gets confusing and complicated, but ultimately I feel like, we can come up with something here that makes sense cause we want Gee Street to redevelop, and if there are things that we need to address to help make that happen we have to consider those things as well, so ultimately I think we can come up with something that really works here, and maybe this is it, maybe we just need to clarify what changes this really entails, anything I can do to help with that, just let me know.

Lonnie Roberts: Anybody have any questions while he's here? Mr. Ford?

Paul Ford (Commission): I don't have any questions but sometimes you ask for comments and I was waiting for that, what I don't understand about the

process, for one I wasn't here two weeks ago when this got tabled, but what I don't understand, is how the building, any building, gets to this point in the construction process, and it be non-compliant. Getting past inspection after inspection, and more money gets funneled into the project by the owner or realtor, whether it be as their own business or build to suit, and hope to rent it out to somebody but yet you have this building, and it's non-compliant and it's getting approved. It's one thing to have a code that we follow, it's another thing to have a code that we don't follow and somebody approves the non-compliance. So when we're looking at, maybe it's just as alarming to me as the fact that it had been built out of code. This may not be the form to say that but I don't quite get that. You know if, I don't understand how this happens, and last thing I would like to know is what evidence is there to support the contention that it was typo as opposed to an intended entry into to the code. Because that's easy to say, oh it's a typo, but what supports that? What other rough draft is there what other source document might there be that it was intended to be 30. Because when you're typing, one's a right hand and one's a left and usually typos are side by side, not opposites of hands, to me. That's my comments.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Jeff Steiling, that this matter be Tabled . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

**Aye:** 6 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

**Absent:** 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

#### **10. Adjournment**