



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes - Final Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, May 14, 2019

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and David Handwork

Absent 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-19:045](#)

MINUTES: April 9, 2019

Meeting Minutes from April 9, 2019 MAPC Meeting.

Attachments: [Meeting Minutes from April 9, 2019.pdf](#)

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

Aye: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and David Handwork

Absent: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

[MIN-19:046](#)

MINUTES: April 23, 2019

Meeting Minutes from April 23, 2019 MAPC Meeting.

Attachments: [Meeting Minutes from April 23, 2019.pdf](#)

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

Aye: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and David Handwork

Absent: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

4. Miscellaneous Items

[COM-19:030](#)

SITE / PLOT PLAN: 4208 Chieftan Lane, 300 Bowling Lane, and 2305 and 2309 Fox Meadow Lane

Ron Cooper on behalf of the Nettleton School District is requesting consideration from MAPC for placement of temporary portable trailers to be used at four of their campus locations for portable classrooms on the properties located at Fox Meadow Intermedicate Center, Fox Meadow Elementary, University Heights Elementary and the Jr. High School Campus. The School District is asking for approximately two years. This request is on R-1 Single Family Density District and R-2 Medium Family Density District.

Attachments:

[Letter.pdf](#)

[Application - 4208 Chieftan Lane.pdf](#)

[Application - 300 Bowling Lane.pdf](#)

[Application - 2305 Fox Meadow Lane.pdf](#)

[Application - 2309 Fox Meadow Lane.pdf](#)

[Portable Classroom Building Spec..pdf](#)

[Info for Trailers.pdf](#)

[Aerial View for 4208 Chieftan - Jr. High.pdf](#)

[Aerial View for 300 Bowling Lane - University Heights Elementary.pdf](#)

[Aerial View for 2305 and 2309 Fox Meadow Lane - Fox Meadow Elementary.](#)

APPLICANT: Superintendent James Dunivan stated there is nothing to add. They are portable classrooms for over growth.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Smith Jr. asked the city planner if he has any comments regarding this.

STAFF: Derrel Smith of Planning stated we would ask they limit it to two years and come back to this body if they're not ready to make new additions within that two years. They can come back and do an extension at that time.

COMMISSION: Dennis Zopler asked if they are requesting a conditional use, in essence.

STAFF: Derrel Smith of Planning stated this isn't shown as a conditional use in our schedule of uses, but any time that we have trailers at schools, churches, we've always tried to limit their time on the property instead of letting them become permanent. That's the reason we had them ask for a two year placement at this time. If for some reason they cannot get funds for a building project by that time, we can extend it as we go, but we know it isn't going to be a permanent building.

COMMISSION: Jerry Reece asked if they could live with that two year commitment.

APPLICANT: James Dunivan stated they could. We are leasing the buildings. We don't intend to keep them. They will be temporary until we can do some more building.

A motion was made by Jerry Reece, seconded by Dennis Zolper, that this

matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and David Handwork

Absent: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

[COM-19:031](#)

SIDEWALK EXEMPTION REQUEST: 2501 Keller Chapel Road

Carlos Wood of Wood Engineering on behalf of City Water and Light is requesting from MAPC to be able to pay the Sidewalk "In Lieu" Payment of \$22,905.54 instead of installing the sidewalks along 2501 Kellers Chapel Road. The total area of sidewalk is 441 square yards.

Attachments: [Applicaiton.pdf](#)
 [Site Plan.pdf](#)
 [Plan.pdf](#)
 [Map View.pdf](#)

APPLICANT: Kevin Imboden with City, Water, and Light stated that we, at City, Water, and Light work for the same folks as you all do and that's the citizens of Jonesboro. We are here trying to look out for their best interest. Certainly, we understand this is a gray area on these kinds of issues and we respect each individual's opinion and ultimately your vote. We support that. We're ok with that. Under the sidewalk ordinance it does allow for exceptions in the case when sidewalks are deemed other unusual circumstances make the sidewalk installation unreasonable or inappropriate. In this case, we feel this site is not really appropriate at this time for sidewalks. It's subjective, but when we did the conditional use to build that substation in a residential area, one of the things we committed to focus on was maintaining as much screening as we could around the perimeter of the site. This sidewalk will result in us losing some screening and some buffer, especially to the terrain out there. In addition, there is a pretty large drainage structure we would have to extend or take under the sidewalk. Again, that's doable. It just makes it a little more difficult. There are some grade changes as you go around the perimeter of that site. We had to do extensive dirt work just to get a substation pad site built up to build the substation. There will be some grade changes. Looking at it from the ordinance, we think there are grounds to get the exception. Again, we're not asking to not spend the money to build a sidewalk. We're asking for instead of building the sidewalk there, to make a payment to the city and let the city build a sidewalk where they deem is more appropriate in an overall plan where the day they form a strip, the next day a family is pushing a stroller down the strip with their baby, versus this location where, right now, when I looked at it, east of us we have the Keller's Chapel cemetery which has 500 to 550 feet of frontage. Under the ordinance, it does not require them to construct a sidewalk. East of that we have a developed subdivision with 1500 feet of frontage. Again, it's an already developed subdivision so if I understand correctly through the ordinance, they're not required to come back and build a sidewalk. On the west line of the property, immediately south of our site, there is a large communications tower. I think they have around 400 feet of frontage if I scanned that correctly. Again, under the ordinance, I don't see that they're going to have to build a sidewalk. South of there is another 900 feet or so of developed subdivision frontage where they won't have to build a sidewalk under the ordinance, as I understand it. Again, looking at this, if we were to build the sidewalk in this location, there's over 3000 feet of frontage to our east and to our south where I guess at some point the city would need to come back and build those sidewalks. The rate payers, the citizens of the city of

Jonesboro, will need to build that. We look at it like at this point, it would be better to take that money and build the sidewalks somewhere else because of these issues with the screening. We would like to keep it in place and with the construction issues we have at that site. In this area 15, 20 years down the road when there is more growth out there, someone in our shoes that has a difficult site, can make the payment to the city and a sidewalk could be built at that time. I've probably said more than I've needed to. That's the way we were looking at it. Again, we respect each one of you, your individual opinions, and your votes.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Smith Jr. asked the city planner if he has any comments regarding this.

STAFF: Derrel Smith of Planning stated it does meet the guidelines to accept a fee in lieu of those.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Smith Jr. opened it up for commissioner discussion, questions of the applicant or city staff, or among each other.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated he drove out to the site yesterday and looked at it. I noticed there is already some sidewalk formed up. Why the decision to pull back from that?

APPLICANT: Kevin Imboden stated they're still trying to get their head around this ordinance and how it works. You may recall, I came to the pre-meeting and we had actually put a petition forward to request to build sidewalks on other CWL properties versus building out there. I don't know how long ago that's been. A month or two ago. It was pointed out the ordinance, as it's written, doesn't allow for an owner or developer to build sidewalks on other properties that owner owns. In our case, other properties that City, Water, and Light owns. We pulled that request. We didn't think we had another option. It was just our not understanding the ordinance completely. Once we understood we had this option of making the payment to the city, we felt like that was the better option not only for City, Water, and Light, but for the city and the citizens of Jonesboro. We halted that work and our intent is to plant trees back that were taken down as a result of that planned sidewalk route. So were back requesting.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated it appears where the form stopped, you're going from east and then turns south. How much of the site is remaining for flat work and form-up work as far as the sidewalk. It looks like about half the site is formed up, maybe a little less than half.

APPLICANT: Kevin Imboden stated it may be roughly half, I'm not exactly sure. Carlos has been out there more than I have in the last few days. Maybe half of it.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated Carlos, can you speak to how much more work has to be done in order to form up and do the other half of the site.

APPLICANT: Carlos Wood stated along the west side of the tank and around Keller's chapel south of the west driveway. It's a little bit less than half. Everything east of the tank is constructed now, or formed up. We have to

remove trees to put this sidewalk in. That impedes or reduces the buffer system that they were trying to provide.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated he can't speak for the citizens regarding the buffer, but it looks like what, just driving by and I stopped to get out and look at it. I recognize that some of the trees may have to be removed to continue on your form work. It looks like you've got a pretty decent buffer with the trees that are remaining. That's my opinion. The driveway that comes out the left side of that substation, obviously you can't have trees there because you have a driveway. There is a big open spot there already so you don't have a buffer. One thing that I would agree with you, there's established development around there and there's not a mandate, but there is an opportunity for sidewalks, especially to the subdivision that is to the east of there. There is a good right-of-way and the fences leaves a pretty good flat spot for a future sidewalk. Then, there is the lot of undeveloped property out there that could be developed for subdivisions which would have the mandate for sidewalks. Because of the potential for sidewalks that could be out there, I would applaud what City, Water, and Light has already done in already starting a precedent for any future development either on the north side of Keller's road or even some of the undeveloped properties that have potential development on Keller's Chapel Road as well. That would connect sidewalks, at least for these neighborhoods, and setup potential for sidewalks in this whole area. It's completely undeveloped with any sidewalks so this is at least a start. The other thing that is encouraging is that 49 South already has curb and gutter. We know that the stance for state highway development for sidewalks, that's one of the requisites they require for sidewalks. If there is any further development on 49 South, that will be an opportunity for sidewalks as well. Even though this is out in a no-man's land already, it may not seem logical to do a sidewalk right now, I would like to speak against this based on the criteria I have.

COMMISSION: Dennis Zolper stated under exemptions it says properties for which public sanitary sewer system is not available and the provision of such service is not planned within the next 12 months. Is there sanitary sewer out there?

APPLICANT: Kevin Imboden stated there is sanitary sewer to the southeast, but not on the 4.5 acre that's the substation site. We don't really have any intention to extend the sewer line up there. I started to bring that up. It actually falls under the exemptions which would be for those applications requesting not to build a sidewalk, or make a payment in lieu of constructing sidewalks. That would be even more severe. I think it would have some impact on this call that if a developer could ask for an exemption, not even making a payment in lieu of the sidewalks, because of not having sewer available then I would think that would somewhat influence granting an exception. Making a payment in lieu of constructing the sidewalks on this site.

COMMISSION: Dennis Zolper stated he knows the city will always be glad to take some money.

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

Aye: 6 - Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Nay: 1 - David Handwork

Absent: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

[COM-19:032](#)

SITE PLAN: Oaktree Manor - Planned Development

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Robert Abraham, M.D. Requests MAPC extension of a 64 month time limit on completing the Oaktree Manor Planned Development. This was decided on December 10, 2013 at the MAPC Meeting. This property was rezoned on August 20, 2013.

Attachments: [Application.pdf](#)
 [Oaktree Manor Planned Unit Development.pdf](#)
 [Ordinance.pdf](#)
 [Email concerning Extension.pdf](#)
 [MAPC Meeting 01.11.14 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)
 [MAPC Meeting 12.10.13 Meeting Minutes.pdf](#)
 [Original Layout Abraham.pdf](#)
 [Planned Development Oaktree Manor.pdf](#)
 [Plat.pdf](#)
 [Revised Plan Layout.pdf](#)
 [OakTree Manor Pud Addressing.pdf](#)
 [Cover Letter HEALTH DEPARTMENT CHANGE.pdf](#)
 [Pictures of Buildings.pdf](#)

APPLICANT: George Hamman of Civilogic stated they prepared the plans for this development as well as this application for an extension on the time. As you mentioned, these plans were approved back in December, 2013 with a 64 month period to get it completed. Dr. Abraham has invested a lot of time and effort in this. He has got the common house completed and he also has 16 of the duplexes completed, not to mention, all of the infrastructure that has gone into place. He had to fill this site two to three feet in order to elevate it above the floodplain to comply with the city's floodplain regulations. All of the drainage is in place, all of the sanitary sewer, all of the water lines, all the water meters. All the electric conduit and transformers are in place and the street is in place. He is requesting a five year period to continue to be able to finish this development and complete the rest of the buildings.

COMMISION: Lonnie Smith Jr. asked the city planner if he has any comments regarding this.

STAFF: Derrel Smith of Planning asked how many buildings are we talking about.

APPLICANT: George Hamman of Civilogic stated a total of 37 buildings. He has 17 of those completed.

STAFF: Derrel Smith of Planning asked and he thinks that will take five years?

APPLICANT: George Hamman of Civilogic stated he doesn't think it will take five years, but he wanted to request five years, so if he does elect to slow down or he doesn't rent a few of them. He has a little bit of flexibility there.

STAFF: Derrel Smith of Planning stated he was just going through the minutes

of the original meeting. He was granted a 64 month time limit which was a little over 5 years. Now we're requesting another 60 months. I'd be more comfortable with a two year extension. I don't know about a five year extension. He can always come back in two years and ask for another if he needs it. This might be an incentive to get the development done a little faster.

APPLICANT: George Hamman of Civilogic stated that certainly would restrict him. This is a remarkable gentleman, I don't know if any of you know him personally. He puts so much personal extra-curricular activity into this development, over and above his medical practice. He's out there a lot of times in the finishing stages installing the landscaping himself, unloading trailers of moss and such. That's one of the reasons it's, I think it's a release for him, a stress release to go out and actually accomplish physical work, physical labor, instead of the intellectual demands of being a physician. I think he just wanted to have a little more flexibility and a little more time to be able to finish it up.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Smith Jr. opened it up for discussion.

COMMISSION: Dennis Zolper stated he thinks Derrel Smith - Planning has a valid point. If we give two years, he can always come back 18 months, explain to us where you are. We would be interested in working with Dr. Abraham for two years. Let's see what happens in two years.

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey, seconded by Dennis Zolper, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and David Handwork

Absent: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

[CU-19-04](#)

CONDITIONAL USE: 2215 Grant Avenue

CU 19-04: Daren Berry on behalf of BLR Investments is requesting MAPC Approval for a Conditional Use to convert an empty 9,000 sq. ft building into a Climate Controlled Storage Facility, which is required for Warehouse, residential (mini) storage within Section 117-139 of the code. This is located at 2215 Grant Avenue. This is a C-3 General Commercial Property that requires a Conditional Use to place warehouse / storage facility on this property.

Attachments: [Application.pdf](#)
 [Staff_Summary.pdf](#)
 [Information on Location.pdf](#)
 [USPS Receipts.pdf](#)
 [Vance's Second Addition Plat.pdf](#)
 [Site Plan.pdf](#)

APPLICANT: Daren Berry on behalf of BLR Investments stated he is wanting to covert that 9,000 square feet to a climate controlled storage.

COMMISON: Lonnie Smith Jr. asked the city planner if he has any comments regarding this.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated it should fit into the area as an indoor climate controlled facility. We would recommend approval with two conditions.

1. Upon issuance of a zoning permit approval, all other building permit and other permits and licensing required locally and state wide be applied for and obtained by the applicant.
2. The applicant will be required to adhere to all codes and ordinances regarding parking lots.

COMMISON: Lonnie Smith Jr. asked if anyone was here to give public input.

PUBLIC: No Comment.

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

Aye: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and David Handwork

Absent: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

8. Rezoning

[RZ-19-06](#)

REZONING: 5917 E Johnson

RZ 19-06: Marsha Bradley on behalf of Steve Sukup of Sukup Manufacturing Company is requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from I-1 Limited Industrial District to C-3 General Commercial District for 5.93 Acres +/- of land located at 5917 E. Johnson.

Attachments: [Application.pdf](#)
 [Questions - Answers.pdf](#)
 [Staff Summary.pdf](#)
 [MP 16-10 SUKUP 49 ADDITION - SUKUP MANUFACTURING - JOHNSON.](#)
 [Warranty Deed.pdf](#)
 [USPS Receipts.pdf](#)

APPLICANT: Marsha Bradley stated she just wants it to match the other land that she owns beside it.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Smith Jr. asked the city planner if he has any comments regarding this.

STAFF: Derrel Smith of Planning stated this meets all of our criteria, all six requirements for rezoning. We would recommend approval with the following conditions:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Stormwater Drainage Design Manual and Flood Plain Regulations regarding any new construction.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning Staff, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to the Planning Staff approval in the future.
4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, sidewalks, dumpster etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Staff prior to any redevelopment.
5. Any improvements required by the Planning Department, Engineering Department, Inspection Department and Fire Department shall be completed prior to any C.O. being issued.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Smith Jr. asked for any public input regarding this rezoning request. He then asked for any commission comments or discussion.

PUBLIC: No Comment.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper, seconded by David Handwork, that this matter be Recommended to Council. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and David Handwork

Absent: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

9. Staff Comments

10. Adjournment