



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes - Final Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, October 27, 2020

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

Absent 1 - Jerry Reece

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-20:101](#)

MINUTES: MAPC Minutes from October 13th, 2020 Meeting

Attachments: [MAPC Minutes from October 13th, 2020 Meeting](#)

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

Absent: 2 - Jerry Reece and Mary Margaret Jackson

4. Miscellaneous Items

[COM-20:063](#)

SIDEWALK REQUEST: 610 Willett Road

Chris Dougherty of Olsson on behalf of City, Water and Light Lift Station is requesting consideration from the MAPC to be able to pay the Sidewalk "In Lieu" Payment of \$18,704.00 instead of installing the sidewalks along 610 Willett Road. The total area of sidewalk is 350 square yards at the 2020 rate of \$53.44 per square yard.

Attachments: [Sidewalk Letter](#)
[Pictures](#)
[Plans for Lift Station](#)
[Aerial View of Area](#)

Chris Dougherty of Olsson on behalf of City, Water and Light Lift Station is requesting consideration from the MAPC to be able to pay the Sidewalk "In Lieu" Payment of \$18,704.00 Instead of installing the sidewalks along 610 Willett Road. The total area of the sidewalk is 350 square yards at the 2020 rate of \$53.44 per square yard.

APPLICANT: Mr. Kevan Imboden on behalf of City, Water and Light stated, the exception that Chris listed comes from the ordinance

Exception 2. If there is a storm water drainage ditch that cannot be relocated or the sidewalk cannot be relocated and that case on this project there is a large storm water ditch that runs North and South on the Eastside of Willow Road. I would estimate its 25ft to 30ft Wide at the top and there is no shoulder along either side of Willow Rd. On our side the eastside of Willow Road, so for us a sidewalk would not be practicable do to the location of the large ditch. The ordinance Exception 4 talks about any usually substances and Loss Creek is on the Southside of the project so the sidewalk, if we wanted to build one there, the Southside of the Sidewalk would have to dead –in at Loss Creek. One other thing Chris did not mention in his letter is for as usually things, about the property, which also qualify as an exception. Is majority of the property own around there, about a 1,000 acres is own by City, Water and light or the County and we holding that for wastewater operation. The bottom line is we support spending money on Sidewalk, but we just think a payment to build sidewalks in other places where the City see fit versus here on our project, we think our rate payer assist will be better serve to that the payment "in Lieu" of sidewalk on this project.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts asked for Staff Comments.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated we agree with Mr. Imboden that this does met two of the Exceptions in our sidewalk ordinance. We would recommend accepting the fee "In Lieu" instead of installing sidewalks.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts asked for Commissioner's Comments or question for either the Applicant or City Staff.

COMMISSION: David Handwork states he has a question for Derrel or Michael. What the current plan is for were we would put this dollars into constructing sidewalks. Therefore, what is the plan for this "In Lieu" Fee?

STAFF: Michael Morris states currently we do an annual list on the project we would like to do. So far until this year, the first year that we really had enough that we can do a project with the sidewalk money. Before we only had about 1,000 ft. and now City, Water and Light contributing and the other projects and industrial development has done it. So now we at least have enough money we can actually turn a project somewhere. So if there is a place that someone would like to see, maybe something we can work at making a plan towards it. You only get maybe half mile on a sidewalk a year is about all you can build. So we have a lot of places to choose, we just don't have enough financing to say let's hey it going to be a 5yr or 3yr plan we just don't have enough money to make a plan like that.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated so you saying there is plenty left on the list from the list back in January that we received.

STAFF: Michael Morris stated yes, I actually have a list, and I can report back to you. How much sidewalk "In Lieu" money that we have, but before this year we did not have enough to make a quarter of a block somewhere.

COMMISSION: David Handworks states that sort of answer my question. So I think what I would like see as a commissioner, when we consider these "In Lieu" fee's that the city kind of instead have a list kind of have a plan, like it's more of just waiting for the dollars to show up and this is where we want to go and these are the priorities. I recall the list so I am not questioning the list, but I really would like to see more of if you like to call it a master plan of where we are going the "In Lieu" fee would help me in situations like this. I do not disagree that there's so severe challenges with this site relative to the adjacent storm drainage and I think there are other elements here that I think is worthy of concerns of the "In Lieu" fee but it makes me feel more comfortable whenever I consider the "In Lieu" fee when I know actually the next step is where we going to go with the plan.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson states she has a comment. While I realize that this is for a sidewalk "in Lieu" fee, I think I would be remiss not to mention that I am unhappy that they are putting a Lift Station so close to the flood way. I understand this is probably to support the enormous amount of development that occurred to the east. It mean if the Lift Station flooded. I know you can take measures to mitigate that, but I just feel like it is a poor choice for a location and I just wanted to say that. This will probably spur up more development in this area. We just really need to take another look at our comprehensive plan and see where and how we want to develop. I know this is a Sidewalk and "In Lieu" request. I just had to say that.

APPLICANT: Mr. Imboden states with that comment made he feels like he needs to respond. This is a replacement Lift Station. It actually replacing the one existing there on the opposite side of the creek. We have study the flood way and we are aware of the flood elevation and this project will be built above that. So from an Engineering stand point there is no measureable risk to Floodway issues and wastewater from that location from my professional perspective.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for any further Commissioner's Comments

or Question

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

Aye: 5 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

Nay: 1 - David Handwork

Absent: 2 - Jerry Reece and Mary Margaret Jackson

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

8. Rezoning

[RZ-20-16](#)

REZONING: 3216 Moore Road

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of John C. Stuckey are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from “R-1” Single Family Residential District to “I-1” Limited Industrial District for 2.88 +/- acres of land located at 3216 Moore Road.

Attachments:

[Application](#)

[Staff Summary](#)

[Layout 1](#)

[Layout 2](#)

[Rezoning Plat](#)

[Minutes of Community Meeting](#)

[Pictures of Area](#)

[USPS Receipts](#)

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of John C. Stuckey are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from “R-1” Single Family Residential District to “I-1” Limited Industrial District for 2.88 +/- acres of land located at 3216 Moore Road.

APPLICANT: Jim Grambling of Grambling Law firm on behalf of John Stuckey states they’re seeking rezoning from “R-1” ” Single Family Residential District to “I-1” Limited Industrial District. This is Moore Road out of the East of town off Hwy 18 across the road from the National Guard Armory & Aramark. One time this property was use as Agriculture property and it already has some grain bins and barn on the property.

To the North is an “R-1” Single Family Home to the South is “R-1” but then “I-1” farther South from there. To the East is vacant and Agriculture and of course to the West is “I-1” already with the Aramark and Armory. We did because there’s some houses around already have a neighborhood meeting on September 16th 2020 nobody showed up and we haven’t heard anything from anybody voicing any concerns. This area is in an Industrial growth sector which would allow lot of heavy Industrial usage we’re not asking for that we’re asking for what I think would be characterized as live Industrial and the purpose is to have some storage and small office space that would be use by Aramark across the street there. Um as I am sure Derrel would tell you the staff report recommended this and met all the factors and its we’re anticipating well under 50 to 60 trips per day for traffic purposes.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated that he would be turning this over to the City Planner in a minute, but what I would like to do is ask for Public comments in a few minutes. The phone number which is 870-336-7248 and the Email is CouncilComments@Jonesboro.org with that being said I will turn it over to City Planner. Do you have any Staff Comments regarding this case.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated this does follows our Land Use Plan for that area and 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 Flood Plain Regulations and Traffic Access Management Policy regarding any new development.

2. 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.

3. Any change of use shall be subject to Planning Department approval in the future.

4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosure, sidewalks etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment of this property.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Public Comments or any callers.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Commissioner's comments or motions.

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

Aye: 7 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

Absent: 1 - Jerry Reece

[RZ 20-18](#)

REZONING: 2512 and 2514 Curtview Street

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Kenny and Shelia Throgmartin are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from “R-1” Single Family Residential District to “RM-8” Residential multifamily classification; eight units per net acre, includes all forms of units, duplexes, triplexes, quads, and higher for 0.57 +/- acres of land located at 2512 and 2514 Curtview Street.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Rezoning Plat](#)
 [Proposed Plan](#)
 [Signed Property Owners](#)
 [USPS Receipts](#)
 [Pictures of Area](#)

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Kenny and Shelia Throgmartin are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from “R-1” Single Family Residential District to “RM-8” Residential multifamily classification; eight units per net acre, includes all forms of units, duplexes, triplexes, quads, and higher for 0.57 +/- acres of land located at 2512 and 2514 Curtview Street.

APPLICANT: George Hamman of Civilogic states he’s here to represent the Owner and Buyer on this and it’s two existing residential Lots zone “R-1” and this street has multiple nonconforming uses. There are multifamily, Manufactured homes in there and there’s a across the street there’s a duplex that’s incomplete even though it appears to be have started under the newer guidelines. It has masonry finish on the outside and the parking in the rear, but for some reason it is not completed.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask with 0.57 acres how many units will that be.

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated they would like to build one duplex on each of the 2 lots and it will be 4 units.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated he be asking for public comments, but he turning it over to City Planner.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated this also applies with our Land Use plan and we would recommend approval of the Rezoning changes with the following stipulations:

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 and Traffic Access Management Policy regarding any new development.
2. 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.

3. Any change of use shall be subject to Planning Commission approval in the future.

4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosure, sidewalks etc. shall submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment of this property.

5. The new development will have to comply with the new Duplex Guidelines.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Public Comments on this Rezoning Request

PUBLIC: Tommy Ellison stated my lot connects to the lot those two lots and I disapprove of it.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask was he here to voice his opposition is that what you are saying do you have anything else to add.

PUBLIC: Tommy Ellison stated he knew Kenny personally and he has own those for some time and refused to sell to anyone like that, because he didn't want no one to do that to the property. We have enough stuff on the street going on as it is right now to have any more places like that to do go there.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask has anyone call in on the case. Anyone with Public Comments

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Commissioner's Comments or City Staff.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated I guess I have flooding on the brain since we had a week of rain behind us and we have another week rain ahead of us. That ditch right there shows issues and the flood map showed some flooding issues in this area. I know I have asked Engineering in the past about flooding and they said "well, we've got maps [of recent flooding] and if you look at the maps pretty much all of Jonesboro is flooding," or something along those lines.

I'm wondering if we have can any information about repetitive flooding? What I am concerned about is just cramming more people in there. I know that is a conceptual site plan there, but they show 8 units which is the maximum one parking space per unit. They obviously going for the highest of what they can do with that land. I was wondering if Engineering give us any information about repetitive flooding in this area?

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated to Mrs Jackson there's two duplexes with a total of 4 units. Two units on the top and two on the bottom.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated: ok, so all together 8 parking spaces. Then when you look around rest of the street you see a lot of debris and, you know, a lot of cars parked in the street and around. Again, I'm concerned about about the flooding in this area and if we have any information about rescues or repetitive losses here. It looks like it could be

bad.

STAFF: Michael Morris stated that he don't know any repetitive lose in this area. There is a floodway established alone with a flood plan and they're allowed to develop a flood plan and left the floodway for future. Basically we can fill up any bit of flood plan and the floodway will handled the flow.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated I 100% understand that. I used to work with them. But, we're making it denser and denser and we putting more people in there. So, we're going to impact the floodplan and increase the water in the floodway which can cover this area. So, this is a rezoning. We making it denser. We are putting more people in there. We're covering this area. This is in flood zone that is next to floodway and I don't know when it was last mapped.

Anytime I'm looking at these places I concerned understandably about putting more people in harm's way . Because even you if they can control the water on their site, a they are going to push water onto other people property. If this is an area that repetitive floods, this is something I am interested in hearing about especially for rezoning for an increase in density. It is something that concerns me and I'm hoping it something that we are keep track of. So, uh, my question again is - do you have any information? I think you said you don't have any information about repetitive flooding in this area?

STAFF: Michael Morris stated no we don't in that area. Now we have it in other places around but we do not in that area. We have one off of Mary Jane and I don't know any over there in Curtview in repetitive loss structures. I can get you a list of those if you like I just don't have them with me

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated yes she would be interested in that.

COMMISSION: Paul Ford stated the photograph that I saw it looks like the nonconforming uses are not adjacent to this property and that the property that the adjacent property are Single Family Residents. Am I wrong in that?

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated the lot to the South of this has at least 4 units and maybe more than that and a Single building

PUBLIC: Tommy Ellison stated I am the one with the privacy fence next door to it. That was like before when they was there and the neighbor just build his yard up just a little bit and that flood me and the one across the street when they build it up that shift all the water my way and I don't think that's fair to me. Because we do have enough flooding over there. I lived there since 1970 and I know a little about it.

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

Aye: 5 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Nay: 2 - Mary Margaret Jackson and Paul Ford

Absent: 1 - Jerry Reece

[RZ-20-19](#)

REZONING: Savannah Hills - West of Dena Jo Drive and North of Craighead Forest Road

Michael Boggs of Tralan Engineering on behalf of PDW Properties, LLC are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from “R-2” Multi-Family Low Density District to “PD-RM” Multi-Family Residential Planned Development District for 5.12 +/- acres of land located at the West between Dena Jo Drive and North of Craighead Forest Road.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Layout](#)
 [Rezoning Plat](#)
 [Rezoning Questionnaire](#)
 [Site Plan](#)
 [Adjoining Property Owner Signature](#)
 [USPS Receipts](#)

Michael Boggs of Tralan Engineering on behalf of PDW Properties, LLC are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from “R-2” Multi-Family Low Density District to “PD-RM” Multi-Family Residential Planned Development District for 5.12 +/- acres of land located at the West between Dena Jo Drive and North of Craighead Forest Road.

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle owner and developer stated requesting rezoning from “R-2” which has a maximum of 12 units as its zone. To a “PD-RM” With density of roughly 8.2 units is what we are proposing. From my review of what you have is the City report doesn’t show any compliance Issues no object from the Departmental or Agency reviews. We could go over the facts all night against Multi Family. I’m sure we are going to hear some and I can debate those. The facts is this. The vote before MAPC to night is not whether not we want to allow more apartments It’s not whether not Commissioner’s like it because it’s already zone that way. The Committee and Public need to understand it Zone for 12 Units an acre and I can build that without going through this Rezoning Process. We’re trying to have a better product out there.

Once you except that you would wonder, way I’m doing it. Rezoning this as proposed allows the City to have much more say in the design and layout and as while allowing me as the developer to build much more attractive product. You make also wonder why we would choose to go with lower density from 12 units to 8 units. Well we’re not interested in building a lower quality lower rent units just to maximum the units or maximum per acre. Our goal throughout the entire development has been and continue to be to create a neighborhood not an apartment complex. Everyone cannot or does not want to buy a house and they also don’t want to live in a large apartment complex.

As you seen out there we have gone for the neighborhood feel, and it only slightly units per acre then some Single Family Residential Neighborhood. Another consideration from the City standpoint with this development that the developer continues to be responsible for the street maintenance because it

not a city maintain street. So just so we understand vote against this request tell everybody tell the Public that the City prefer more units to be built on the property with the less desirable design with roughly 19 more units on this 5 acre track if I went with the way its zoned as it stands now. So voting against does not stop the project from being develop with multiple units. It also says that you prefer to take on the street maintenance whether then push that to the developer.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask do the Commissioner's have comments

COMMISSION: Paul Ford stated why can't you build exactly what you want you want to build on R-2. Simply because you could build more units doesn't mean you have to correct.

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle stated to allows us a little more design flexibility

COMMISSION: Paul Ford stated how is that? How can you not design anyway you want too if it fit within the zone

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle states the current zoning use have it on each duplex, triplex, fourplex on its own lot. So the setbacks are a little different. It allows us to have some pretty sidewalks in there. The walking trails around the back and it just lays it out better. Again, we can go back to that in our opinion it not attractive.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated each building has to be sub-divide onto its own lot is that right.

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle stated that is correct

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated so as he has the curve and design of the street there those things can't be done when you have to divide them up into each lot they have to stand alone that kind of a short term of saying it.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated I have a couple of question. First of all, on your questionnaire you indicated that you did not have community meeting. I was curious why you did not have a community meeting.

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle stated he didn't know it was supposed to. I would be glad to have a community meeting.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated that don't what it says. It said no meeting has been held at this time.

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle stated that is correct

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated if the proposed has not be discuss with neighbors please attach a statement explaining the reason failure to consult with neighbors may result on the delay in hearing the application. I just I think it' always important to hold up to that side of your bargain to work with the public whenever you ask for a rezoning. And then my second question is you're not going to be proposing some kind of density transfer by changing this area to a PUD.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Staff Comments

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated again this does met our Land Use Plan and it does met all 6 requirement for rezoning. So 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 and Traffic Access Management Policy regarding any new development.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to MAPC approval in the future.
4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosure, sidewalks etc. shall submitted to the MAPC prior to any redevelopment.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Public Comments and I have been informed that would probably be some call-ins comments on this one. So with multiple speakers let try to keep it 5 minutes per speaker.

PUBLIC: Ron Blackburn stated he lives at 798 Brownwood Circle, which is the "R-1" Brownstone addition, which share street with Savannah Hills Apartment Complex and the proposed Rezoning Site. I would like to address a couple of issues that goes with addition of other 66 units alone with the other 100 units there is already under construction. Issue #1 is the inaccurate local street that services our neighborhood and the increase burden that would be place on them. Those streets affected is the 1000 Block Russell Hill, 4200 Block Makala, and Craighead Forest Road. These street need extensive improvements to give safety to all of the citizen who use them curves, gutters and drains, etc. are needed. An add note of interest is that new streets in this development will be 27 ft. and Russell Hill Road measure 16 ft.

The 2020 Master Street Plan for Jonesboro suggest a Transportation Impact Study would be necessity when a proposed development of this size is offered. I like to read some inserts from the chapter in the Master Street Plan that address impact studies. Mr. Blackburn refers several pages from the 2020 Master Street Plan.

The second item I have an issue with is inform of a question. Is the site plan mirror image of what we done 4 years ago. If it yes and it is then you need to know the design guidelines for Multi-Family Residential Development adopt by the City Counsel in early 2018 would require upgades that would prevent duplication of the one story triplex portion of your plan. Mr. Blackburn is given reference to the Jonesboro Ordinance for Multi-Family qualification at this time.

PUBLIC: Sherry Ray stated she live at 810 East Craighead Forest Road. The

picture at the top is a very old picture and the reason it's an old picture because they put a walking trail from the entry to the apartment all the way down Craighead Forest Road. Sherry Ray stated I need a more pacific answer for the purpose of rezoning, because you say the "R-2" Is 12 apartments but to rezone is only 8 apartments. What is the benefit to the community to be rezone from "R-2" to "PD-RM"?

The next one on this questionnaire it says: What will the proposed rezoning effect nearby property, and I would say all the property around it is all property value.

My next one is question 13 how the neighbors feel about the rezoning. There was no meeting there was nobody that come around that said hey how you feel about this rezoning. It would have been very beneficial to the community to have a neighborhood meeting.

The Tree ordinance that was pass January 2019, the reason I pointed out that picture because it's a very old picture the lot there's ton of trees down there where that line is. The ordinance is the Tree preservation for the general health safety and wellness of the community.

PUBIC: Patty Lack 4108 Forest Hill Road stated that we was up here a month ago and I told you about the history and all that of this property and the thing kind of concern with again is I looked at when we came on July 14th on the one he was trying to rezoned and the information on staff summary was incorrect on that. One concern that I have is the entry and exit and I know Derrel we talk about this and when their start to be more of those units because there going to be over 500 already on that property. All those units goes out to private residential streets unlike the links they have a wide street that they have they using a residential street.

So what I'm concern with we don't have a compliance plan, because what going to happen if we build these 42units that we have. We have 12 that we just had approve just about a month ago so when you add the number of cars its concerning. But where is the other exit entry going to be when we keep on building and building because all it can do is go into the back. So that's a concern of mines where's the next exit going to be and I think that was question to Mr. Boggs the last time.

Also, on that December 14th it says that amendment was pass but it failed on that one. So I just wanted to make a note of that. But when we was here on September 22nd is that I stood up here and I told you the history of that property and when I look on the minutes of MAPC for that is none of the stuff I talked about from Mayor Perrin had promised been the obligation to the citizen to improve Makala and Becka. Patty Lack is refer to a hand out from January 2nd 2018 of Mayor Perrin referencing to Street Improvement.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Commissioner's Comments

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated she would like to know why Traffic Study hasn't been triggered with all these additional addition to this development first of all and I would like the City answer why a traffic study has not been triggered for this area because all the new development. Second, I

would like the City to address the prior question about the tree ordinance and how the city would work to enforce the tree ordinance on this property.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated the reason we haven't done a traffic study yet is because we don't have plans and we don't a traffic study on the rezoning we doing when the plans come through. As you probably didn't here I read into the minutes that a traffic study would be required. The Tree ordinance will be look at when we get actually plans to look at. We will look at the Grading Plan and occurring to the grading plan they have to have a tree preservation plan with it. We would look at it and see if it met requirement, if it doesn't we will have them make changes and if it does, we will issue the permit.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated if the traffic study says that we need to do improvement of the all the street that is connect to this development then what happens

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated the Ordinance states that if improvement are required it is up to the developer to make the improvement.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated a follow up question far as the traffic study so there's been obviously there several units out here in this area already what-how would the traffic study account for that separately from this addition how do you do that

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated he would require the engineer who does the study will have to take all that in count. They would have look at existing conditions and future condition and make a determination.

COMMISSION: David Handwork ask is there way for the Traffic Study to be made condition prior to the change in zoning.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated no we're looking at Land Use only and we can't trigger a Traffic Study until actual site of plan is submitted

COMMISSION: David Handwork reference question to Mr. Pickle. How many units are in this proposed development and how many traffic parking spot are there.

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle state 42 units and 95 spaces no 112 spaces

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson state how can the City legally inforce the road improvement.

COMMISSION: Carol Duncan stated I don't consider after the fact because it's being requested prior to once you get the site plan. I mean it is after the rezoning, but it's part of the rezoning. So it's not after the fact on the new development does that make sense.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for anymore Commissioner's comments

PUBLIC: Patty Lack stated this was the report I gave there almost 3 years ago and we knew that those two streets and Craighead Forest Road is not

adequate to handle the traffic from all these apartment units and if you look at the ones back in 2018 that was over 100 units that was being built and still being built.

So you figure 2 car per unit that 200 and you add the 80 some that going to over Craighead Forest Road that another 160. So you add up that total you almost 400 cars more on those two streets on those neighborhoods. So it just poor planning of the City that 3 years ago we should have done something about it and we didn't, but we can do something about it now instead of just keep on building.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated she would like the City to develop to answer why what are the requirement for the public meeting and why a public meeting wasn't held and who inforce that.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated there is no requirement for the City that they hold a public meeting it's a suggestion from the City it's not a requirement. Therefore, if they don't hold one we can't hold them up.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated the developer said he was not aware of that he needed a public meeting. Would the developer be willing to a public meeting?

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle stated it wasn't required

PUBLIC: Sherry Ray stated on the questionnaire said failure to consult with neighbors may result in delay in hearing the application

APPLICANT: Sid Pickle stated regards to the traffic study I think it should be noted and I don't remember the time, but I know the City in expanding and widening Harrisburg Road sometime between 2018 -2020 proposed widening Harrisburg Road even farther down which would elevated a lot of the traffic issues.

Some of the people on Forest Hill and around there didn't want Harrisburg Road widen and ended up getting vote down at the Council. So I think we're getting into sticky area with the City tried to do it and make improvement the member talk the City out of it and now said we going to have a traffic study the developer has to do it. Also a question for Derrel, did you say that a traffic study was required if I'm not doing this as a rezoning.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated if you producing more then 100 trips a day on any of your development you will be required to do a traffic study.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts ask for Commissioner's comments

A motion was made by Mary Margaret Jackson to Table the consideration of this proposed until a public meeting is held, seconded by Paul Ford that the matter be tabled. The Motion Denied by the following vote:

Aye: 3- Paul Ford, Mary Margaret Jackson, David Handwork

Nay: 4 – Kevin Bailey, Jimmy Cooper, Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated would everyone like to give a favorable recommendation from Planning Commissions

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Nay: 1 - Paul Ford

Absent: 1 - Jerry Reece

9. Staff Comments

10. Adjournment