



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, January 12, 2021

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 9 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-20:123](#)

MINUTES: December 8th, 2020 MAPC Minutes

Attachments: [MAPC Minutes from December 8th, 2020 MAPC Meeting](#)

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

Aye: 8 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

4. Miscellaneous Items

[COM-21:002](#)

SIDEWALK IN LIEU FEE: 3000 E Parker Road

Michael Boggs of Tralan Engineering on behalf of Bayird Auto Parking Expansion is requesting from MAPC to be able to pay the Sidewalk "In Lieu" Payment of \$7905.00 along 3000 E Parker Road. The 2020 Rate is \$53.33 per square yard.

Attachments: [Sidewalk Letter](#)
[Parking Lot Expansion Site Plan](#)
[Commercial Application](#)
[Site Development Plans](#)
[Aerial View of Location](#)

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 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper and Kevin Bailey

Nay: 3 - Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Paul Ford

[COM-21:003](#) SIDEWALK IN LIEU FEE: 2123 Red Wolf Blvd

Mr. Vaughn R. Hill, PE of TSH Properties, INC. dba Cheddars Casual Cafe is requesting MAPC Approval to be able to pay the Sidewalk "In Lieu" Payment of \$10,050.48 along 2123 Red Wolf Blvd. The total area of sidewalk being requested is 282 lineal feet. The 2020 annual rate is still what is being used of \$53.33 per square yard.

- Attachments:** [Letter](#)
 [Site Plan](#)
 [Commercial Application](#)
 [Plans](#)
 [Grading Plan](#)
 [Pictures](#)
 [Aerial View of Location](#)

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

Aye: 8 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

6. Final Subdivisions

[PP-21-01](#)

FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL: The Landing @ Hudson

Carlos Woods of Wood Engineering on behalf of C & O Enterprises, LLC is MAPC Approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Approval for The Landing @ Hudson for 22 proposed lots on 6.38 Acres +/- located 3423 Hudson Drive east off of Old Greensboro Road within the R-1 Single Family Residential District.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Staff Report](#)
 [The Landing at Hudson Plans](#)
 [Aerial View of Location](#)

Carlos Woods of Wood Engineering on behalf of C & O Enterprises, LLC. is MAPC Approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Approval for The Landing @ Hudson for 22 proposed lots on 6.38 Acres +/- located at 3423 Hudson Drive east off of Old Greensboro Road within the R-1 Single Family Residential District.

APPLICANT: Brandon Woods of Wood Engineering stated we are asking for the final approval of the subdivision for the 22 lots, they are all single family homes. We have storm drainage built, retention ponds built, and the streets constructed. We are working with CWL to finish the utilities.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated we have reviewed it and it does meet all our requirements. We recommend approval.

STAFF: Michael Morris stated did they turn in a maintenance bond for this development?

APPLICANT: Brandon Woods stated I will have to check on that, I know they were working on it.

COMMISSION: Kevin Bailey stated question for Michael Morris, does the bond not have to be in affect already before we can make this approval?

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated what we have done in the past is you can make the approval, we just will not record it until the bond is in hand.

COMMISSION: Kevin Bailey stated thank you Derrel.

COMMISSION: Jimmy Cooper stated I make a motion of approval with submission of the bond before final approval.

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

[PP-21-02](#)

FINAL SUBDIVISION: 3506 Southwest Drive - Southern Hills Replat

Jeremy Bevill of Fisher & Arnold, Inc. on behalf of Southern Hills Real Estate, LLC and Mr. Carroll Caldwell are requesting MAPC Approval for a Final Subdivision located at 3506 Southwest Drive with 14 proposed lots on 118.34 Acres +/- of land within a PD-M Mixed Use Planned Development.

Attachments: [Replat](#)
 [Staff Report](#)
 [Application](#)
 [Subdivision Plans](#)
 [Subdivision Plat](#)
 [Aerial View of Location](#)
 [Schematic Landscape Plan](#)
 [Schematic Outline Landscape Plan](#)
 [Tree Preservation Plan 1](#)
 [Tree Preservation Plan 2](#)
 [Proposed Access Map for Drives and Streets](#)
 [Traffic Study](#)

Jeremy Bevill of Fisher & Arnold, Inc. on behalf of Southern Hills Real Estate, LLC. and Mr. Carroll Caldwell are requesting MAPC Approval for a Final Subdivision located at 3506 Southwest Drive with 14 proposed lots on 118.34 Acres +/- of land within a PD-M Mixed Use Planned Development.

APPLICANT: Jeremy Bevill of Fisher & Arnold (with Carroll Caldwell) are asking for MAPC Approval for the Final Subdivision Plat. We have also submitted the performance bond.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated we reviewed it. It does meet the requirements of the subdivision ordinance and we have the bond in hand. We would recommend approval.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated I have questions about the tree preservation plan and about the traffic plan. How many trees will be preserved on the site?

APPLICANT: Jeremy Bevill stated I don't have an exact number in front of me.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated it looks like only 3 trees are being preserved.

APPLICANT: Jeremy Bevill stated that picture on the screen is across the highway.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated how many trees for Southern Hills?

APPLICANT: Jeremy Bevill stated Southern Hills has already been clear-cut many years ago. We will plant trees along the road.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated the other development shown that will come before us, will there only be 3 trees preserved?

APPLICANT: Jeremy Bevill stated with grading and earthwork and everything that is required, we could not preserve as many trees as we would like. We are going to replant new trees.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated I'm wondering why you do not show the trees that you anticipate on the common space on what's proposed since we are supposed to be looking at landscape and tree preservation, was hoping for more. Next, I would like to look at the traffic study. On Kellers Chapel Rd, they said that they did a traffic study. It was created based on the assumption that certain mitigation efforts would be constructed. Putting in turn lanes, traffic stoplights, and other things are listed. In a previous meeting, I asked if a developer would be responsible for those mitigation efforts and engineering stated yes they would. I want to confirm that the applicant will be paying for and constructing these mitigation measures and when the mitigation measures will be constructed on their timeline.

APPLICANT: Jeremy Bevill stated the developer will pay for those improvements on Kellers Chapel Rd and that's included in the bond amount that was already provided to the city several weeks ago. We plan on having all those improvements on Kellers Chapel Rd completed this year.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated thank you for the clarification.

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.

7. Conditional Use

[CU 20-14](#)

CONDITIONAL USE: 413 Ridgecrest Street

City Water and Light is requesting MAPC Approval for a Conditional Use to place a new wet well pump station, gravity sewer diversion structure, flow meter vault, and air release valve vault on this property that is located at 413 Ridgecrest Street, which is required for major utility within Section 117-139 of the Code. This is within an R-1 Single Family Residential District.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Letter](#)
 [Site Grading Plan](#)
 [Existing Site Plan](#)
 [Notification Letter](#)
 [Signed Notification Letters](#)
 [USPS Receipts](#)

City Water and Light is requesting MAPC Approval for a Conditional Use to place a new wet well pump station, gravity sewer diversion structure, flow meter vault, and air release valve vault on this property that is located at 413 Ridgecrest Street, which is required for major utility within Section 117-139 of the Code. This is within an R-1 Single Family Residential District.

APPLICANT: Grant McDaniel with CWL stated we are improving that central service or sanitary sewer system. We have had a pump station there for about 20 years and we are increasing the capacity and upgrading it. One of the mitigations we are doing is a swell through the middle of it for any kind of overflows to get to the ditches.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated we reviewed it. We do feel that since there has been a pump station there that this won't have any additional impact on the area so we would recommend approval with one stipulation. Upon the issuance of Conditional Use Approval all, the building permits, other permits, licenses required locally and statewide be applied for by the applicant.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated I'm supportive of this contingent upon any type of call ins or other questions or comments. What has triggered the Conditional Use for this since there was already a pump station?

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated because it is being expanded and it can impact the area by the expansion.

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: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

Abstain: 1 - Jim Little

8. Rezoning

9. Staff Comments

[COM-21:001](#)

NEW PURPOSE AND INTENT: Cottage Housing Ordinance

This is a Draft Cottage Home Ordinance for MAPC to review and recommend to Public Works for approval to be Recommended to City Council for Approval.

Attachments: [Cottage House Ordinance](#)

This is a Draft Cottage Home Ordinance for MAPC to review & recommend to Public Works for approval to be Recommended to City Council for Approval.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated we have had several people request a different type of housing option instead of duplexes and triplexes. We have looked at this and come up with a Cottage Housing Ordinance and we feel this will give that extra option that people don't have right now. They can put small single-family homes and group them together around one common area. This has been successful in other areas around the U.S. There is a lot of interest for this in Jonesboro. We would like to propose this to give another option for different types of housing. I need to make a change that there was a math error under A1-B where it talks about minimum lot area and says 12,000 square feet, that needs to be 14,520 square feet. At 12,000 square feet, you can't have the four units that is required to have a Cottage Housing Development. We have tried to set up a lot of design guidelines.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated I love these type of developments and it opens up an option for portable housing. I see we have a maximum grouping of 12, is that grouping of 12 for an open area and then you can have another group of 12 beside it, or is that 12 total per development.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated we are looking at 12 total for a development. If you start grouping more, than all the sudden it turns into a planned development instead of Cottage Housing, that is the reason we looked at 12. Trying to keep 12 within an acre. I guess it would be possible to do an acre and then have an adjacent acre but I think we will see more of this infill than just open development. It is hard to find many infill areas that have a total of one acre, so our thinking was doing it as a maximum of 12.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated so if you did want to do a larger development it could be a planned development that looks like this, would that be a correct statement?

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated yes.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated that answers my question. I'm concerned if you have a neighborhood with a certain style house and you pop this infill there maybe a challenge to their character and I know we will have to look at these case by case. If you have large lots and you have this popped in the middle of, a residential area that is being redeveloped and you put this grouping with it, it may or may not be consistent with the character of that neighborhood, but I do think this is positive. The other question I had was the site plan with the parking. How will we address some of these? It will be challenging where you are not looking at the back of the house and it looks

like something that is facing a street that is the back of the house. If you are looking at it from a street view, you are looking at the back of the house instead of something that looks more appropriate for a street view.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated these are not going to be a street view. We are trying to put these in alleys. The street view you are going to see is the front of houses, and if you have a unit that has two streets, it is going to have two frontages on it.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts stated it may not necessarily fit in, but it is an excellent alternative. Duplexes and Quads do not fit in, so this is a smooth transition. In some areas where houses are being destroyed or torn down, the only option to make the most value of the property is to go in there with something more dense like a four plea. I think this will be a great try for us.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated I agree with that statement. When we get a developer that has not done this before, there is going to be opportunities for snags in how it transitions between adjacent lots and adjacent residential. I'm going to ask the Planning Department to put some thought into that. We want to make sure we are creating a good alternative for infill that doesn't detract from the overall neighborhood.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated I definitely support this type of development. My suggestion is to start out in the downtown redevelopment district. I don't think we should allow it in all high and medium density zones. Putting developments like this next to healthcare, grocery stores, whether it is seniors or University students, that type of audience that might be attracted to this type of housing. Most of these types of developments have some on street parking in the walking vicinity with beefed up sidewalks and bike lanes. I think we should encourage if not mandate that. If we are looking at putting some of these "In Lieu" fees, we should couple these developments together with these concepts. Overall, I support it, but you need to change it out of medium and high density.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated I can make the changes and forward it. There is going to be three separate readings at City Council on this. If you feel comfortable with making the changes that have been suggested, I can make those, go ahead, and forward it on.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated will we get to see it before its forwarded?

COMMISSION: Paul Ford stated I propose we make the changes and move it forward.

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

Aye: 8 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey and Paul Ford

10. Adjournment