



# City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center  
300 S. Church Street  
Jonesboro, AR 72401

## Meeting Minutes 2 - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, February 10, 2015

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

---

### 1. Call to order

### 2. Roll Call

**Present** 7 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Kim Schrantz; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock and Kevin Bailey

**Absent** 2 - Brant Perkins and Jimmy Cooper

### 3. Approval of minutes

**MIN-15:013** Approval of the MAPC Meeting Minutes for January 27, 2015

**Attachments:** [MeetingMinutes012715MAPC](#)

**A motion was made by Jerry Reece, seconded by Jim Scurlock, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 6 - Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Kim Schrantz; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock and Kevin Bailey

**Absent:** 2 - Brant Perkins and Jimmy Cooper

### 4. Preliminary Subdivisions

### 5. Final Site Plan Review

**SP-15-01** Final Site Plan

David Onstead is requesting MAPC approval of a Final Site Plan Submittal for property located on the southeast corner of Sage Meadows Blvd. and Hwy 351.

**Attachments:** [ComApp-pg1](#)  
[ComApp-pg2](#)  
[CornerSage-SP1-Site](#)

**Carlos Wood appeared before the Commission, representing the owner, stated that he is asking for approval of a site plan for a commercial lot on Hwy. 351 and Sage Meadows Blvd, which is zoned PD-R. Mr. Wood stated that they are requesting an abandonment of the drainage easement, east side of the PD-R Zoned tract. He explained that there is an existing drainage ditch. They are**

open to the idea of closing it with a storm drain system approval through staff. They will be revising the site plan plat to show a sewer easement as required by City Water and Light.

The drainage easement is noted as well. Michael Morris, Jonesboro Engineering stated that there is shown a pipe which runs about 30 ft. along the ditch to the drainage system. The water from the residential lots from the Village of Sage Subdivision to the west runs to the impoundment structure. They will pipe it in which there will be a more narrow drainage easement width.

Mr. Spriggs gave staff a comment, noting that the corner lot at Sage Meadows Blvd. is zoned C-3 General Commercial and the north lot is zoned PD-R for 22 single unit landminium style homes. He described the access of the C-3 which is off of Hwy. 351 (distance must comply with the 80 ft. distance requirement from the un-signalized intersection). An additional driveway is provided off the traffic circle on Sage Meadows Blvd. Staff has no issues with the proposed plan, which will be reviewed in greater detail during the administrative plan review.

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Jerry Reece, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

**Aye:** 6 - Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;Kim Schrantz;Jerry Reece;Jim Scurlock and Kevin Bailey

**Absent:** 2 - Brant Perkins and Jimmy Cooper

## **6. Conditional Use**

## **7. Rezoning**

### **RZ-15-02**

RZ 15-02 Rezoning Case

David and Debra Hartshorn, owners, request MAPC approval of a rezoning of 3.56 acres of land located at 5441 and 5443 Southwest Dr. from R-1 Single Family (rear) and C-4 Neighborhood Commercial (front) to C-3 General Commercial.

**Attachments:** [Rezoning Application](#)  
[Staff Summary RZ1502 5441 Southwest Drive Rezoning MAPC 2](#)  
[Rezoning Plat](#)  
[DEED](#)  
[RECEIPT](#)  
[ClearviewSubdivisionn1990](#)

Mr. John Easely from Associated Engineering, appeared before the Commission, representing the owners asking for a rezoning at 5441 and 5443 Southwest Drive, just west of the Dollar General Store, which is also zoned C-4; we were asking for C-3 Zoning. However, after meeting with staff and speaking with the owners, they concur and agree with the recommendations of the City Planner to revise the application to C-4 L.O.U. Neighborhood Commercial with the noted allowed uses.

**Staff:**

Mr. Spriggs gave an overview of the Staff Report Findings, giving the surrounding conditions of the site. The Land Use Plan and Master Street Plan findings were offered, which denotes the property to be partially consistent and partially not having the frontage recommended as neighborhood commercial, while the rear listed as single family residential. Historically, in 1989 & 1991, the property was partially rezoned to C-4 after being revised at the Council adoption from an original petition of C-3.

The Master Street Plan recommendations include the frontage along Highway 49 as a Principle Arterial (60 ft. Right of Way); Jaybee Dr. is a local road, which terminates into the development with an undeveloped stub-out and turn-around radius as seen on the plat. Coordination would have to be made with any future development of this site. There are some concerns from staff, on relating what is being proposed to the existing single family residential, which most of houses on Jaybee Drive are in good quality, in terms of housing stock. Consideration needs to be made for the connectivity of street as well as types of uses concerns in the report. Land Use Plan consistency was achieved along Hwy 49 north, the rear recommendation on plan was for single family residential. On page 4, of the staff report, are some uses listed that are considered a nuisance to a quiet neighborhood. Hence, the recommendation to change the zone to C-4 L.O.U limited use instead of C-3.

No comments received from various staff, departments, or agencies.

Mr. Spriggs read four sample conditions, from page 6 of the staff report that the planning commission would find that the property could be rezoned to C-4 L.U.O. as modified with these four 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.
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. The applicant/successors agree to comply with the Master Street Plan recommendation for Southwest Drive and Jaybee Drive upon any future redevelopment of the site.
4. The property shall be redeveloped under the C-4 Commercial District standards, without the following prohibit uses:

- . Gas Fueling Station
- Billboard Advertisement
- Automotive Repair Collision Repair
- Animal Care
- Adult Entertainment
- Hospital
- Auditorium/Stadium
- Freight Terminal

**Public Comments:**

Richard Green, 2204 Jaybee Drive, Stated that he works at NEA Hospital. Additionally for a few years, he made a living reading maps. If you standing out there, you don't see any of that at the end of Jaybee Drive. Jaybee Drive is a "C" shape; you can only enter in and out in one place. Buses rush through there every morning. He quoted traffic issues with the commercial coming

through. If you step outside his drive way and look east, it looks nothing like the drawing. There is an old barn out there that is zoned R-1. Anything commercial will invite more commercial traffic. He stated that he does not need trucks and cars driving down his residential street. It's a dead end street and the only business you would have on this road, is if you live there. Concerns for adverse reaction to his property values and having a through street to commercial were voiced. He sees nothing but negatives even with a privacy fence. Along Hwy 49 plenty of commercial property and opportunities but the residential zoning doesn't need to be changed.

John Easley stated that the plat shows record information, the lots existing there is what is recorded. In his personal opinion, you would abandon the street and put tall evergreens to buffer the commercial and keep Jaybee as private. Where the mow line is, you would have a landscape buffer it wouldn't affect the school buses. There would be no access or traffic through Jaybee Drive and it would remain a dead end street.

Mr. Scurlock: There will not be access off Jaybee drive, correct.

Mr. Spriggs mentioned the acreage above the blue highlighted portion, which is the site, it is private property which has frontage on that street right away, so some form of abandonment would have to be made officially to City council and they would have to consent to that abandonment before that could occur. The owners have legal frontage on street right away, the vacant property that has not been developed there and they have legal rights to connect to that public street and develop the property. This issue would have to be dealt with.

Mr. Scurlock: That part of the development could be left intact for a future street, correct.

Mr. Spriggs: Somehow, you would have to barricade it off and make it only for residential use only and end where commercial could possibly be developed.

Mr. Green: I understand that and that would be great but what if all of a sudden, five to ten years down the road, someone else buys the property and its commercial and they don't share the same ideas or plans we have discussed here tonight? My property values take a hit. That portion of the property we would like to keep residential, so we can keep the neighborhood homogenous.

Mr. Spriggs: In response to Mr. Green, the applicant originally requested a C-3 without any restrictions, however the C-4 L.U.O. means whatever is approved if changed would be held to the conditions listed. As well as, any conditions the Planning Commission was to add to that would go with the land. Regardless of who owns or develops it in the future, they could not make changes to those conditions without going through this very same process.

Mr. Scurlock: Still not clear on where the access to the property is. Off of Hwy. 49?

Mr. Spriggs: All of the blue green area would be owned by the applicant, correct.

John Easley: Owner owns all of highlighted "blue green area". Access would

be off of Hwy. 49, not on Jaybee drive.

Mr. Spriggs: Agreeable to such a condition that would condition the access only on highway 49; no commercial would be allowed to or from Jaybee drive in the future.

Mr. Bailey: Mr. John, do you agree barrier or barricade natural barrier?

John Easley: I guess on any type of development here you have the offsite mitigation to deal with. In favor of not having in the front or visible, you have in back which would offer a natural barrier. Any kind of excess off Jaybee Drive.

Mr. Lonnie: That was one of my concerns when I went out there today, it is not in the back yard houses it is the full length of the side, the 2201 Jaybee Drive. Could the barrier be done on the entire side of that residential line?

Mr. Spriggs: It would be done on the west line and then some areas south of that turn around there would have to be some form of screen or barrier.

John Easley: Agrees to leave the right away open and leave it intact for future development or revisions.

Mr. Spriggs: Right away abandonment would not occur unless staff contents to it or the property owners consent to that. We could not legally cut off access to the individual owning property in the rear.

Stewart Cooper, 2303 Jaybee Drive, second property to the left of Clearview entrance asked what prevents the property owner from putting a street off of Southwest Drive that would connect to our Jaybee Drive.

Mr. Spriggs: Through the plat approval and through any conditions we have placed, would run with the land.

Stewart Cooper: Where you saw on the plat, there was a street, if that is pre-plated I did not know how easy it would be for them to connect to that proposed street.

Mr. Spriggs: They have the legal right to connect to that now but they are giving up or waiving that right to connect to that street because of the conditions placed on this case.

Stewart Cooper: My children are some of those children riding the bus and riding bikes we just really would prefer the land to stay residential. What they did with the area off Southwest Drive I don't have any objections to that, there is a Dollar General and that is fine. I just agree with my neighbors that it should remain residential.

Mr. Reese: Do you agree with the ingress and egress only being off Hwy. 49 Southwest Drive? And do you agree with the buffer?

Mr. Easley: Yes, we agree.

Mr. Lonnie Roberts asked, if you leave the Jaybee Drive, open for access to the

vacant property to the north, can you replat the property so that it will move the access the west corner.

**Mr. Morris:** Asked, if you move the right of away to the middle of the property above, it would be preferred it to be more in the center.

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Ron Kelton, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

**Roll Call Vote:** Mr. Scurlock Aye, Mr. Holscher Aye, Mr. Reese Aye, Mr. Bailey Yes, Mrs. Schrantz Aye,

**Aye:** 6 - Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;Kim Schrantz;Jerry Reece;Jim Scurlock and Kevin Bailey

**Absent:** 2 - Brant Perkins and Jimmy Cooper

## 8. Staff Comments

### COM-15:011

Final Site Plan Revision:

Joshua H. Brown, CCIM, of Haag Brown Commercial Real Estate & Development is requesting final site plan approval for Red Wolf Blvd. & Brazos for property recently rezoned to C-3 LUO on October of 2014. The Site Plan was approved by the MPAC on January 27, 2015; Applicant is requesting minor revisions.

MAPC is asked to waive its bylaw rules, and place this item on the agenda for consideration.

**Attachments:** [JonesboroSiteLayout](#)  
[ORD 14 055 \(2\)](#)  
[Conceptual layout for Red Wolf](#)

**Mr. Brown** came before the board, to request a final site plan approval for Red Wolf Blvd. & Brazos. The site provided to the Commission today is a more refined site plan from the companies they were working with when they started their rezoning. As a supplement to their rezoning package they submitted site plan of what they thought the 2.5 acres would look like. The revised site plan looks almost identical; the big user for the box at the bottom corner got a really sophisticated engineering team, they met with CWL and the started architecting their site and they had a couple of minor modifications to the site plan. Since it was so close to the site plan they submitted at the beginning, they sent it to Otis to get it reviewed by the Commission.

**Mr. Spriggs:** From a planning standpoint there are no major issues in terms of what is being provided. Along Brazos and Faircove the only comments we would have is the landscaping appears to be in the right way, so that would have to be coordinated but that is a minor detail something that we can work out with the final site plan. Other than that, there are no other major issues with the site layout.

**Mr. Morris:** The only concern Engineering has is there is area unless you are going to do underground detention.

**Mr. Brown:** I think that is what we plan to do, Greg Hamman has been the

engineer on our civil side and from his meetings with the City, and he has concluded that is what we plan to do. Greg Hamman said we would raise the site up and contribute to an offsite detention. The national companies we are working with have their own engineers. However, each building is responsible for their own detention so if that is off site or underground, that is on them. George and I are developing and owning the building to the north and George has indicated we will be flowing somewhere else.

**Mr. Morris:** The lowest point is down at the corner of Fairpark and Brazos there are barely 18" pipes under there and that is where all the water will go. Now that it is being redeveloped you have to do 20% more green space or 20% reduction of flows and the lot coverage.

**Mr. Brown:** I'm assuming that they will do underground detention like some of the other lots we have had developed done in that area.

**Mr. Spriggs:** As long as the commission makes the motion that the final site plan is reviewed subject to the standard storm water plan regulations and requirements and any other site plan of chapter 117 zoning resolution.

**Mr. Reese:** How does it differ from the original site plan?

**Mr. Spriggs:** The previous plan is approved by the Planning Commission on January 27th, but the drive on Brazos actually cuts off a portion of the lot.

**Mr. Brown:** The big companies that we work with came in and visited with the City or CWL and they felt this was a better flow for cars coming in and out of parking lot. Brazos is a street, if you turn on it, you can go straight into the traffic light of Turtle Creek, uninterrupted. They felt it gave their cars more room to get out of traffic's way. We anticipate the rest of the 10 homes on the block, be redeveloped for commercial use.

**A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Paul Hoelscher, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.**

**Aye:** 6 - Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;Kim Schrantz;Jerry Reece;Jim Scurlock and Kevin Bailey

**Absent:** 2 - Brant Perkins and Jimmy Cooper

## **9. Adjournment**