



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes 3 Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, February 23, 2016

3:00 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent 1 - Paul Hoelscher

3. Approval of minutes

Approval of the MAPC Meeting Minutes from February 9, 2016.

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

Aye: 6 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 2 - Paul Hoelscher and Jim Scurlock

4. Preliminary Subdivisions

Preliminary Subdivision Review: Bobcat Meadows Subdivision

Jeremy Bevill of Haywood, Kenward, Bare and Associates, Inc. on behalf of RWT Land Development requests MAPC review of a Preliminary Subdivision Bobcat Meadows located South of E. Johnson Avenue off of Airport Road East of Hilltop Drive and Vickie Drive. Applicant proposes 102 lots on 30 acres of land within an R-1 Single Family District.

Applicant: Mr. Terry Bare, H.K.B. Fisher Arnold stated he submitted a Conceptual Plan for the subdivision. Now here for the Preliminary Review. Held a meeting yesterday, and there was an Engineering Dept. question about a vertical curb at a street intersection. We will resolve that issue on our Final Plans. We are here asking for Preliminary Approval.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs noted that the pre-meeting was held on yesterday and we had this discussion. The Preliminary Plan does meet the minimum requirements of the R-1 Single Family Subdivision. As the MAPC members recall there was a question raised on the alignment on Airport Road and that it did not meet the separation requirements of the code. The code requires 125 ft. of separation as the requirement.

Mr. Bare: We have aligned it based on safe speed and we are only 85 ft. from alignment with the street to the west; it is controlled by the Highway Dept. The permit officer understands and has no issue with the alignment.

Mr. Kelton: Stated that he wanted to clarify that the sewer realigned will be in phase 1 as noted in the pre-meeting.

Mr. Michael Morris stated he had no issues with the Preliminary Stage. Dual access will have to satisfy minimum Fire Marshall requirements, Mr. Spriggs noted.

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

Aye: 6 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 2 - Paul Hoelscher and Jim Scurlock

5. Final Subdivisions

Final Site Plan Approval: Trim Gym addition located at 1916 Race Street.

Tridant Builders, Inc. requests MAPC Approval of a Final Site Plan Approval for land that was recently rezoned C-3 Commercial District.

Mr. Spriggs stated this was a recent rezoning. Staff has received the permit document set. The documents were shown on the monitor. Staff has no issues. Tennis courts were added to the north. There were no driveway alignment issues. The site layout was presented based on all requirements of site plan being met. Staff recommends approval.

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

Aye: 6 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 2 - Paul Hoelscher and Jim Scurlock

6. Conditional Use

CU 16-01 3304 Parkwood Road

Angel Prunty is requesting MAPC approval of a Conditional Use for a currently licensed daycare that is licensed for 8 children to 16 children located at 3304 Parkwood Road. This is located in an R-3 Multi-Family High Density District.

Applicant: Ms. Prunty appeared before the Commission, stating that she is requesting approval to increase the number of kids from the allowed 8 to 16. She has been in operation for almost 3 years.

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs gave Staff Report summary comments. Some of the items were discussed during the pre-meeting. There are questions raised regarding

access management and backing out into the roadway, and this being a corner lot. The conditions were read. A sample motion was provided and photographs were shown. The development trends near stadium were mentioned.

Ms. Prunty: Met with the State License Reviewer and she checked. And approved it. The health and fire have approved. Will have to An emergency ramp.

Mr. Perkins. Is this the maximum number of children that you can accommodate at the facility. **Ms. Prunty:** Sixteen (16) is not; however I can have but it has to be rezoned to commercial. **Traffic:** We have 2 areas for parking with room for my family and space to park 6 vehicles at a time. We are open from 5:30 PM - 5:30 PM. Some drop-offs are staggered; we never had an issue with traffic. There is not a large issue because the drop-offs will continue to be staggered. We have parking spaces for additional cars.

Mr. Perkins: Do you mean 6 customer parking spaces in addition to staff/family? **Mrs. Prunty:** Yes.

Mr. Spriggs: Are you increasing staff? **Ms. Prunty:** No. It will continue to be her and her husband with the 16 children.

Mr Kelton: Asked what is the general age of the children. **Ms. Prunty:** They will range from youngest at 3 months to 6 years of age. She is licensed for after school children to the age up to 10 years. She has no school age children other than occasionally over the summer time. We would only be allowed. If we gain approval on 16 children. We will only have 2 infants and all the others between the age of 2 and 5.

Mr. Perkins: Are the after school children in addition to the 16? **Ms. Prunty:** No they count into the ratio. State Licensing only allows the 16 total.

Mr. Kelton: Noted that Condition No. 5 states that this is subject to 2 year re-evaluation. Would you mind if we reduced that to 1 year? He noted that he is concerned about traffic out there and anyone waiting in the streets will create additional traffic issues in the narrow street. **Ms. Prunty:** Agreed.

Public Input: None Present. **Mr. Spriggs** noted every one required within 200 ft. were notified.

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

Aye: 6 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 2 - Paul Hoelscher and Jim Scurlock

CU 16-02 220-226 Union Street

CU 16-02: George Steam on behalf of Vision 2000, Inc. are requesting MAPC approval of a Conditional Use for Multi-Family Apartment Units to be located at 220 - 226 Union Street on Ground and Upper level Floors in a C-1 Downtown Core Commercial District. Eleven units are proposed.

Applicant:

George Stem: We are buying the property to convert to 11 apt units. The upstairs zoning is met. On union there is not need for the retail space and a demand for the apartments.

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments and the basis for the conditional use. We are dealing with the lower floors based on the Hyett Palma Study findings in the past. The downtown core has been looked at by the MAPC and it has been your agreement that you would look at the lower floor allowance for apartments on the outlying streets such as Church and Union Streets for such. Photographs were shown. No parking requirements exist for the C-1 Districts. This property does have onsite parking. A very similar use just north of the property. The conversion of the dry cleaning business would be subject to Building and Fire Codes, as well as the EPA standards and a condition has been added and four conditions were read.

Public Input: None Present.

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

Aye: 7 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

7. Rezoning

RZ 16-01 700 W. Huntington Ave.

Jeremy Moore on behalf of Obrien Family Trust are requesting MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-2 Multi-Family Low Density District to RM-12 Residential Multi-Family classification; 12 units per net acre, includes all forms of units, duplexes, triplexes, quads, and higher for .755 acres of land located at 700 W. Huntington Avenue.

Applicant: Jerry Moore appeared before the Commission explaining the rezoning petition. It is located between Culberhouse and McClure above Huntington. My dad had a grocery store diagonally at one time. It is R-2 District and formally a trailer park.

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs gave Staff Summary comments noting surrounding conditions. The criteria for rezoning were considered and explained. The R-2 District does have stringent guidelines in terms of lot configuration and sometimes the redevelopment of those lots does not lend to lots being arranged and laid out in the most efficient and desirable manner. This property on the land use plan is part of a Redevelopment Cluster. The trend in this area has been in filled property providing for newer housing needed in the area. Consistency is achieved. The master street plan for Huntington is a Major Arterial; Culberhouse is a Collector Rd. Compliance with the MSP will occur during the redevelopment process. With the new district, the building would be situated on one lot with cross access parking under the RM-12 district. The density will remain the same. This is a Limited Use Overlay and the use will be limited as

well as the density. No objections were raised during the pre-meeting; the conditions were read. Photographs of the area surrounding were shown.

Public Input:

Mrs. Susan Hall: 1304 W. Jefferson. Lived here 14 years. Two (2) decades I was activist on rezoning next to my home. It wasn't rezone do. I realized that residents do have a voice. When we moved here, a lot of the residents thought their property was zoned R-1. She described Old Jonesboro development. She referenced the application first page regarding the location and couldn't find the property card only 231 McClure which showed a lot size of 175X96. MAPC stated that the area was calculated by using the map.

Ms. Hall: Lot3, Lot 2 of Flints Addition is being rezone do. Application Question Number 2: Perimeters are restrictive. the new Code under much debate is not a good fit for Historic Jonesboro. Number 3 says density is the same. Without a plat we do not know the size. Communications with neighbors was not applicable.

Ms. Hall: Have photographs of multifamily and they show apartments on various streets nearby. Most of y'all should have received mail about developmental cluster and how I read the map and I didn't see it as apartments, it was talking about redevelopment of houses as offices between flint and Madison. I thought of alternative solutions. If lot is large for 3 triplexes without a need for rezoning, the suggestion of building a quad on the lot is an options. One difference between R-2 and RM 12 is you can have manufacturing housing.

Ms. Roberta Laser. John have own and reside at 711 W. Huntington diagonally across. Said property wear respectfully request that the Zoning remains R-2.

Mr. Scurlock. We talked about it a lot for PD on this. If we go with R-2 infill development, cooking cutter housing. If it is more of an infill development with greens spaces, it is more desirable. Do we want to improve the development or just put in as much as we can.

Mr. Moore: I would not dream of putting 12 units there. I was born and raised in this neighborhood at 333 S. Culberhouse. My family is rooted there. I want as many as allowed, not more than 9. Three (3) triplexes will be great with plenty of green space in between.

Mr. Bailey: Will we address the sidewalk issue as brought up in the pre-meeting. Mr. Morris: They will be required; there will be upgrades to the existing sidewalks.

Mr. Kelton. Do you have a problem with this bering a L.U.O. to RM 12.

Mr. Spriggs: The issue of a plat was raised earlier. He suggested that a condition be added requiring the plat as part of the rezoning.

Mr. Moore: There were always mobile homes going straight down Culberhouse. They will be all brick.

Mr. Perkins. We talked about triplexes. Would you have any problems with restricting the property from mobile homes. Mr. Moore: No issues with that.

Mr. Phillip Cook. Richardson Drive.: We are talking about building houses. Children's play area and safety is a concern? Mr. Moore, are you placing any fencing? Mr. Moore stated that he doesn't planned to fence it. The only area would be on the north line, but it depends on how the buildings are faced. The square footage will determine the number of units' it could be less units, and we would have to reconfigure.

Motion by Cooper based on Stipulations. We will follow this development. Residence is important to you. Safeguard your interest. I think you will be oak. 2nd by Mr. Kelton

The following conditions shall be satisfied:

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. Density of any proposed development shall not exceed 12 units per acre (3,630 sq./ft. per unit) or 9 units.
3. No mobile homes will be permitted on the redeveloped site.
4. 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.
5. That a final replat be submitted and recorded prior to any redevelopment of the site.
6. Compliance with the Master Street Plan shall be required prior to any redevelopment of the said site, unless waivers are granted by the MAPC.

The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 7 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

8. Staff Comments

9. Adjournment