



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, June 14, 2022

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 7 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson and Jeff Steiling

Absent 2 - Dennis Zolper and Paul Ford

3. Approval of minutes

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

[MIN-22:047](#)

May 24, 2022 MAPC Minutes

Attachments: [May 24, 2022 MAPC Minutes](#)

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson and Jeff Steiling

Absent: 2 - Dennis Zolper and Paul Ford

4. Miscellaneous Items

[COM-22:026](#)

SIDEWALK IN LIEU FEE: 4229 Stadium Blvd.

On behalf of Third I C Joint, LLC, Tralan Engineering is requesting MAPC approval to pay the sidewalk "in lieu" payment of \$8,510.00 for 141.5 square yards along 4229 Stadium Blvd. The 2022 rate is \$60.13 per square yard.

Attachments: [Dairy Queen - Sidewalk Letter](#)
[Dairy Queen - Sidewalk Waiver SP](#)

APPLICANT: Michael Boggs with Tralan Engineering on behalf of Third I C Joint, LLC, asking for the waiver, reason being the Arkansas Highway Department has a job that will be starting the next few years that will extend the sidewalk from Red Wolf (Stadium) Blvd all the way to Caraway Road, down Stadium. They would likely be putting a sidewalk in now and in a couple

years tearing it out again, which would be a waste of money that could be used by the city somewhere else to connect sidewalks that are already existing.

COMMISSION: Chair Roberts asked for Staff comments from City Planner Derrel Smith.

STAFF: Derrell Smith stated the applicant is asking for the “in lieu” fee due to Item #4 under the conditions – other unusual circumstances. As the proposed changes to zoning codes have been discussed, this is one of the changes to be made – if a project had an ARDOT Job #, to allow the fee “in lieu” and these circumstances will be seen more in other locations in the future. Staff would recommend approval.

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson and Jeff Steiling

Absent: 2 - Dennis Zolper and Paul Ford

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

8. Rezoning

[RZ-22-09](#)

REZONING: Belt Street

Weston Wagner is requesting a Rezoning from R-1, Single-Family Medium Density District, to RM-16, Residential Multifamily 16 units per net acre. This Rezoning is for 0.95 +/- acres located north of 804 Belt Street.

Attachments: [Application](#)
[Deed](#)
[Property Owner Notification and Receipt](#)
[Rezoning Plat](#)
[Staff Summary](#)

APPLICANT: Weston Wagner stated he currently has two lots of land there on Belt Street – one at 804 Belt and the parcel right behind that. Currently, one property is divided by two different zonings. The front half of the property is R-3 and the back half is R-1. He is looking to rezone the back half of the property to RM-16. Where the front half is currently R-3 – Multi-Family High Density District, which allows 18 units per acre. RM-16 allows 16 units per acre. He is asking for RM-16 zoning because it is the current zoning closest to an R-3. He directed commissioners to some handouts that weren’t submitted in time to be displayed on the screen. He’s looking to do a total of 18 units on 1.71 acres.

COMMISSION: Chair Roberts asked for Staff comments from City Planner Derrel Smith.

STAFF: Mr. Smith stated he is aware there is an R-3 zoning in the front. Planning suggests they go to an RM-12 zoning for both properties. It would still allow the density of units that he needs while dropping the density on the front property from 18 to 12, and instead of 16, it would also be 12 on the back. He would get everything he needs but would not be quite as dense. In the past, there has been problems with City Council approving an RM-16.

COMMISSION: Asked the applicant to confirm that would cover all the units he plans.

APPLICANT: Correct. He stated at an RM-12, on 1.71 acres, that should be 20 units and he's only planning 18 units.

STAFF: Derrel Smith said with an RM-12, Staff would recommend approval with these conditions:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all the requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Storm Water Drainage Design Manual, and Flood Plain Regulations regarding any new construction.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosures, sidewalks, etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to the Planning Department approval in the future.

COMMISSION: Chair Roberts asked for comments from the public. There were none. He asked for commissioners' questions of Staff or Applicant.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the zoning density could be changed later.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated it could be changed to less, but not more.

COMMISSION: Jim Little asked if he changes his R-3 to RM-12, then is turned down by City Council, if he would still be allowed to keep his R-3 zoning.

Chair Roberts and Director Smith answered yes. Commissioner Bailey stated at the pre-meeting a day earlier, it had been discussed with Wager, he would probably need to follow up and go through with a replat. Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Wagner if he was committed to doing that.

APPLICANT: Directed commissioners to a sheet attached to the handouts where he does have it ready but still needs to submit it.

COMMISSION: Mr. Bailey told Mr. Wagner that he has plenty of time to do that, but wanted to confirm that he was to follow through with that.

Recommended to Approve to the City Council

Aye: 7 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson and Jeff Steiling

Absent: 1 - Paul Ford

[RZ-22-10](#)

REZONING: East Johnson Avenue

Hall Premier Development, LLC is requesting a Rezoning from R-1, Single-Family Medium Density District, to C-3, General Commercial District. This Rezoning is for 0.79 +/- acres located at 4913 E. Johnson Ave.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Boundary Plat](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipt](#)
 [Site Plan](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

APPLICANT: David Hall stated he hired George Hamman who was not available to attend tonight's meeting.

COMMISSION: Chair Roberts asked for Staff comments from City Planner Derrel Smith.

STAFF: Derrel Smith said the proposed zoning is correct for the area so they are in agreement. It does meet all six requirements for rezoning. There might be problems with access on the lot that the engineer would have to address as he works through it. If the zoning on the property is changed, it does not guarantee that a building can be built on the property without getting some cross-access easements, and things like that. They need to be aware of that before moving forward.

APPLICANT: Asked, regarding cross-access easements, if that means going into adjacent properties.

STAFF: Mr. Smith referred to the drawing on the screen, where there shows a driveway, (existing), they would be required to do a traffic impact analysis. It would not meet the separation requirements for the area, so they might need to work with the adjacent property owners to have a shared drive or something similar. They need to be aware of that now so it is not a problem later during the plan review process. The zoning itself makes sense as it is in a commercial area and should be a commercial zone. But the engineer will have some work to do to be able to get that building the way he has it drawn out, on that lot. With that said, the city recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all the requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Storm Water 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 illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosures, sidewalks, etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment of the property.
 3. Any change of use shall be subject to the Planning Department approval in the future.
 4. The development shall comply with all requirements of the Overlay District.
- COMMISSION:** There were no public comments.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Jeff Steiling, that this matter be Recommended to Approve to the City Council. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson and Jeff Steiling

Absent: 2 - Dennis Zolper and Paul Ford

RZ-22-11

REZONING: East Nettleton Avenue

Easton Agricultural, LLLP is requesting a Rezoning from R-1, Single-Family Medium Density District, to C-3, General Commercial District. This Rezoning is for 3.00 +/- acres located at 5459 E. Nettleton Ave.

Attachments: Application
Certified Mail Receipt
Hancock Survey
Staff Summary

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Jim Little, that this matter be Tabled . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson and Jeff Steiling

Absent: 2 - Dennis Zolper and Paul Ford

9. Staff Comments

Planning Director Derrel Smith let commissioners know they have received RFQ's for a comprehensive growth plan last week. They will now be going through those. There are four applicants who have submitted and will be reviewed. Once a decision is made, they will probably bring it back to MAPC and then move forward to City Council. The four applicants appear to be very qualified.

10. Adjournment