



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Board of Zoning Adjustments

Tuesday, March 18, 2025

1:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

Present 4 - Rick Miles; Casey Caples; Kevin Bailey and Doug Gilmore

Absent 1 - Max Dacus Jr.

3. Approval of Minutes

[MIN-25:021](#)

Minutes: February 18, 2025

Attachments: [2.18.25 BZA Minutes](#)

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

Aye: 3 - Rick Miles; Casey Caples and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 1 - Max Dacus Jr.

4. Appeal Cases

[VR-25-02](#)

Variance: 1209 East Country Club Terrace

Randy Woodard is requesting a variance for an eight-foot-tall fence. The property is zoned R-1, single family medium density district.

Attachments: [Application](#)
[Certified Mail](#)
[Fence Location](#)
[Fence Photos](#)
[Letter - Mike Childs](#)

Doug Gilmore (Chair): Number one, Mr. Woodard. Come on up and tell us everything you want to know.

Randy Woodard (Proponent): I didn't want to come up here, but I didn't know you had to get a permit to put up a fence and so, I'm asking, he's going to show you what we've done and how we approved it and why I did it. Because my neighbors to the south's fence is just the same height as mine. All I had was a chain link fence down behind and I definitely improved the property but Jared, do y'all have everything?

Doug Gilmore: Yes, we have seen the pictures and that kind of stuff but if Jared's got something he wants to show us.

Randy Woodard: Jared you have something you want to?

Unable to transcribe

Doug Gilmore: Yeah, we've seen those. That was in our packet. Now, I don't know if everyone saw them or not. Did y'all see them?

Board: I did.

Jared (Proponent): That makes it easier, so it's our understanding that there's three neighbors in the backyard, which will be the west side, that neighbor has already said that he's fine with the way it is. He just wants it board on board. Where it's not showing the opposite side of the fence.

Doug Gilmore: Right.

Jared: Otherwise he's fine with the height of it. You know, the way it was before, just that little chain link fence, I think he said, he was just glad there was a fence there. And then on, the north side of the fence. The Morisons, from my understanding they just want it stained, they said that the height was okay. They just the stain to match they're existing fence. Otherwise they're okay with it. Then on the south side, I think it's the Nunnelly house. There's a retaining wall the pictures should show. It looks like about a two and half or three foot retaining wall and then a fence on top of it which makes it about eight or nine foot tall and so what Randy thought was, you got this tall fence here, so he just put a fence up to match it, to everything else. The fence he actually put up was shorter, that what is to the south of him, in the Nunnelly yard so you got the retaining wall, the fence, and then everything else matches around it. With the same stain, same fence, and then once he does the board on board on the Child's side of the property, it seems like everybody will be good with it but that's all, you guys got the pictures and y'all have seen them, it makes it easy.

Randy Woodard: Y'all have seen the before and after.

Doug Gilmore: Yes, that was provided. Who was your fence guy?

Randy Woodard: He was just a carpenter and I helped him.

Doug Gilmore: Oh okay. I didn't know if it was a company or-

Unable to transcribe

Doug Gilmore: Kevin should have known you needed a permit to do this.

Alright do y'all have any questions for Mr. Woodard?

Rick Miles (Board): Is the fence completed?

Randy Woodard: Oh yeah.

Rick Miles: All stained and everything, everyone wanted around you?

Randy Woodard: Everything's done and I cut down all the weeds from the neighbor's house or bushes. They were all over the place, pretty sad looking to be honest with you. It made it look a lot better and you've seen the before and after of the backyard. The backyard was pretty bad, so yeah, it's done.

Jared: In the neighborhood, there were some houses that already had eight-foot tall fences and on the exact same street, which I understand that it could have been there for a while but you know, it certainly wouldn't be the only one that was like that and that's an older fence as well.

Kevin Bailey (Board): Mr. Chair I went and drove through the neighborhood and looked at the fences. There's a host of different fences that came from six foot to eight foot, to sitting on top of block foundation walls and a host of different materials. So, I don't know what the city wants to do to Mr. Randy about slapping his hand on not getting the permit but once we're past that, I think I would make a motion to grant the variance.

Doug Gilmore: Does anyone have anything to add?

Casey Caples (Board): Did you say you got better pictures of the complete fence? Do you mind if I look at them real quick? I'm just wondering where is

the retaining wall in relation to this photo?

Unable to transcribe

Casey Caples: That's where I'm struggling, I'm not sure what part is actually 8 foot. I get the retaining wall I see the retaining wall.

Unable to transcribe

Casey Caples: I'll tell you, it's kind of, I've been against a lot of these 8 foot fences because it gives us so much diversity inside of a neighborhood, it's just got fences from one height to the next and I've been that guy that spoke out more than anybody and they kind of give me a hard time about it because we've had some come in here and say, hey we want to do one side of our fence eight-foot tall. So, I've prominently stood on one side of this and haven't done many eight-foot fences. Haven't done any really unless it's a grade change on the bottom. Now, the retaining wall area, I can one hundred percent agree with you. There's going to be grade changes and that's when I've said in the past, hey I think I'm okay, if we got some substantial grade changes. I haven't in the past where people just want more privacy, because I like anybody, I think I've explained it, I have a pool in my backyard and I'd love to have some more privacy too but it's going to make the neighborhood look a little bit weird. Me, the only guy with a barricade around my house. But I do see half of your situation. I really do with some of the grades.

Doug Gilmore: So, Randy you're saying that you're going to fill in the backside.

Randy Woodard: Yeah, I'm going to make it look just the same on Mike's side as it is on my side.

Doug Gilmore: And then, stain the whole thing.

Randy Woodard: Well, I'm going to stain my neighbor's. I offered to stain it and he said I don't need to stain it, just shadowbox it. I'm going to stain my neighbor's to the north. He sent a text too to confirm it.

Doug Gilmore: Morrison?

Randy Woodard: Yes.

Doug Gilmore: Okay, any other questions, comments?

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

Aye: 3 - Rick Miles; Kevin Bailey and Doug Gilmore

Nay: 1 - Casey Caples

Absent: 1 - Max Dacus Jr.

[VR-25-04](#)

Variance: 3225 South Caraway Road

Stonebridge Construction, LLC is requesting a variance on behalf of Stomsang Enterprises, Inc. for the requirement to connect to the property to the west. The property is zoned C-3, general commercial.

Attachments: [Variance Application](#)
 [Variance For Drive](#)
 [Variance Narrative Letter](#)
 [Variance Neighbor Notifications](#)

Doug Gilmore (Chair): Alright, Stonebridge.

Stonebridge Construction (Proponent): What we presented, we actually met with the city back in June, July last year for predevelopment and we had a few other issues and we came to BZA in September for a few items. One of the

things that wasn't brought up until we were in the permit phase was in the code, it says we had to provide access to the adjacent property owner. Well, the only adjacent property owner is the Upper Crust Pizza and it really kills the flow of the lot and not only that, the parking lot that we will be tying onto is only fifty-four feet, even with eighteen-foot parking spaces, that only leaves 18 feet for a drive by which doesn't meet any code by any standard. And if anybody's parked there, it doesn't flow well. So, that would be direct access and we would be more concerned about them utilizing our client's property for additional parking and may cause an issue. That's the reason we're asking to wave that right for that adjacent property owner connection. We do have and we did design in our plans potential for a future connection on the south side if the property to the south of us on Caraway is ever redeveloped. We did provide for that and connectivity. If and when that happens, so we can have some connectivity. The area by the old Front Page doesn't work because the property lines are so far back. The property on this corner's setbacks I believe are almost 60 feet from the street. So, connectivity with them doesn't make sense either and they have two accesses on Parker already.

Doug Gilmore: So, it's c-store and a stand-alone drive-thru restaurant and some food trucks?

Stonebridge Construction: Yes, sir and we already have the permit in hand for the c-store. We've had the traffic study done for the entire site before development. None of this was ever brought up in their traffic study as far as the requirement of having access over there. They only they have asked us to do is add a left turn lane onto Caraway, along with the right turnout on Caraway.

Doug Gilmore: So, you can make that Caraway entrance and exit a little wider?

Stonebridge Construction: It is, that's been done and that has actually already been submitted, it was done after this was submitted, and that's already been processed through the city. That was an owner requirement suggestion from the traffic study regarding access.

Kevin Bailey (Board): Y'all were here for the drives.

Stonebridge Construction: Yes, basically what we did, the variances we requested were to keep the two existing drives. One on Parker, one on Caraway, and we reduced the setback requirement on Caraway side because the property already lost so much to the drive to the right-away already. Then the other one was the coverage requirements, we were to reduce it by 5 or 10 percent. But that was done in September and like I said, if we had known this, we would have brought this up at that time but it didn't come up until the final stages of the permit process. On the c-store.

Casey Caples (Board): What are the rules on the cross access, when does cross access management no longer exist?

Kevin Bailey: I think it's in the development code but Derrel?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Any commercial project, you're going to be required to have cross access. Any new development requires cross access, to the commercial property adjacent to you.

Kevin Bailey: Casey, if you remember it goes all the way back to, next to Harris Furniture.

Casey Caples: I know, but those lots were smaller and I thought once you got over a certain lot frontage, you didn't have to do the cross access.

Derrel Smith: What you're thinking about is number of driveways, the smaller the lot you're only allowed one driveway unless you're over a certain.

Casey Caples: Alright, that's good to know.

Kevin Bailey: Rob, we don't have the plan in front of us to day like we

normally do.

Doug Gilmore: We do, right here.

Stonebridge Construction: I got a paper copy right here if you want to see it. And what we have shown is what we originally had planned for this lot. And this is when we met with Derrel, Craig, and the entire development team of the city back in June, July, last year. And it just wasn't brought up until I think, Michael Morris brought it up throughout the process that it was part of the code that we had to provide access to all adjacent property owners and the only way around that was to request a variance, for it. So, currently we've modified our permit plans for the c-store to show a proposed drive access over to this lot. Because we couldn't get our permit issued without that and then once we have the variance we'll be able to remove that and revert back to our original layout.

Kevin Bailey: And in that layout Rob, the one over there off Caraway to the future development lot that access is going to stay?

Stonebridge Construction: Yes, and we don't control that, that would have to be when that property is redeveloped and then they would.

Kevin Bailey: But you got the turn out?

Stonebridge Construction: But, we've got it set up for that, yes sir.

Doug Gilmore: Tried this with Simmons Bank, didn't work.

Stonebridge Construction: Like I said, if this was you know, a different drive aisle, if it actually met code, it could be a benefit for both parties. The way we see it, we feel like it would do nothing but be detrimental to our site and it would give the adjacent property owner more parking and better access. Not to the road but to just be able to have an access because the parking lot is very narrow.

Kevin Bailey: If you put this drive into their parking lot, when you leave your property and cross onto them, you're going to be driving through parking places.

Stonebridge Construction: Right.

Kevin Bailey: Because their drive is not.

Stonebridge Construction: Right and not only that but with the location, where it's at, it literally renders that portion of the lot almost unusable because we would have to cut that lot in half. So, it changes everything. But it is what it is, if we had known this ahead of time, we would have brought it up in September when we asked for the other variances.

Kevin Bailey: Derrel, what's the city's thought process on this?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): We've already granted a lot of variances on this. This is just one more. Possibly if it needs that many variances maybe that's not big enough for everything they have planned on it.

Stonebridge Construction: My other question is our site doesn't require, because of, and the traffic study repeats that. This property currently has access and cross access to Front Page which had two entrances on Parker and they have access to Shelby, as well. That adjacent property owner has three accesses to Parker currently. What it would do is add additional driving, and additional traffic, and parking through our site. That's the position we stand on. And even if the variance wasn't granted we would have to plan for and set aside property of ours currently for some chance in the future that, that property is redeveloped and they actually grant access. So, it doesn't automatically tie in because there's not a cross access easement through there because when that property was developed, it didn't exist. So, we would just have to set aside that property in the hope that it will be redeveloped. Because I don't think the city would allow access to it, as it currently is.

Casey Caples: I know the Upper Crust parking lot, and that's a rough deal.

They already spill out into the adjoining property. So I imagine they would hate it.

Doug Gilmore: If you start cutting in there, it goes back into their parking lot.

Casey Caples: Yeah, it's even worse.

Stonebridge Construction: Like, I said I measured it, if you use 18 feet, which none of our vehicles are 18 feet, they have parking blocks a few sets away, that only leaves 18 foot for a drive aisle and if you use 20 feet it's 16. So, it doesn't meet any requirement at all and that's the concern I'd have is that you'd be adding traffic through that already small parking lot.

Casey Caples: Mr. Chair I think that parking lot that the city is asking them to adjoin to, with those depth requirements and already the chaos that comes with that parking lot. I make a motion that we approve the variance.

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

Aye: 3 - Casey Caples; Kevin Bailey and Doug Gilmore

Absent: 1 - Max Dacus Jr.

Abstain: 1 - Rick Miles

[VR-25-05](#)

Variance: 3811 South Culberhouse Street

Todd Wilcox is requesting a variance for an eight-foot-tall gate. The property is zoned R-1, single family medium density district.

Attachments: [BZA Application](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)
 [Gate Picture](#)

Doug Gilmore (Chair): Mr. Wilcox.

Todd Wilcox (Proponent): Hello, so I guess everyone's seen the packet I submitted, asking for a variance to construct a gate going up to our property. Just built a new home at 3811 South Culberhouse a year ago. Our house sits roughly 800 feet off the driveway or off Culberhouse. We're wanting to back off Culberhouse about 125 to 150 feet, put in two brick posts. You should have a colored picture there.

Doug Gilmore: Our technology is a little suspect today but it was in the packet.

Todd Wilcox: I may have a copy, to just show you what kind of gate, it's not a fence it's a gate.

Casey Caples (Board): How far did you say you were off the street? I'm sorry.

Todd Wilcox: Roughly 125 to 150 feet.

Doug Gilmore: Your house?

Todd Wilcox: Oh, the house is 800 feet. I'm sorry.

Casey Caples: No, I meant the gate.

Unable to transcribe

Todd Wilcox: We're going to turn off and we're going to set up a separate electric meter for it because we're not going to try to run back from our house to get power to it. The variance we're needing, of course my wife has certain things she wants. She wants a gate that is in the center, roughly between seven and eight feet tall. It's going to be custom built steel gate, powder coated, painted, two brick columns, with coach lights on them. And the main reason is to stop people from trespassing. We have camera's up.

Doug Gilmore: You're back there 800 feet, somebody could come up and you'd

never know they were there.

Todd Wilcox: We've caught them back there. We have them on camera. That's the reason for it.

Doug Gilmore: Well Todd, we all know there's multiple houses on that area right there on Culberhouse that have gates and some of them are taller and bigger.

Todd Wilcox: We drove down there and there are seven gates on the west side of Culberhouse, which is the same side of the road we're on. I think that there may be one that's shorter but every double gate is between seven and eight feet tall. One's close to ten.

Doug Gilmore: There's a few people I know down that way that have big gates. So, we've established there's a precedent, now what do we do?

Rick Miles (Board): Mr. Chairman, if Wilcox is trying to set this that far off of the road, I move that we grant the variance.

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

Aye: 3 - Rick Miles; Casey Caples and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 1 - Max Dacus Jr.

[VR-25-06](#)

Variance: 5800 CW Post Road

Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company is requesting a variance on behalf of Post Consumer Brands for the requirement to pave an off-street temporary parking lot. The property is zoned I-2, general industrial district.

Attachments: [Varaince Application](#)
 [Plans](#)
 [CERTIFIED MAIL RECEIPTS](#)

Doug Gilmore (Chair): Alright, 5800 CW Post Road.

Rick Comer (Proponent): My name is Rick Comer with Burns & McDonnell Engineering. Post Consumer Brands is our client and we are doing some work for them at their facility. What we are asking for a variance for is to construct a gravel lot for the time period of the project that we're doing, we do have a stormwater pollution prevention plan through the state of Arkansas. Certified by an engineer in the state of Arkansas and Burns & McDonnell is the actual permit holder. So, there's no chance of us walking away from this once it's complete, but the plan is once it is completed, we will reclaim it, to hit that 70% revegetation that is required by the state and then at that point we'll close out our stormwater plan, but the plan is to revegetate everything once it is said and done with. Like I said, I have a SWPP that we submitted to the city, should be in the package as well as a soil erosion control plan and everything like that, that is required by the NPDS for the state.

Casey Caples (Board): What's the duration for this parking lot?

Rick Comer: Roughly a year. So, it'll be completed by March of next year.

Kevin Bailey: So, this is your construction, trailers, equipment, access while you're doing the addition or whatever it is across the street.

Rick Comer: Correct. Layout yard.

Kevin Bailey: Yes, it just happens to be across the street:

Rick Comer: Yes, on their property, correct. And this is the only disturbance that is taking place for the project. And we're just over an acre I believe.

Kevin Bailey: So, you're gonna put it back like it was before you get your CO

on your addition?

Rick Comer: Yes. Correct.

Unable to transcribe

Kevin Bailey: Mr. Chair I move that we grant this temporary variance for the construction time, and it will be removed before the CO is issued.

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

Aye: 3 - Rick Miles;Casey Caples and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 1 - Max Dacus Jr.

5. Staff Comments

6. Adjournment