

SP-11-06

SP 11-06 Site Plan Review

Mr. Robert Rees request MAPC approval of Bowers Farm Apartments, located at 1200 Commerce Dr. for 256 units (32 8-plex buildings), for property recently rezoned to RM-12, Low Density Multi-Family Residential.

Attachments: [BowersFarm 1200 Commerce Dr. Apartments](#)
[SP 11 06 Bowers Farm Robert Rees StaffMemo](#)
[ORD11 032](#)

Mr. Robert Rees addressed MAPC.

Stated that he met with the Predevelopment Review Committee. They noted some issues and we have addressed most of them. One of the changes we made was- we placed 50 ft. between the buildings to give a lot of area to walk the dogs, etc. Water and sewer will be approved by CWL and the Health Dept. There was a question about the fire hydrants which are within 500 ft. apart. We had to add 2 entrances; the Fire Department wanted 2 entrances, and I have that on this plan here (Offered MAPC a revised site plan). They wanted a spot at the end of these drives for turn-around for trucks at a size of 120ft. x20 ft. and it is shown on that plan also. Trash pickup locations will also be shown. Landscaping scheme was also presented by Mr. Rees.

Mr. Spriggs gave Staff Comments: As noted we presented the plan to the Predevelopment Review Committee. The Fire Department concerns serving the units with a secondary access point were noted. The distance away from the original drive was discussed in regards to the fact that one drive could get blocked due to an emergency. Mr. Morris noted that you can have more that 200 units unless you tie the other future road back to the existing there is still only one entrance to the buildings. We can limit you to a certain units until you hit that threshold to have another access. Mr. Rees ask for approval based on any problems referring them to the Planning Department for approval. Mr. Spriggs asked Mr. Rees if he has done a Phasing plan.

Mr. Rees responding that he would start on the west side and develop one drive at a time both ways which will be 64 units. Then next year go to the next drive.

Mr. Spriggs noted that he is only concerned that the plan shows 256 units with no complete connection shown but it shows future development and I do not want the cheat the MAPC here with approval an overall plan that is not complete. So my advise is you could approve Phase 1 with the notion that Mr. Rees will come back with Phase II, given a certain number of units. I feel comfortable with that. Staff has concerns that the secondary drive here shows future development and doesn't show the exact connection. Mr. Rees noted the is not interested in a building permit for all for these. If there are problems with any of the departments I will address those. Mr. Spriggs asked Mr. Rees to draw on his copy, the limits of Phase I for the MAPC's consideration. The boundary was drawn, accepted and signed by Mr. Rees.

Mr. McElroy, Commerce Drive: He commented on stormwater control and how Mr. Reese proposes to help with the runoff.

Mr. Rees stated that the Engineering Department will dictate that. Mr. Rees

stated that he will probably have 40 or 50 % more drainage detention than is required. At the south end, I will dig a pond and will take that field dirt and use it for my pad for what ever we need.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that likes the idea of bringing housing closer to the Industrial Park; however, he is not very enthused about taking 30 acres of land and closing off a traffic route to the east/west and north/south. That is my major concern that we tie up this big block. We did this in the other developed parts of Jonesboro such as the country club where there is no north/south corridor. We have a good opportunity with a flat piece of land and that we don't have to do a bunch of "curly-que" roads and culdesacs. We can plan this well. This will be taking out cross routes for traffic.

Mr. Tomlinson added: You could take your private drive running east/west and make it public; and take a public residential street north and south so that when someone else develops we start doing some real connections and real planning. that is my biggest concern about the whole project. Mr. Rees noted that he took this avenue with Otis' suggestion. This is how he suggested we go. He commented on the ditches to the east and to the south. Mr. Tomlinson: There are bridges all over Jonesboro. Mr. Rees: The property to the south is all industrial and commercial. The property to the east is a ditch there. Commerce Dr. is to the west. In talking with Otis on how to proceed he suggested we go this way.

Mr. White moved to approve Mr. Rees' request with the following stipulations that this approval is only for Phase 1, 64 units as noted on the plan tonight; that he acquire prior to permitting any department approval necessary for the project (stormwater detention primary concern).

Motion seconded by Ms. Norris. Mr. Reese asked if he finished Phase 1 could he just go to planning without going back to the MAPC? Mr. White stated he would like his motion to remain as noted. Mr. Spriggs stated that there will only be required a 10 day deadline submission to MAPC for any future phases for site plan approval. Roll Call Vote: Ms. Norris- Aye; Mr. White- Aye; Mr. Tomlinson- Nay; Mr. Scurlock- Aye; Mr. Roberts- Aye. Motion Failed. Mr. Spriggs stated that we would total/ unanimous vote for any approval. Mr. Spriggs stated that the MAPC be clear on why it is being denied.

Mr. Rees stated that it doesn't seem right that I am being denied because of the private streets and all; when I did what the City wanted me to do it. Mr. Tomlinson asked was he told to or suggested. Mr. Spriggs clarified to Mr. Rees that he cannot dictate the design of plans submitted; Staff only suggested ways to deal with access management such as a secondary access to the site.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that when we deal with private streets we have Planned Unit Developments. Mr. Spriggs clarified that this is an apartment complex served by private parking lot drives.

Mr. Scurlock: Seems like we have 2 issues. One- a secondary outlet for Fire Department outlet. I can't imagine we are requiring a developer to work out the traffic pattern. Do we have a future street planned there?

Mr. Spriggs: Mr. Tomlinson is suggesting a public right of way to be

incorporated into a plan. We cannot demand any right of way from a developer. In terms of preference (private or public), Engineering has stated that they would prefer that it remains private because we do not want an instance where the City is maintaining drives into a private development. So, I would proceed with caution in terms of requiring the public right-of-way absent a subdivision request.

Mr. White: Mr. Rees you mention earlier on the Phasing, you will create another access based on the City's requirements. Is that public or private?

Mr. Rees. It would be on the site side- I could make it either. I could make that public to the east/west. Mr. Rees what if I make the main entrance a city street. Mr. Tomlinson concurred.

Mr. White moved to approve Mr. Rees' request with the following stipulations that this approval is only for Phase 1, 64 units as noted on the plan tonight; that the plan be amended to show an East West street from Commerce to the ditch, and also that the developer acquire prior to permitting any department approval necessary for the project (stormwater detention primary concern).

Mr. Tomlinson clarified that it is not based on the fact that he did not require a city street but was through discussion and with your permission. Mr. Rees concurred. Mr. Morris noted that Mr. Rees will have to post a bond on the public improvements prior to platting/ C.O.

Motion seconded by Mr. Tomlinson. The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

6. Conditional Use

7. Rezoning