



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, May 12, 2020

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Absent 1 - Jim Scurlock

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-20:042](#)

MINUTES: MAPC MINUTES - APRIL 28, 2020

Attachments: [MAPC Minutes from April 28, 2020](#)

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey, seconded by Mary Margaret Jackson, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 3 - Jerry Reece; Dennis Zolper and Jim Scurlock

4. Miscellaneous Items

[COM-20:022](#)

SIDEWALK IN LIEU FEE: 811 Windover Road

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Bartels Family Dentistry is requesting from MAPC to be able to pay the Sidewalk "In Lieu" Payment of \$5,931.84 along 811 Windover Road. The total area of sidewalk being requested for is 111 sy. The 2020 Rate is \$53.44 per square yard.

Attachments: [Letter](#)
 [Plan](#)
 [MAPC Meeting 11.12.19](#)
 [Vote from MAPC Meeting 11.12.19](#)
 [Pictures](#)

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Bartels Family Dentistry is requesting from MAPC to be able to pay the Sidewalk "In Lieu" Payment of \$5,931.84 along 811 Windover Road. The total area of sidewalk being requested for is 111 sy. The 2020 Rate is \$53.44 per square yard.

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated there are four legitimate requests that can be made for a sidewalk in-lieu-of fee. This situation addresses three of those four. The first on the list is removal of a large, exceptional tree. That does not apply in this case. Number two is storm water consideration. There is a drain down by the west entrance of this property. He stated if they construct a sidewalk in such a manner as to not interfere with the drainage, our slope to get back down to the existing entrance would be in the excess of fourteen percent slope. That is a clear violation of ADA standards. The third item is the height of a retaining wall. With the new master street plan and placement of a sidewalk, it would require a retaining wall of roughly 3.3'. Exception four is any extraordinary circumstance that would accompany the request. In this case, in order to become ADA compliant, they would have to completely rip out their existing entrances because those entrances have an existing slope of eight or nine percent. ADA standards require a slope not in excess of two percent.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated he does meet the requirements for an in-lieu-of fee. He stated they have no problems accepting the fee of \$5931.84 in-lieu of the sidewalks.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for commissioner comments.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated he went to the site and walked the site. He stated there are some challenging slopes there. He stated if this is set off back of curb like in the street plan, everything George has stated is accurate and true. If there was a request to put this at the back of curb, the only challenges would be the driveways. He stated he believes it would be very difficult to change the slopes. He stated in principle, he believes this area needs to have sidewalks, but this does meet the criteria so he will vote in favor.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Jim Little, that this matter

be Approved. The motion **PASSED** with the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 3 - Jerry Reece; Dennis Zolper and Jim Scurlock

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

6. Final Subdivisions

PP-20-06

FINAL SUBDIVISION REPLAT: Fair Park Crossing

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Fair Park Crossing, LLC is requesting MAPC Replat Approval because the frontage along Caraway Road is only 59.94 ft. and the stated minimum is 60 ft.. The shorage is .06' which is only 3/4 inches short of the requirement. Also, The developers would like to have MAPC Permission to install a 40 ft driveway into that lot. However the commercial requirements state that commercial driveways are to be a minimum of 25 ft from the side property lines. If 25 ft is measured from both sides, there are only 9.94 of width for a driveway. The is within the C-2 Downtown Fringe Commercial District.

Attachments:

Replat
Fair Park Crossing Subd. Set
Aerial View
Phase 2 Plat
Email from Craig Light
Traffic Study

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Fair Park Crossing, LLC is requesting MAPC Replat Approval because the frontage along Caraway Road is only 59.94 ft. and the stated minimum is 60 ft.. The shorage is .06' which is only 3/4 inches short of the requirement. Also, The developers would like to have MAPC Permission to install a 40 ft driveway into that lot. However the commercial requirements state that commercial driveways are to be a minimum of 25 ft from the side property lines. If 25 ft is measured from both sides, there are only 9.94' of width for a driveway. The is within the C-2 downtown fringe commercial district.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. stated this was previously tabled and will need to be untabled to proceed.

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey to untable this rezoning, seconded by David Handwork, that this matter be untabled. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 7 – Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey; Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Nay: 0

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated a traffic study has been submitted. Fair Park Crossing, LLC had to hire a traffic engineer. That property has all been rezoned to C-3 now except for the northwest corner lot which is FNBC Bank. He stated they did obtain a conditional use to place a bank on that C-2 property.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated they have received the traffic study. He stated they are still okay with the 59' on Caraway. However, there are still a couple questions that we have sent to the traffic engineer about access onto Caraway.

He stated they would recommend approval for all accesses on Fair Park, but would like to hold off on Caraway until a couple more questions are answered from the traffic engineer to our city engineer.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for commissioner comment.

COMMISSION: Jimmy Cooper asked what are the questions.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated Craig Light sent Mr. Peters seven questions this morning. They are as follows:

1. What about Lot 7? Given the lot dimensions and the proximity to the intersection of Race and Fairpark, shared use driveways on either Race and/or Fairpark will be required to serve this Lot.
2. What percentage of traffic generated by this site is "new" traffic as compared to "existing" traffic being captured?
3. How does the "new traffic generated by this site impact the signalized intersections at Caraway/Race and Race/Fairpark, since they are within 1/8-mile?
4. At what LOS do the remaining driveways operate without the requested driveway connection to Caraway Road?
5. Does an additional driveway on Fairpark alleviate any issues caused by the loss of a driveway on Caraway Road?
6. If a connection to Caraway Road is still warranted is a cross connection to Hilton Garden Inn possible, and will this remedy the LOS issue?
7. Is cross section with Hilton Garden Inn possible regardless?

COMMISSION: Jimmy Cooper asked when the traffic study was received.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated it was received yesterday.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated she does not think this was ready to come in front of MAPC. She stated these are legitimate questions that need answers before she can consider approving this. She stated she cannot support it as presented.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated he agrees with Ms. Jackson.

COMMISSION: Kevin Bailey stated he agrees with Ms. Jackson as well.

COMMISSION: Jimmy Cooper asked if they are talking about totally voting it down or tabling it again. He stated he does not have a problem with tabling it. If he is turned down he will have to start all over.

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

Aye: 5 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 3 - Jerry Reece; Dennis Zolper and Jim Scurlock

7. Conditional Use

[CU-20-03](#)

CONDITIONAL USE: 1500 Loberg Lane

Josh Olson Realtor on behalf of Dennis Lard is requesting MAPC Approval for a Conditional Use based on the sale of a property to be issued to continue use as a business on land located at 1500 Loberg Lane. This is located on an R-1 Single Family Residential District.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Pictures of Signs and Location](#)
 [Property Owners Signatures](#)
 [USPS Receipts](#)

Josh Olson Realtor on behalf of Dennis Lard is requesting MAPC Approval for a Conditional Use based on the sale of a property to be issued to continue use as a business on land located at 1500 Loberg Lane. This is located on an R-1 Single Family Residential District.

APPLICANT: Josh Olson stated the property has been a church and a cabinet shop. The prospective client would be using it as a storage facility for employees of a lawn care business and a spraying business.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated this has been a business since 1986. He stated they would like the area to stay like it has been in the past where everything has been stored inside the building. He stated that they would ask that, if the commission grants this conditional use, that:

1. That upon issuance of the Conditional Use Approval, all other building permit and other permits and licenses required locally and statewide be applied for and obtained by the applicant.
2. Fencing will be required to buffer from equipment, trucks, trailers, etc. from residential neighborhood if stored outside the building.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts asked for public comments. There were none. He then asked for commissioner comment.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper, seconded by David Handwork, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 7 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 1 - Jim Scurlock

8. Rezonings

[RZ-20-03](#)

REZONING: 1020 E Washington Avenue

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Jahbari McLennan are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from C-3 General Commercial to RM-12 - Residential Multi-Family Classification, 12 units per net acre, includes all forms of units, duplexes, triplexes, quads, and higher Limited Use Overlay for .34 Acres +/- of land located at 1020 East Washington Avenue.

Attachments:

[Application](#)

[Certified Receipts](#)

[Floor Plan](#)

[Front and Left Building Elevations](#)

[Preliminary Layout number 3](#)

[Rear and Right Building Elevations](#)

[Rezoning Plat](#)

[Property Owner Notifications Signed](#)

[Plat of Survey](#)

[Email from Curtis L. Tate](#)

[Email from Jason Marshall](#)

[Email From Civilogic](#)

[Staff Summary](#)

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Jahbari McLennan are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from C-3 General Commercial to RM-12 Residential Multi-Family Classification, 12 units per net acre, includes all forms of units, duplexes, triplexes, quads, and higher Limited Use Overlay for .34 Acres +/- of land located at 1020 East Washington Avenue.

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated there is a typographical error. Instead of RM-16, they are looking for RM-12. He stated a part of the limited use is a maximum of four units. He stated this is surrounded on all sides by R-2 property. If you use the mathematics and take an acre and divide in by the 3600 as required per unit in R-2, that calculation is 12.1 units per acre and they are requesting an RM-12.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked if the limitation is only to four units given the acreage.

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated that is correct.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated they have reviewed it and it does fall in line with the land use plan for the area. He stated they would recommend approval with the following requirements:

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. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning Department, prior to any redevelopment of the property.

3. A final site plan illustrating compliance with Multi-Family requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, sidewalks etc., shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment.

4. The Limited Use Overlay Proposed Limitations are: a. Maximum of Four (4) Residential Units. b. Compliance with the Current Master Street Plan. c. Compliance with the City's Storm Water Management Specifications. d. Building Setbacks are to be defined as follows: i. Front 25 ft. Setback ii. Rear 20 ft. Setback iii. Side 7.5 ft. Setback.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for public comment and commissioner comment.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated they have received a couple emails concerned about parking in this area. She asked the Engineer to address this. She asked if they are confident that parking can be maintained on site for this density.

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated it can. Part of the submittal included the site layout. He stated they have positioned the building on the lot for appropriate parking. Parking is in the back, north of the building. The building will be out close to the front setback and face Washington.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. stated he will read two emails he received. The first is from Curtis Tate. He is the owner of 1009 E Washington, 1016 E Washington, 423 McDaniel, and 426 McDaniel. His email reads:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Planning Commission, Please consider this letter as formal opposition to the rezoning of 1012 East Washington Ave. The property should stay properly zoned in congruity with the prevailing use for the street as a whole. The zoning requested is too dense to be beneficial to the neighborhood, and it sets a trend that will both lend to over-density and disparate development attempts.

1012 E Washington is currently zoned to its highest and best use. The entire modern E Washington Ave. corridor is commercial development pertaining to medical or professional industries. Owners of the surrounding properties have commercial projects either underway or planned for future use.

Furthermore, RM-16 zoning is too dense and has too large of an effect on neighboring property owners to be used in spot zoning. This rezoning will put a four-plex on a quarter acre and place a dozen parked cars inches away from the property to the north that is a mere fifty foot wide. I happen to be the owner of that particular property to the north. The precedent set by RM-16 spot zoning could mean a minimum of ten more fourplexes, each disparately executed, in the same block.

We are excited that the area is garnering interest and are looking forward to great neighbors. However, we believe that a fourplex on that area of Washington frontage is short-sighted and would impair value of everyone on the block as well as East Washington as a whole.

That is from Curtis Tate at 906 Steele Ave. He stated he has another letter from Jason Marshall, MARMAC Construction, LLC, Renee Capital, LLC. He is the owner of 1021 Hope St., 1101 Hope St., 1222 E Washington, 423 McDaniel St., 400 S Patrick, 502 E Washington, and 504 E Washington. His email reads: Planning Commission, The neighboring property owners listed above oppose the rezoning of 1020 East Washington Ave. The property is currently zoned to its highest and best use. Our surrounding properties have three commercial projects either underway or planned for near the future. RM-16 is too dense for a single lot to allow for the needed buffers. This could create a trend without a coordinated effort at planning. This rezoning has the ability to lower the value of all land in the area.

That is from Jason Marshall. To correct both of those letter, George has stated they are going with RM-12 now. He asked for any public input. There was none. He asked for additional commissioner comment.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper, seconded by Jimmy Cooper, that this matter be Recommended to Council. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Nay: 1 - Jerry Reece

Absent: 1 - Jim Scurlock

[RZ-20-04](#)

REZONING: 3006 Rook Road

Michael Daniels, Land Surveyor is requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Medium Density District to C-3 General Commercial Limited Use Overlay. for 15.3 Acres +/- of land located at 3006 Rook Road.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Rezoning Plat](#)
 [Certified Receipts](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Pictures of Area](#)

Michael Daniels, Land Surveyor is requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Medium Density District to C-3 General Commercial Limited Use Overlay for 15.3 Acres +/- of land located at 3006 Rook Road.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. stated this was previously tabled and will need to be untabled to proceed.

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey to untable this rezoning, seconded by Jerry Reece, that this matter be untabled. The motion **PASSED** with the following vote.

Aye: 7 – Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey; Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper
Nay: 0

APPLICANT: Michael Daniels stated he would be happy to answer any questions.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated this was tabled out our request last time because there was an error in our determining when the access management ordinance went into effect. We found that this was not covered under that so we have asked that it come back before you. He stated they would recommend approval of this rezoning with the following stipulations:

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. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning Department, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to Planning Department approval in the future.
4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosure, sidewalks etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any

redevelopment of this property.

5. The property is located in the Overlay District and will comply with those design standards.

6. The Rezoning is a Limited Use Overlay with the following proposed uses being allowed: Carwash, Office General, Retail Service, Vehicle and Equipment Sales, Vehicle Repair and Warehouse.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for public comment and commissioner comment.

COMMISSION: Jerry Reece stated considering all of the commercial property around that and being familiar with the site he would recommend approval.

COMMISSION: Kevin Bailey stated part of the storm water retention is the large area to the southeast. He asked if this property is in cooperation with that storm water retention plan.

STAFF: Michael Morris stated he believes it took care of a portion of it. He does not believe it took care of all of it. He stated he believes there is a little additional area he needs to dig out. He stated he will double check and get back with him.

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey, seconded by Jerry Reece, that this matter be Recommended to Council. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Absent: 1 - Jim Scurlock

Abstain: 1 - Dennis Zolper

[RZ-20-05](#)

REZONING: 3506 Southwest Drive

Jeremy Bevill of Fisher & Arnold, Inc. on behalf of Southern Hills Real Estate, LLC and Mr. Carroll Caldwell are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from C-3 General Commercial District Limited Use Overlay to PD-M for 118.34 Acres +/- of land located at 3506 Southwest Drive.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Letter](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Rezoning Plat](#)
 [Outline Plan](#)
 [Pictures of Rezoning Signs](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)
 [School District Letter](#)
 [First Baptist Church Notif. Signed](#)
 [Pattern Book](#)
 [Property Owner Signature](#)
 [Traffic Study](#)
 [Pedestrian Circulation Plan](#)
 [Email Southern Hills PD](#)
 [Email From David Handwork](#)

Jeremy Bevill of Fisher & Arnold, Inc. on behalf of Southern Hills Real Estate, LLC and Mr. Carroll Caldwell are requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from C-3 General Commercial District Limited Use Overlay to PD-M for 118.34 Acres +/- of land located at 3506 Southwest Drive.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. stated this was previously tabled and will need to be untabled to proceed.

A motion was made by David Handwork to untable this rezoning, seconded by Dennis Zolper, that this matter be untabled. The motion **PASSED** with the following vote.

Aye: 7 – Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey; Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper
Nay: 0

APPLICANT: Brant Perkins stated they made their presentation last time. He stated they have had discussions with the city this week about access points. He stated they have reached an agreement with the city that we would allow for a maximum of eight access points. Three of those are the collector streets. There will be five additional curb cuts. Those would be deemed temporary until a structure is constructed or until placement of a signal and a deceleration lane at Collector E which is the middle and main collector. The city has agreed to apply for a signal and deceleration lane at Collector E with the Arkansas highway department. If an access point or curb cut comes within the deceleration lane, the access point will be removed.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked if any updates were need to staff comments from last meeting.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated they would recommend approval of this development with the following stipulations:

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. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning Department, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to Planning Department approval in the future.
4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosure, sidewalks etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment of this property.
5. The Rezoning will have to comply with all the Planned Development District Standards.
6. The City will allow three permanent roads and up to five temporary driveways along Southwest Drive until such time as a traffic signal is installed by the developer at Drive "E". At that time, any driveway in conflict with the traffic signal shall be removed by the developer. All such, permanent and temporary drives shall meet the spacing and other requirements set forth in the City's Access Management Ordinance, including the need for deceleration lanes or tapers.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for public comments and commission comments.

COMMISSION: Jimmy Cooper asked how much of this has the highway department seen and what are their thoughts.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated he is not sure what they have seen of it to date. He stated when they get this, they will go to the highway department and work with them to make sure this all happens. Drive E that they are proposing a traffic signal for, the city is going to send a letter to the highway department requesting that traffic signal at that location. It will have the support of the city so we are hoping that will allow the traffic signal to be placed there. He stated they feel the traffic that is out there and the traffic this is going to generate will warrant a signal at that location.

COMMISSION: Jimmy Cooper stated that as close as it is to Kellers Chapel Road and trying to flow traffic to the state highway he would not be surprised if they turn it down.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated the conditional part of the temporary

drives, that is based off of if they get a signal at Collector E. He asked for clarification on what it means to be in conflict with the signal at Collector E.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated if they get the signal at location E, with the speed of the highway there will have to be a deceleration lane of a minimum of 400'. The will be in conflict with the drive that is southwest of location E. The collector streets may require deceleration lanes as well. It could come into conflict with a couple of others. He stated they will not know that until they get the report back from the highway department and they let us know if they are going to allow the main signal at location E.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated his concern is having that many access roads, even if it is consistent with the street plan. If they do not get a light there, you are going to have a lot of access points. He stated he is supportive of the concept, but he is not supportive of having that much traffic and not thinking about cross access parking lots and driveways to access those retail and businesses along Southwest Drive. He stated he thinks that is a better approach than having all those temporary access points.

PUBLIC: Ryan Robeson stated he has been asked by phone for the Planner to show where the traffic signal will go on the map.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. stated this is the answer to the call in question. Please look at the screen.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated she agrees with Mr. Handwork's comments. She stated she is curious why this did not go to the highway department before in came to MAPC. She stated that in order for them to make a good decision they need to have all of the input from all of the utilities that will be impacted by this site before they make their decision. She stated she agrees that this is a very creative and interesting development. She stated in her past life as a city planner in Florida she reviewed a lot of multimillion dollar, multiuse plans in Destin and San Destin. It can transform a city for better or for worse. She stated some of the developments she has worked with before did transform the city. Luckily that city had the ability to make up for the impact of that development through tourism money, impact fees, and other funding mechanisms which we do not have in Jonesboro. She stated she is glad in the last meeting that we were able to confirm that the developer will pay for those improvements both in the development and outside the development. That will continue throughout the life of the development regardless of whether that changes hands. She stated back to her original point, why did this not go to the highway department first.

APPLICANT: Brant Perkins stated you have to get your plan approved first before the highway department will look at it.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson asked if the highway department was part of the technical review process with City, Water, and Light.

APPLICANT: Brant Perkins stated they are not going to look at it because there is no road approved. It is 140 acres of ground. From their perspective it is 100 plus acres of ground. They are just not going to put a traffic light in the middle of nowhere. They need to look at the approved plan first. He stated he would

like to remind everyone this is for a rezoning. It is not a site plan. Those will come later.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated it was hard to believe they would not look at it on some level before putting together the plan. She stated she feels that would be prudent for the developer and the city to have some input. This is an area that has a lot of traffic that backs up to I-555 and she stated that can be included as part of your technical review process. She stated it is common in other areas to include the highway department in the beginning stages.

APPLICANT: Brant Perkins stated not when it is a rezoning. He stated this is just a rezoning request.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Dennis Zolper, that this matter be Recommended to Council. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; David Handwork and Kevin Bailey

Nay: 1 - Mary Margaret Jackson

Absent: 1 - Jim Scurlock

9. Staff Comments

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated the three o'clock meeting always comes into conflict with the finance committee meeting that is at four o'clock. He stated he has spoken with Mayor Perrin and would like to change the second meeting to 5:30 so that both meetings are at 5:30. We try to push all of the rezoning to 5:30 so it makes our 5:30 meeting much longer. This should help level things out so meetings are about the same length.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for commissioner comment. He stated they will be taking action on this tonight.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper to approve this request, seconded by Jim Little, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 7 – Mary Margaret Jackson; David Handwork; Kevin Bailey; Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Nay: 0

10. Adjournment