



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, August 22, 2023

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford and Jim Little

Absent 1 - Dennis Zolper

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-23:082](#)

MINUTES: August 8, 2023 MAPC

Attachments: [August 8, 2023 MAPC Minutes](#)

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; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Absent: 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

4. Miscellaneous Items

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

6. Final Subdivisions

[PP-23-07](#)

FINAL SUBDIVISION: Southern Oaks Phase I

Crafton Tull is requesting final subdivision approval for Southern Oaks Phase I; 78 lots on 21.54 acres. This property is located north of Jaxon Drive and zoned RS-6, single family residential.

Attachments: [Application](#)
[Record Plat](#)
[Staff Report](#)

Jeremy Bevill – Crafton Tull: We are requesting final plat approval of this

subdivision. Southern Oaks Phase I. All the infrastructure is in place. The sidewalks, speed tables, we've turned in a maintenance bond to the city and they're reviewing it.

Derrel Smith – Staff: We've reviewed it and it does meet all requirements of the city subdivision code and we would recommend approval.

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

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

Absent: 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

[PP-23-08](#)

FINAL SUBDIVISION:Edgemont Park Phase II

Mark Morris is requesting final subdivision approval for Edgemont Park Phase II; 51 lots on 15 acres. This property is located at Edgemont Drive and zoned R-1, single family medium density.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Final Plat](#)
 [Staff Report](#)

Mark Morris – Morris Construction: We're requesting final plat approval on 51 lots. We have everything but the asphalt down.

Derrel Smith – Staff: We've reviewed this, and it does meet the subdivision code. We would recommend approval.

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

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

Absent: 2 - Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

7. Conditional Use

[CU-23-09](#)

CONDITIONAL USE: 3648 Hudson Drive

Focal Point Investments, LLC is requesting conditional use approval for a climate controlled storage complex at 3648 Hudson Drive. This property is located in the C-3, general commercial district.

Attachments: [Application - Updated](#)
 [Plans](#)
 [Letter of Intent](#)
 [Mail Receipts](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

Kyle Ham – Signal Source: We're seeking conditional use for approval for climate controlled storage.

Derrel Smith – Staff: We would recommend approval with the following conditions.

1. That upon issuance of the Conditional Use Approval, all other permits and inspections required locally and statewide be applied for and obtained by the applicant.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. The site shall follow all overlay district standards.

Lonnie Roberts – Commission: Is there anyone here who would like to make public comments on this?

Paul Ford – Commission: The reason this is before us is because it exceeds 75,000ft otherwise it's all zoned correctly?

Smith: No, a mini storage or storage is only allowed Conditional under C-3. So that's why it's before you.

Jeff Steiling – Commission: Yesterday at the pre-meeting, we talked about getting an example of what you've done similar in the past. Did you bring that? Unable to transcribe

Ham: Those are 2 different examples of what they might look like.

Monroe Pointer – Commission: This example you've given us, is this 2 story?

Ham: Yes, this building will be 2 story.

Commission: It's one big building instead a bunch of mini building.

Ham: It's one fully enclosed climate controlled building. There will be doors on the outside, but they're not doors to access the units. They'll be the doors to enter the building and then it'll be a hallway system. You can't access the units from the outside. It's all one building.

Commission: Without access from the outside, is the market to have things people can carry in.

Ham: They won't be big units, they'll be kind of smaller units. I think the biggest one is about 10x10 maybe. It's only things you can get through a normal door. There won't be any roll up gates or garage doors or anything like that.

Steiling: Can we add stipulations to this that if follows this concept and it doesn't change to something different? If we were to approve this, they're not tied to this.

Roberts: I would think within reason.

Smith: They're going to be tied to the overlay district requirements.

Steiling: There's nothing to stick them to a single building. If they decided to change to multiple buildings, they could change their whole concept.

Smith: Yes. If they're going to change to multiple buildings, it would have to be approved by us again.

Roberts: We'll see the final site plan.

Steiling: So we are approving this with a single building?

Smith: Yes. If it changes from that, they'll have to come back.

Pointer: Is that conditional use only to the owner of the property?

Smith: Yes.

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

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

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

8. Rezoning

RZ-23-10

REZONING: 5914 E. Johnson Ave.

Junior Das Business Holding Trust is requesting a rezoning from I-1, limited industrial, to C-3 LUO, general commercial with a limited use overlay. This request is for 1.29 acres located at 5914 E. Johnson Avenue.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)
 [Rezoning Plat](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

Michael Bogg – Tralan Engineering: We're looking to get this property rezoned from I-1 to C-3 LUO for the 1.29 acres.

Derrel Smith – Staff: We would recommend approval with the following conditions

1. 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. The site shall comply with all overlay district standards.
5. The limited use overlay shall prohibit:

- Adult Entertainment

Lonnie Robert – Commission: With this rezoning, is there anyone here to give public comments?
(There were none)

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

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

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

RZ-23-11

REZONING: 4018 Willow Rd.

Stan Staton is requesting a rezoning from R-1, single family medium density, to RS-7, single family residential. This request is for 18 acres located at 4018 Willow Road.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)
 [Rezoning Plat](#)
 [Rezoning Plat 2](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

Jeremy Bevill – Crafton Tull: We are requesting RS-7 single family residential from R-1. It's on the east side of Willow Rd about 800ft north of Ingles rd. with this rezoning there can be approximately 75 single family lots. Originally we planned for detention on the east property line and the west property line near Willow.

Derrel Smith – Staff: We've reviewed it and we would recommend approval with the following stipulations:

1. 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.

Lonnie Robert – Commission: Is there anyone here who would like to give public comments on this application?

David Gibson – 916 Gloster Dr: I don't rise against this development or for this development. I own a house at 4107 House Dr. House Dr has 4 houses on it. It's directly off of Willow Rd. I'm not sure if my property touches the development, but I know my neighbors does. We have severe drainage problems in that area. There's a ditch that runs on the south side of House Dr in front of 3 houses. There's on house on the other side that doesn't have a ditch but they also have drainage issues. I've had the house for 7-10 years and we've always had drainage problems. In 2022 or early 2023 we had a huge rain and water was against the first block of my house, my entire front yard was flooded. The house is built on 2 blocks. My second problem before the drainage is that I don't want this development to make our problem worse. I called the Mayor's office after that first flooding, I spoke to the Mayor's assistant and she directed me to the Engineering Department. Mr. Pillow worked in the Engineering Department. He was extremely professional and polite and kind to me. Mr. Pillow met with me and at that time we were talking about maybe something the city can do with the drainage ditch in front of the property. It's a very shallow drainage ditch I am still confused on this matter and I'd like to hear more from the city engineer. If I understood him right, they investigated it and got back with me and said this was taken into the city after the development had been made and there were no easements given at that time. At the end of House Dr Mr. Pillow pointed at a fence and said even if we were to be able to dig a ditch and help you, there's no place for the water to drain. The land across the fence is a proposed development before you. I just want to make sure the problem won't be made worse and if possible to be resolved. Someone made the comment that they might not be able to do anything until the land gets developed. I would appreciate thorough consideration of the matters I've brought before this body by the City of Jonesboro and the developer from the proposed property.

Michael Morris – Staff: They will be required to reduce the amount of runoff to the precondition. Currently they're allowed to build Single Family Homes, what they're asking for is a few more additional houses for this area.

Roberts: So there are ponds planned?

Morris: It'll have to be to city code.

Bevill: We plan to have detention ponds on the east property line and the west property line. This area is in a floodplain so you would expect to have flooding in this area. We will meet all the floodplain regulations and like Mr. Morris indicated, we're not going to make drainage worse. We'll meet the city's drainage requirements.

Monroe Pointer – Commission: There was a concern about that area. You said it's not going to make it worse, but would this development help?

Bevill: Once drainage infrastructure is in place on the 18 acres, we can have underground drainage system. We can collect the storm water that flows onto the property, convey it to the detention ponds, and release it a little more slowly. It's helping the drainage if the water is coming onto the property. If there's an existing problem on Willow Rd, this project may not touch that.

Gibson: I've talked to the developer, I have no opposition, and the property I'm concerned about is on House Dr. The engineers did tell me that the water cannot run the other direction to Willow Rd. It can only run one direction into their proposed development. If they don't receive their water in a better way, we have no way.

Gary (unable to transcribe) – 4005 Willow: Willow Rd can't take one more ounce of water. The last rain we had, my ditch when they paved the road they asked to have 10ft of my yard, I said sure. South of me is my twin sister Brenda, from there down to the corner, the ditch is smaller plus the subdivision north of me on Longcrest has dug a 6 acre 60ft deep retention pond that holds water. The mosquitoes are up, he dug a ditch around our 5 acres, and it holds water. Willow Rd can't handle another ounce of water. You can't put water on Willow.

Roberts: He's going to keep the water in the subdivision. His drainage plans will keep the water in the subdivision.

Fred Harget – 1811 Carolyn: I own property that fronts on Willow Rd, north of this property. My wife's family owns the property that's going to border this property on the south. Talking about drainage, I'm going to read something that comes from the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. It says even though individual properties can be brought in with confirmation of flood prevention standards to allow construction, limited development is still advisable. So even though they can take in the drainage, limited development in this area by the definition of the books says you should still limit the development. It also recommends for the rural property which adjoins this on the east side, it says houses should be built on lot sizes of 5 acres or more. Not 7 to an acre. Someone said earlier that a few houses were going to be built on this property. I'm judging by the size of the map, we're looking at 80 acres total. There's about 20 houses in that 80 acres right now, if we had 75 that's more than a few houses in that area. On the findings it said there's 6 criteria is that you who prepares that?

Roberts: It's the city staff. It's part of the city's process.

Harget: Have you seen those results? I went to the package and looked at a few things. The first thing that got my attention is the 6 criteria, the very first one says consistency of the proposal with the comprehensive land use map. In the finding it says it's not consistent, but in the yes and no box it's checked yes. Is that a clerical mistake or did I miss something?

Monica Pearcy – Staff: It was most likely a typo.

Harget: So that should be an X instead of a yes?

Roberts: Is an RS-7 still considered low intensity?

Unable to transcribe

Pearcy: It should be an X on that one.

Harget: So they're not in compliance to do with the land use map. Hopefully we'll get that fixed. A few items I saw on this application for rezoning, on the first page it said Willow Rd is going to be servicing this whole subdivision. Willow Rd according to the master street plan right now should be a 4 lane road. I know it takes money to do that, but it's supposed to be a 4 lane road and its 2 lane right now. I got a feeling someone's going to do a traffic study and say 2 lanes is okay, but to me traffic is already bad enough to add to it. On the second page, why are they requesting this property, it says it's for the best use of the property but I don't know who's going to benefit for that. I don't think anyone thinks it's going to be a benefit. The surveyors, the engineers, and the attorney and spec builders who are going to build the houses will benefit, but I don't see any benefit at all to the people in the neighborhood. Question 9 says how would the proposed rezoning effect nearby property including the impact of property values, traffic, drainage, visual appearance, noise, hours of operation, and so on. It says the rezoning and future development should have a positive impact on adjacent properties. I think you can ask anyone on that whole map, I don't think there's anyone who's going to have a positive effect on that neighborhood. I'm against it.

Kenneth Hollis: On your rezoning to RS-7, what's the difference between RS-1 to RS-7.

Smith: RS-7 allows a 50ft wide lot where RS-1 is 60ft. It's so you can get more lots in there.

Hollis: You're wanting 75 houses on that property, right?

Smith: That's what they're saying.

Hollis: Where are they going to put retention ponds?

Smith: He said on the east and west property lines. They haven't designed it yet, so I don't know.

Hollis: So it might fall through?

Smith: Well, they'll have detention ponds. There will be detention there.

Hollis: I own the 30 just to the east of it. I just don't see where he's going to put them.

Smith: I don't know where he's going to put them.

Hollis: So this is just to put more houses in more spots?

Smith: Yes, sir. 7 to the acre.

Roberts: Jeremy, what did we come up yesterday as the current number you can put on there?

Bevill: Under the existing zoning, it was 60 lots as it sits.

Roberts: So the proposal is for an additional 15 lots?

Bevill: Approximately. We have to work out the size of the detention ponds, and we could lose a lot or something like that.

Commission: Do that many lots require two exits?

Bevill: Yes. Once we're over 30 homes it requires 2. The intention is to extend House Dr into the development and have a new connection into Willow Rd. Ultimately, two connections to Willow Rd.

Commission: That would be an opportunity for the drainage to connect. It could be improving House?

Morris: They'll have to look. It'll still have to be submitted through this body. Once it gets approved or not by rezoning, the RS-1 or RS-7 will have to come back to this body for review.

Paul Ford – Commission: To connect a house, will you have to get an

easement outside this development?

Bevill: I believe that's a public right of way. There's lots that front Houses drive, so that would be a public right of way. We would connect to that.

Commission: So you do have a legal right to connect to House Dr. Is it yet to be determined?

Bevill: I believe it's a public road. We plan to extend it into the development.

Morris: Those things will be determined in the subdivision process.

Buddy Davis – I own property to the southwest of this. Is he saying House Dr will be the only access to that?

Roberts: No.

Davis: What about the narrow spot on the west end?

Roberts: Jeremy, didn't you say there was going to be another access to it?

Bevill: Correct. There will be a new road that connects to Willow Rd as well as House Dr. So for the 17.5 acres it'll have 2 roads to serve that residential neighborhood.

Davis: I've lived there all my life, where that narrow spot is on the west end that used to be underwater every time we got a rain. With that water coming through the northwest, if we get a big rain that will be underwater. There's an old slew that meanders at that property, and I don't know what they're going to do with all that water. That's my question. If that was going to be the access or if House Dr was going to be the access.

Roberts: It'll have 2 accesses.

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

Nay: 7 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford and Jim Little

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

9. Staff Comments

10. Adjournment