



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, August 11, 2015

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

[play video](#)

2. Roll Call

[play video](#)

3. Approval of minutes

[play video](#)

MAPC July 14, 2015 Minutes

[play video](#)

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

4. Preliminary Subdivisions

[play video](#)

5. Final Subdivisions

[play video](#)

Prospect Farms Phase III

[play video](#)

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

6. Conditional Use

[play video](#)

Jerry J. Cook requests MAPC consideration for a Conditional Use within an R-1

Single Family Residential District for the purpose of installing a Residentially Design Pre-Manufactured Housing Unit at 2713 Carriage Rd.

[play video](#)

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Brant Perkins, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

CU 15-05 Max Dacus Jr. is requesting MAPC approval for a Conditional Use for property located at 1804 W. Washington Ave. for property located within a C-3 Zoning District, to allow three additional mini-storage buildings.

[play video](#)

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

7. Rezoning

[play video](#)

RZ 15-09 Josh Brown on behalf of Haag Brown Commercial is requesting MAPC approval for a rezoning located at the terminus of Hill Park Drive and Ritter Drive/ West of Browns Ln., from C-3 L.U.O./R-1 Residence to PD-C (Limited Commercial Business Planned Development) on 13.68 acres.

[play video](#)

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

Applicant: Mr. George Hamman, Civilogic appeared before the Commission, introducing the Planned District development and noting that they are continuing to working the design details.

Mr. Josh Brown, Haag Brown Commercial presented proposal details noting that all of the logistical questions will be addressed by Mr. Hamman later. They are planning to redevelop approximately 20 acres of residentially zoned land, creating amenities for the proposed commercial park property. We have asked the Commission to approve a planned use development moving the office park line back to allow Haag/Brown's personal office to be situated close the lake. With private drives accessing the commercial we are wanting it to be secure and private with fencing, allowing for an access gate to be operated during normal business hours requiring a code. Discussions have been had with the City staff and the lot sizes are undetermined there for it is submitted as a Planned District based on that.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs: The currently adopted Land Use Plan recommends the current site as a Moderate Intensity Growth Sector. Consistency is achieved with the proposed development.

Mr. Spriggs: Portion of this land is subject to an approved Subdivision: Hill Park Edition. The Criteria for approval of the rezoning and Planned District shows consistency and suitability with the general area.

Mr. Spriggs: The applicant proposes a focus on fitness and exercise showing amenities such as a private lake with dock, exclusive running and biking trails, over 20 acres of natural tree areas, a pavilion for outdoor meetings, a future home for Haag Brown Commercial, and a number of planned future office development.

Mr. Spriggs: Under the Planned Development Commercial District, the applicants have proposed a list of uses that will be limited to the following:

- 1) Automated teller machine
- 2) Bank of financial institution
- 3) Medical service / office
- 4) Office / general
- 5) Utility / Minor
- 6) Restaurant / Fast Food
- 7) Restaurant / General
- 8) Retail/Service.

Mr. Spriggs: During the pre-meetings concerns and reservations over the fast food use were voiced. The applicant agreed to remove that use.

Public Input: None present.

Mr. Jerry Reece asked will any public be allowed to use the trails. Mr. Brown: No, it will be used by the employees and their spouses, family and friends/clients. Our goal is to make it private and make it exclusively for the offices out there.

Mr. Reece: Have you had a meeting with the neighborhood. Mr. Brown responded that he has a close relationship to the adjacent church and some adjacent property owners, and also the Hill family in which we represent. We have not talked to anyone to the west. The owner to the north is the Blessed Sacrament Church, who will be building on their property and have asked for a minor easement to get traffic out to the adjacent subdivision. He has spoken to some in the Highland Forest Subdivision because of questions raised since he had rezoning signs located out there. Their perception and preference was that it be a private trail and lake.

Mr. Spriggs noted that regarding the Hill Park Edition Subdivision (attached), there was a stub street that allowed for any possible future connective to the remaining Hill property which extends to Highland Drive, has the team considered that future connection in relationship to this new proposal?

Mr. Brown: Noted that he emailed graphic which shows a 20-40 ft. that goes near the corner Huey's Nursery and will provide for an easement/extension out to Highland Drive.

The conditions were read by Mr. Spriggs:

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

3. The property shall be redeveloped under the C-3 General Commercial District standards.

4. The 40 ft. northern buffer shall be maintained along the most northern boundary abutting residential uses, with no habitable structures allowed; the 100 ft. buffer depicted on the plat shall be maintained at the southwest corner of the property with no habitable structures allowed.

5. The permitted uses shall be limited to the following:

- 1) Automated teller machine
- 2) Bank of financial institution
- 3) Medical service / office
- 4) Office / general
- 5) Utility / Minor
- 6) Restaurant / General
- 7) Retail/Service

6. No billboards allowed on subject property.

Mr. Bailey made motion to place Case: RZ-15-09 on the floor for consideration of recommendation by MAPC to the City Council with the noted conditions, and we, the MAPC find that changing the zoning of this property from "R-1" Single Family and C-3, L.U.O. to the proposed PD-C, Planned District Development will be compatible and suitable with the zoning, uses, and character of the surrounding area, subject to the listed conditions; 2nd by Mr. Scurlock.

Roll Call Vote: Case approved by an 8-0 vote unanimously:
Mr. Hoelscher-Aye; Mr. Perkins-Aye; Mr. Reece-Aye; Mr. Cooper-Aye; Mr. Kelton-Aye; Mrs. Schrantz-Aye; Mr. Scurlock-Aye; Mr. Bailey-Aye; Mr. Roberts was chair.

RZ 15-10 Walter K. Jackson on behalf of Estate Inc. is requesting MAPC approval for a rezoning located at 600 Jonathan Dr./ East of N. Church St./West of Winesap Dr., from R-1 Residential to RM-12 (Residential Multi-Family) on 8.86 acres.

[play video](#)

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Paul Hoelscher, that this matter be Denied . The motion FAILED with the following vote.

Case RZ-15-10: RZ 15-10 Walter K. Jackson on behalf of Estate Inc. is requesting MAPC approval for a rezoning located at 600 Jonathan Dr./ East of N. Church St./West of Winesap Dr., from R-1 Residential to RM-12 (Residential Multi-Family) on 8.86 acres.

Applicant: Mr. Walter Jackson appeared before the Commission stating that he would like to rezone the subject property from vacant R-1 Single Family to RM-12 Multi-family zoning populate or build 3-bedroom single level units for families. He will put a fence all around the property, and provide a common area or small park or pavilion for barbecue grills for tenant amenities.

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs gave staff remarks summarizing the findings of the Staff Report.

The application listed the surrounding conditions which were noted on the 8.06 acres which is part of the Applehill Subdivision. I-1 Industrial to the South, a church to the west. The area is primarily single family. The Land Use Recommendation for this site is Moderate Intensity Growth Sector, of which the proposal is consistent for low intense housing with a maximum of 8 units per acre. Although the request was submitted for RM-12, Staff pointed out in the report that the resulting units will be and should be kept below that density level. The Master Street designation is a local street of which the plat would have to reflect such a dedication. The code requirements of the RM-8 are listed in the report. Staff requested a lowering of the number of units to resemble low density. The applicant has reduced the proposed units since to 60 units.

A neighborhood meeting was held by the applicant, and those notes were provided for the Planning Commissions consideration.

Public Input:

25-30 people stood in opposition. (At the applicant's request 14 persons stood that lived adjoining or across the street from the site).

John Heern, 2014 Winesap Dr., Applehill Addition Subdivision: Stated he is in total opposition to this. This was set up for a single family use area. He and his family moved there in 1976 and it was promised as ¾ acres minimum lots. There is a mix of racial families and little children that have lived there for a lot of years. It is getting unsafe for kids to play on Jonathan St., which is not kept up for the increase of traffic. We don't want apartments in our area, nor businesses and no low rent apartments. He stated that he has a letter from the abutting Church who is also opposed to this. Crime will increase. He noted issues with Kum-n-Go, where the police cannot control crime with the apartments there. People are walking the streets all hours of the night. Others have written letters of opposition who could not be here. What about background check? This will increase crime and our insurance.

Derrick Elrod, 1916 Winesap Dr. Lives across from the north-end. Noted that he has water issues from the back of his lot and the southeast corner of his property down to Patrick St. The last heavy rain there left debris on Jonathan where it was running across the road. It will have to be some kind of levy to save the people east of this development. There are no sidewalks. It was designed for single family and basically one-acre lots. We don't have a problem with them developing it as single family lots.

Anthony Martin, 1913 Winesap Dr., East of the property. The lot next to me, my father owns, and it is fenced with my property. He has concerns with flooding. It runs between and him and Mr. McCoy's property. We have had to dig out our ditch because it over floods Jonathan. It was 8-10 inches over the corner at Warren and Jonathan. He noted concerns with the street. If you drive down Jonathan, just the traffic from the church along has torn the street up; there are potholes. The street will not hold up and support an added 60 units. If you add vehicles per those families to that street, including the church traffic, the city will be out of money for maintenance. I don't believe it is a good idea. Traffic and flooding issues were reiterated.

Wade Rawlins, 2112 Montgomery Ln./Cove. Stated he moved there 5 yrs ago from the Richland Development, which he had problems where as people stole things. He lives on an acre, with lots averaging 1 acre to ¾ acres. Spoke on

crime and reports from the Jonesboro Sun on Garden Manor, where there were 596 records for police crimes in the area. Stated that he has learned that it's closer to get to his needed services at Hilltop. He has to cross Peachtree and go to Hwy. 351 to go shopping, because we have none of those services on the north side of town.

Larry Stevenson, 2020 Winesap Dr. He's had kids coming through his back yard; the night light keeps coming on. The road is not built with sidewalks. The trash gets washed up on from the road to the ditches. The ditches sidewalks and roads will have to be built to accommodate this. The say it will be low rent apartments. Spoke on issues with more living there than on the leases, and the landlord doesn't do nothing about them.

Brock McCoy, 1909 Winesap Dr. Neighbor of Anthony Martin, this is abutting his property. He agreed with previous comments and noted that he bought his property in 2009. If he had known that this development would occur, he would not have purchased the home. He has a wife and 3 kids, and there is enough crime in the area and he does not want this in his back yard. He voiced concerns over the property value decreasing and his investment would end up being worth zero.

Wynona Elrod, 1916 Winesap Dr., Agreed with previous comments. Voiced concerns over the safety factor. They said they would have 60 residences, 4 bedrooms, with 4 people in each, it would be 240 extra people. At this time the walking traffic from the apartments on Daybreak Dr. is presenting a danger factor at night and in the mornings. She has been harassed at night, walking her pets. She has had to step into the ditch because of the cars racing on the street. Will they do a background check? Working in social service for years, all that tells you is that they have not gotten caught yet. There are newer apartments that are going for much higher income ratios than what he is going to rent these duplexes. They are having massive drug busts now. The rent is half of what we were told in the meeting.

Mr. Walter Jackson (Rebuttal): Crime issue is a management problem with apartments. Noted that he does background checks on his tenants. He requires an income of at least \$2,400 per month. He will fence the property, and it will be single level, RM-8 property. He can manage them better than what they mentioned. They will be for him. The foot traffic is from the lower income/subsidized housing properties that are not working and are home all day.

Commission Deliberation:

Mr. Perkins: Is there a bill of assurance on the property.

Anthony Martin, 1913 Winesap Dr., stated that it was amended in 2003 and it said no apartments. He doesn't have a copy with him but can deliver one tomorrow. (Mr. Michael Morris researched the files and later retrieved a copy).

Mr. Jackson: He was not aware of any.

Mr. Kelton: The City of Jonesboro cannot enforce a bill of assurance. They are enforceable, but we don't have any authority but we can take that under consideration.

Mr. Hoelscher: Requested Staff to respond on how many units can be built on the property under the current zoning.

Mr. Spriggs: Referring to the report, under the 8.06 acres they are allowed 5.4 homes per acre, which could result a gross 44 homes, not taking into account streets or stormwater detention.

Mr. Perkins: Those numbers would be based on a replat of those lots/acreage into one. You didn't make separate calculations off of each lot.

Mr. Spriggs: That is based on each lot having a minimum acreage of 8,000 sq. ft. each under the R-1 Standards. As noted that it does not take into account of the roads to be built. There is also a need of abandonment of the existing platted roads requiring Council action.

Mr. Jackson: Noted that he plans to keep the property; things do change and his plans are towards retirement, and it will stay with him. If it were to be sold, he does not know how to guarantee the management in the future.

Mr. Bailey: Requested Mr. Michael Morris' input on the drainage questions.

Mr. Spriggs read the conditions. Mr. Jackson agreed with the RM-8 Limited Use Overlay district change.

Mr. Michael Morris returned to the chambers, with a 1970 and 1988 bill of assurance for the property. No clause for modification was found. The original starts out with 35 acres.

Mr. Spriggs noted that they documents could refer to the larger acreage of Applehills Subdivision.

Drainage Issues? Mr. Morris: No one has called him personally regarding issues. And he is unaware of any issues prior.

Mr. Kelton asked Mr. Martin for more specific on the Bill of Assurance language in terms of the 2003 changes.

Mr. Anthony Martin: It had the signatures of those living out there at the time. Only glanced at it recently and it said no apartments.

Mr. Kelton: Are you in the process of purchasing this property?

Mr. Jackson: It is under contract for sell, pending the outcome of this rezoning.

Commission Action:

Mr. Scurlock: Made a motion that we place Case: RZ-15-10 on the floor for consideration of recommendation by MAPC to the City Council with the noted conditions from "R-1" Single Family to RM-8, L.U.O.; Motion was 2nd by Mr. Hoelscher.

Roll Call Vote: 8-0 Denial:

Mr. Hoelscher-Nay; (No positive support nor information on the need for this

for working families; This constitutes a Spot Rezoning); Mr. Perkins-Nay; Mr. Reece-Nay; Mr. Cooper- Nay; Mr. Bailey-Nay; Mrs. Schrantz-Nay; Mr. Kelton-Nay; Mr. Scurlock-Nay (Bill of Assurance was an issue); Mr. Roberts was Chair.

RZ 15-11 Tom Brown is requesting MAPC approval for a rezoning located at 908 Oakdale St./South of E. Matthews Ave., from R-2 Multi-family to CR-1 (Commercial Residence Mixed Use District) on 0.27 acres.

[play video](#)

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

Applicant: George Hamman, **Civilogic:** Stated that he prepared the application and rezoning plat. Mr. Brown owns the C-3 Commercial property to the north as well as the subject property. The only reason to rezone the property is so that it will provide flexibility as time goes by to market the larger tract. He has no immediate plans to redevelop or change the use of the subject tract, in fact he has signed 1 year rental lease that won't expire until next year.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments, explaining the CR-1 District which allows for a mixture of commercial and residential. The current property is zoned multi-family low density. The currently adopted Land Use Plan recommends the current site as High Intensity Growth Sector. Consistency is achieved with the proposed rezoning. Neighborhood Commercial would be ideal for the vicinity of a residential scale and intensity.

Mr. Spriggs: The Glendale St. example mirrors the request which was approved similarly one street west of this site. The intention here is to allow for a redevelopment on the corner of Matthews and Oakdale St. Consistency is achieved in regards to the Criteria for Rezoning listed in the report.

Mr. Spriggs: The permitted use table was summarized depicting the various uses allowed by-right or as a Conditional Use application. By default a number of the uses will not be allowed merely because of required size/space and minimal lot/bulk setback regulations. Any converting of the existing residential structure will require individual architectural code analysis and upgrades to accommodate any form of use change, and buffering and screening should be considered for the residential subdivision to remain.

Mr. Spriggs: No agency objections were received from the departments or City Water Light who attended the pre-meeting.

The five conditions were read:

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.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. The applicant/successors agree to comply with the Master Street Plan recommendation for Oakdale St. upon any future redevelopment of the site.
4. The property shall be redeveloped under the CR-1 District standards.

5. Any future change of use shall be subject to Final Site Plan review and approval by the MAPC.

Public Input: None.

Mr. Hoelscher: If this is rezoned as limited use overlay, can it be replatted/consolidated with adjacent property, if it has the same district zoning. Mr. Spriggs replied that staff has the mapping capability to achieve that type of replat with same or different zoning classifications.

Mr. Cooper made a motion to approve Case: RZ-15-11 and recommend it to City Council with the noted conditions, and we, the MAPC find that changing the zoning of this property from "R-2" Low Density Multi-Family to "CR-1, L.U.O. (Modified), Commercial Residential", will be compatible and suitable with the zoning, uses, and character of the surrounding area, subject to the noted conditions; 2nd by Mr. Reece.

Roll Call Vote: Case approved by an 8-0 vote unanimously:
Mr. Hoelscher-Aye; Mr. Perkins-Aye; Mr. Reece-Aye; Mr. Cooper-Aye; Mr. Kelton-Aye; Mrs. Schrantz-Aye; Mr. Scurlock-Aye; Mr. Bailey-Aye; Mr. Roberts was chair.

RZ 15-12 Zimmer Development Company, LLC on behalf of Willis & Caroline Gray and James Carr, requests a rezoning for the property located 2506 & 2510 E. Johnson from C-3 L.U.O. to PD-RM (Multi-Family Residential Planned Development) for off-campus student housing on 15.7 acres.

[play video](#)

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

Applicant: Attorney Don Parker, Agent:

Mr. Parker: Stated that he represents Zimmer Development Company out of Wilmington N.C. and the owners of 2 tracts- Mr. James Carr and Mr. & Mrs. Willis Gray who are asking for a rezoning from C-3 L.U.O., on 15.7 acres to a PD-M, Planned District.

Mr. Parker introduced the Zimmer Development Team: Emily Zimmer Moring, in-house council, Adam Tucker who will address you with more information on the project and background information about Zimmer.

Mr. Parker: On July 14, you may recall that I shared information about the Zimmer Development Company, in that they have a billion dollars in assets, over 245 projects in over 130 cities across the U.S., they have over 8 million sq. ft. of commercial retail space; and over 3,300 multi-family beds. Mr. Parker also noted that he provided info in the packet, referring to exhibits 4 & 5 of which the minutes from the neighborhood meeting.

From Texas, also with the team is: Stacey Lecocke, Senior Vice President of Asset Campus Housing Management, which is one of the largest student housing management companies in the U.S., with over 135 properties in over 75,000 beds under management. Ms. Lecocke handed out information on Asset Campus Housing.

Mr. Parker gave additional background information on Mr. Carr who owns 2510 E. Johnson, where he purchased with his father, the late O.L. Carr and his uncle, Mr. Bob Carr. Many of you remember Mr. O.L. Carr and his brother Elbert who both owned the formerly known Carr's Grocery Store. The Gray's own the neighboring tract.

Mr. Parker: Zimmer Development together with Mr. Carr and the Gray's are rezoning the property to the PD-RM. There is currently a house and shed at 2806, and the other property has remained vacant with no structures.

Mr. Parker: If approved by the MAPC and Council as PD-RM, it will be developed as an upscale housing off-campus project: 10 buildings with 240 units containing 720 beds, under the RM-16 District standards with a mix of two and four bedroom units, having private bathrooms in each unit, with a common living and kitchen area.

Mr. Parker: Zimmer plans to invest over \$20 million in this project. We held a neighborhood meeting on June 11, 2015 and 12 persons attended the meeting. There were a large number of concerns on problems the neighbors experienced when the Grove was developed, i.e. broken promises of what was approved by Council and the MAPC.

Mr. Parker made past references to the original company Campus Crest and previous issues.

Mr. Parker: Some of the issues discussed included: onsite landscaping, fencing, layout design to provide as much buffering to reduce noise. Attendees wanted more information on Zimmer Development and after the meeting Zimmer sent to all in attendance a complete packet. That information is attached to the agenda.

Mr. Parker: The proposed site plan was significantly modified to increase the landscape buffering around the perimeter of the property. As required, we contacted the Nettleton School District about the Multi-family zoning; however, we do not believe that there will be much of an impact on Nettleton School District being that this is an off-campus student housing project, which leases by the bed, and not by the unit.

Mr. Parker: While children are a protected class under Federal Law, students with children are not the demographic attracted to this type of housing. Given the proximity to ASU, Zimmer believes that this property is best suited for an upscale student housing project. There are currently multi-family developments to the west and to the east fronting on Johnson Ave.. The City Staff has recommended 8 conditions of which we agree with all. The conditions were read by

Mr. Parker. Connectivity of pedestrian sidewalks has been committed to by Dr. Hudson from ASU.

Mr. Parker: Adequate vehicular stacking as addressed by the City's Traffic Engineer Mark Nichols.

Mr. Adam Tucker, Zimmer Development stated that they are a family owned business with 25 employees. Mr. Tucker: The Zimmer family is not flashy and

we fly under the radar. We let our work do the talking. He stated that there is a market here at ASU for this type of use.

Mr. Tucker: On-campus housing is adequate at ASU. But there is always that group of students that want to spread their wings and move off campus. The millennials want more; i.e. more amenities, more space, their own bathrooms, and walk-in closets. You will find these amenities at all major universities.

Mr. Tucker: We visited Fayetteville, AR and they have everything and more that we can ever provide. We met with 3 different departments at ASU here, to talk to them about our goals, and they have been receptive. They gave us comments on storm water which was an issue. We will have our engineers do that work; there are 2 ponds in place. The buffering is an issue of neighbors. If they want different things to improve buffering, we will do them. We tried to keep off the residential to the north. We will have a traffic study done to study the vehicle stacking and the need for right-turn lanes, etc. We really don't do a lot of those things until the zoning occurs, so that we don't get ahead of ourselves. The project will be done in 2 phases; the first 6 buildings close to Johnson will have 144 units with 432 beds; and, the 2nd phase will be the 4 buildings with 96 units and 288 beds. Timing is dictated by how well the first phase does. We had a market study done and there is a demand.

Mr. Tucker: We talked to the university and they stay at 98% leased. The freshmen are required to live on campus so we don't look for those. We look at what the market is and that is what we per-forma; we don't try to over sell ourselves.

Ms. Stacey Lecocke, Senior Vice President of Asset Campus Housing Management presented to the Commission noting that they are the largest privately owned Off-Campus Housing Management Company in the nation; They have had the family business for over 30 years started by Mike McGraft, who has no intentions on selling the company. His son is the Vice-President. We manage 75,000 beds in 35 states and 90 cities.

Mr. Scurlock: Commented on the concept with renting-by-the-bed. If 4 people agree to share an apartment and if 3 of them decide to go out west to play Cowboys and Indians, do they have to put up with who you put back in the unit?

Ms. Lecocke explained that they are responsible for their own bed space. They have lease guarantors. We do roommate matching and some come in as groups. If they don't have a roommate, we do room matching where 10-12 bench mark questions are used to group similar personalities. It is not a joint leasing liability.

Subletting was discussed. Ms. Lecocke: We call it re-assignments, because some have to leave school early. Before they are allowed to sublet, whoever they find will have to go through the same background check process as the original lease holder.

Ms. Lecocke: We run credit worthiness as part of the application. Most students do not qualify; this triggers the guarantors' policy because a 5—1 income to rent ratio is required. A criminal background screening is also run.

Ms. Lecoche: Campus Crest management style was different than how this will be. She stated that she oversees about 30-40 properties. Campus Crest had a more of a global issue, from a senior issue at the corporate level, and it has trickled down to their local staff level.

Ms. Lecoche: We have town hall meetings and we do not have a “red solo” cup as our mascot. We do not condone alcohol use at our common site area. We do drug awareness group meetings.

Mr. Spriggs: Regarding Subletting, are there policies against non-students becoming Sublettes. Ms. Lecoche: This will be a college student clientele only.

Mr. Cooper: Will applicants be screened by the onsite team or through Houston?

Ms. Lecoche: It all goes through the main hub, but all decision making is not left to the onsite team.

Mr. Spriggs reiterated that condition 8 lists a request that the policies be submitted in writing.

Ms. Lecoche: Stated that they have no problem providing all requested components on the disciplinary policy and security. We have an emergency preparedness plan also.

Mr. Bailey questioned the facility life-cycle, given the popular example of north of Johnson, Apartment City, where most of us have lived or visited. It's now not a good place to live. Can you speak on management/ maintenance?

Ms. Lecoche: From a management perspective, we put together a capital strategy from a 5-10 year point of view on how you would maintain that asset, so that it's not only aesthetically pleasing for the community, but it is also safe for the people to live in a quality environment as promised. It's our responsibility to maintain the asset. Ownership provides the financial capital and means to do so.

Mr. Kelton: Do you have other similar facilities like this and how long have you had them; and, what history have you had with challenges with fair housing being that this is a student housing project.

Ms. Lecoche: Stated that Asset has several projects like this one. We will have 20 projects delivered a year for Asset. There are no claims: All staff personnel has to take the Fair Housing course, we have to abide by the laws. Unaware of any involvement.

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs gave summary comments. All requirements of the Planned District Standards are met. Staff has reviewed the concept plan layout. Compliance and consistency is achieved with the land use plan. The criteria for rezoning are met. The Master Street Plan right of way is in compliance. The school district notification was sent out. The alternative access point was a concern from the reviewing departments and the applicant has added the emergency entrance.

Mr. Spriggs: As noted the applicant is in concurrence with the noted conditions. The buffering concerns of the neighbors have been addressed. The nearest building to the rear lot line is over 200 ft. The Engineering staff/Traffic Engineer has commented on the vehicular stacking distance at the gated entry and the distance 150 ft. is adequate.

Public Input:

Paul Carter (Carter Lane): Stated that his mother lives on the north side of the site and owns land there. She had time constraints and had to leave. Mr. Carter commented on concerns with placing 3-story apartment buildings back there.

Mr. Carter: Although we reserve the fact that there will be some apartments over there. Studies have shown the negative effects of having dense 3-story apartments like the Grove Apartments; they had issues at first and still have issues. Mother is not happy to have the apartments back there; she has no quorums with a smaller complex. Regarding the apartments to the east, were there restrictions placed on them. Mr. Higgins stated he asked for more but you all gave him less.

Mr. Spriggs stated that each case is considered on its on merit.

Mr. Carter stated that they should consider adjusting their numbers. Do you all go back and look at the property and say we want to expand it even more? The crime issue was commented on regarding background checks. Can you place some limited use overlay restrictions on this and what materials they can use (vinyl siding deteriorates)?

Mr. Harold Carter (Tony Drive): Is alcohol use forbidden on site? Mr. Harold Carter: What is the maximum occupancy?

Betty Shaw, Johnson Ave.: Stated that her mother's trust backs up to this property on 2 sides, one which is 5.37 acres on the north side of this property and the part on Johnson. Ms. Shaw commented on how the Grove sold her on broken promises and how wonderful it would be. I heard nothing different about their management, than I've heard at the Grove. I have been over at the Grove every 6 months with issues, whatever you do, you need tighter control over it. I just want to make sure all the "i's" are dotted and the "t's" crossed. She stated that she is not opposed to it, but it is a long way to go.

Ms. Lecocke: regarding criminal activity; we do evict.

Ms. Lecocke: If the tenants are of age then they can consume alcohol in their private apartment. We don't provide or endorse it within our programming and activities. We will have 7 full-time personnel. We have 7 part-time student assistant positions throughout several areas. Again, Campus Crest's track record can be researched and they have a very different management style, they are for sale and their performance record has declined.

Mr. Spriggs: Do you hire your own security personnel or contract it out?

Ms. Lecocke: We do both, it just depends if there is a local authority or courtesy officer or a third party company. We use them from 9 PM to 5 AM.

Mr. Roberts: Rental control? Ms. Lecoche: We do room checks once a month, and the roommates usually would report occupancy issues.

Mr. Spriggs asked for comments on the materials question.

Mr. Tucker: Stated that they plan to use a masonry product with hardy plank siding and not vinyl siding. Building elevations were shown.

Mr. Josh Brown commented from his brokerage role. His company represents Mr. Carr. This property has been marketed for than 5 years, our office has done \$100 million development, real estate related, along Johnson/Hwy. 49 N in that 5 years. Our development company has seen this type of development happen in Northwest Arkansas and Conway. Only thing here we have to base this on in Jonesboro is the Grove. It is successful, if managed right such as the 15 of these in Fayetteville.

Commission Action: Motion was made by Mr. Scurlock, to place Case: RZ-15-12 on the floor for consideration of recommendation by MAPC to the City Council with the noted conditions, and we, the MAPC find that changing the zoning of this property from "C-3, L.U.O." to the proposed PD-RM, will be compatible and suitable with the zoning, uses, and character of the surrounding area, subject to the noted conditions; Motion seconded by Mr. Cooper.

Roll Call Vote: Mr. Hoelscher-Aye; Mr. Perkins-Aye; Mr. Bailey-Aye; Mrs. Schrantz-Aye; Mr. Reece-Aye; Mr. Cooper-Aye; Mr. Kelton-Aye; Mr. Scurlock-Aye; Mr. Roberts was chair.

Approved 8-0 unanimously.

8. Staff Comments

[play video](#)

9. Adjournment

[play video](#)