

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present (6): Kevin Bailey, Jim Little, Monroe Pointer, Paul Ford, Stephanie Nelson, Jimmy Cooper

Absent (3): Dennis Zolper, Jeff Steiling, Lonnie Roberts

3. Approval of minutes

MIN-25:068 MINUTES July 22nd, 2025 MAPC

A motion was made by Jim Little, seconded by Monroe Pointer, that the minutes be approved, the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (6): Kevin Bailey, Jim Little, Monroe Pointer, Paul Ford, Stephanie Nelson, Jimmy Cooper

Nay (0)

Absent (3): Dennis Zolper, Jeff Steiling, Lonnie Roberts

4. Miscellaneous Items

COM-25:032 **Sidewalk Waiver at 903 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd**

Kevin Bailey (Chair): First order of business is a sidewalk waiver at 903 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, do we have the proponent for this item?

John Easley (Proponent): I'm John Easley with Associated Engineering, and on behalf of the owners asking for a sidewalk payment for 903 Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. ARdot is widening MLK Boulevard and they have planned to install sidewalks. Therefore, the requirement for us to do it is really non-essential.

Kevin Bailey: Okay, City Planner?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes, we reviewed it and we would recommend approving the fee in lieu.

Paul Ford (Commission): Ford, motion to approve.

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Cooper, second.

Monroe Pointer (Commission): Can I ask a question?

Kevin Bailey: Sure.

Monroe Pointer: So, that lieu of fee, usually I see it stated different. This one looks like a waiver. Is that the same?

Kevin Bailey: It's the same, it's not a waiver it's a in lieu of.

Monroe Pointer: Okay.

A motion was made by Paul Ford, seconded by Jimmy Cooper, that the matter be approved, and the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (5): Jim Little, Jimmy Cooper, Monroe Pointer, Paul Ford, Stephanie Nelson

Nay (0)

Absent (3): Dennis Zolper, Jeff Steiling, Lonnie Roberts

COM-25:033

Presentation Discussing a Comprehensive Growth Plan and Street Master Plan by representatives from DPZ and CTA

Same presentation that was presented to the City Council. Please see video, time stamp for Presentation: 9:42-24:25

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Cooper, I have one question. Assuming the city council goes forward with this. Do you have a timeline of what we'll see, when we'll see?

Matt Lambert (Presenter): Yeah, I'd mentioned it's usually 18 to 24 months. In terms of the total timeline for doing a comprehensive plan. Some of that will depend on when holidays fall and things like that. So, a year and half to two years but there's different pieces. Early on we'll have meetings with you all, we'll have meetings with the public. So, there's engagement there. There will be a website online with all those materials. We'll do analysis and then we'll publish that on the website move into a survey, then move into the design week or process which would most likely be in the spring. Then, after that process we would review publicly the outcomes and materials and produce the first draft of a document which would be, probably around this time next year for your first review and then we go through refinements after that.

Kevin Bailey (Commission): I have a question, so as far as getting the public engaged, what do you guys, what do you do to get to the public? As you can see there is a room full of people here tonight on a rezoning request but how do you go about getting the public engaged in these meetings?

Dave Roberts (Presenter): Social media is a good tool to put the word out because most people do follow, whether it's the city or any of the groups that are related to your city. So, the idea is to get the word out, tell people we're going to have events. Sometimes, you can have multiple ones in different locations if people don't all come to one place. We helped the city of Searcy just last year with a bond. We were doing some master planning work with them. We had a lot of public engagement events and one of them was a giant party like I alluded to. We had 450 people show up to this. We set it at 5:30 where people could hit it right on their way home. We had grills going, feeding people, the police and fire were there with some of their equipment. There was bouncy houses, but we had stations inside so people could go around the room and do the information gathering that we needed at these stations, and a radio station was there out front, live broadcast. So, we just made it a big community event. Sometimes, that works great and sometimes it doesn't. So, your student committee could kind of tell us what works well and we've got a lot of tools in the toolbox but online is another way to gather information too. So, we'll balance it between in person and online and then, like we mentioned there is going to be that workshop. That's a week long, and that's an open house where people can drop in to where we're located. Our whole team will be here in town in one of your storefronts or at the university or where is easy for you guys to access and people can just come and go and see what we're drawing. I mean, right there when we're doing it and then, we'll have a presentation at the beginning of that week and one at the end of that week. So, we're giving updates through the process and you all as leaders can tell us, hey, the best place to do these bigger meetings is in this location or in that location, but we'll also have different ones, so we'll have all kinds of engagement opportunities.

Kevin Bailey: Okay, commissioners do you have any questions?

Monroe Pointer (Commission): I have one, so why your company?

Dave Roberts: So, Crafton Tull is engineering, architecture, landscape architecture, and surveying here in Arkansas. We do comprehensive plans like these but we don't do the bigger towns. We bring in the national pros to help us with the bigger projects. So, we've worked with them now, this team has done 5 together, I think in the region and so, we're the local in state, DPZ is elsewhere, they're national they have offices in Miami and Oregon and New York and elsewhere. So, we know Arkansas and we live here. We have employees that work here in your town. So when we hear about a comprehensive plan like this, we pull together the A team, because we've done it elsewhere and have had a lot of success.

Paul Ford (Commission): Does the planning that you put together, just develop new places or does it involve retrofitting in the power of, I mean condemnation to say this has to be taken

because we need to do this or we need to do that because sometimes, we have, we had a recycling plant that kind of creates issues, well then the things that develop around a recycling plant aren't necessarily, what might be otherwise the best use acreage that's right on the edges of downtown and is it in plan to say, we gotta go in here and say the city's have to take this and redevelop this even though that may make individual landowners, maybe not so happy.

Matt Lambert: We will take into account both. It's both new development and redevelopment, there's that type and there's also just any sort of redevelopment and it's going to be different if it's downtown or on the major roadways and shopping centers. Something like that. For the most part we try to align the land use so, that the marketable value will result in the natural redevelopment of something like that. You are restricted to some extent in terms of what you can do as a city but if there's specific issues like that, we can look at what are your legal options to be able to address that and what are the market based options that might naturally cause the change to occur?

Paul Ford: I have read things in other cities where they have, you talk about doing things across the country, where the city says we're going to take this land and redevelop it and buy everybody out and have you ever worked in projects like that?

Matt Lambert: Yeah and there are a few different strategies. There's the buyout approach to it and then there is the condemning approach, but the condemning approach is more restricted. You can build parks or you can build roads basically. So, those are basically your options if you're actually taking property as a city. But there's all sorts of other mechanisms that you can use. So, absolutely we have experience in other cities out of those different types of approaches. I think that in the planning process our goal is to identify the issues and understand what the community thinks in general about them and then the best strategies forward in terms of the options like I said that are legally approachable for the city and options that may be possible from the market.

Jimmy Cooper: One last question, how far reaching are your plans? Are you strictly bound by the city limits? Are you bound to downtown Jonesboro? Do you look for future, how far out would you reach?

Matt Lambert: Well, it's the city limits but if we're talking about growth and the type of growth, we'll project the population growth and see how much land and where that goes and sort of determine from there. So, it's really based on what the growth looks like but yeah, the boundaries are the city, it's not just downtown, but the entirety of the city limits, whether or not anything goes beyond the limits is certainly something that we can discuss during the process.

Jimmy Cooper: Well, my concern is we have a development that goes on outside the city and some of the development does not meet any kind of city standards and then they want to annex and where does it go from there?

Matt Lambert: Well, that's an interesting issue you're dealing with just now with the new state legislation, right? Where you no longer have your extra territorial jurisdiction over the lands

outside of the city limits, right? So, we could certainly, we'll be having some of those county level discussions elsewhere in terms of the reality from a county standpoint that you have two choices you can either restrict growth in the county or you can grow county government to deal with those sorts of services and maintenance that you need for having growth that you manage within the county. Like most of them aren't set up to maintain roads, local roads, and developments nor the infrastructure. So, that's totally something new that all communities in Arkansas are now starting to deal with. So, I'm sure that will be an important thing for us to consider in this process.

Jimmy Cooper: Thank you.

Monroe Pointer: I got one more, so with our current city codes and you guys coming in and doing your comprehensive planning, would we use those existing or would that be say something after your planning that we would be required to change our codes to match wherever you're planning could possibly be?

Matt Lambert: Yeah, we'll make recommendations, so we'll analyze them and see in terms of different preferences for growth and different types of growth whether or not you're set up to allow that to happen. So, we'll do the planning for what that growth should be and then we'll see if the codes aren't going to work we'll specify why and how they should be updated and when. And usually that's a sort of right of way thing to get into updates if they're going to be in the way of future growth goals.

Kevin Bailey: Any other commissioner questions? Is anybody ready to make a motion? What we're looking for tonight, commissioners is a recommendation to send this presentation to full council. So, is there anybody ready with a motion?

Jimmy Cooper: I think the city has chosen the direction that they want to try to move us forward and do planning and hopefully it's the right move and I make a motion for it to be approved.

Kevin Bailey: We have a motion do we have a second?

Jim Little (Commission): Second.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Jim Little, that the matter be forwarded to council, and the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (5): Jim Little, Jimmy Cooper, Monroe Pointer, Paul Ford, Stephanie Nelson

Nay (0)

Absent (3): Dennis Zolper, Jeff Steiling, Lonnie Roberts

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

PP-25-06

Preliminary Plat Sarah's Crossing Phase IV PLN-8538

Kevin Bailey (Chair): Our next item is a Preliminary Plat on Sarah's Crossing Phase 4.

Mark Morris (Proponent): My name is Mark Morris, I'm the owner of Sarah's Crossing subdivision we're seeking preliminary approval for 54 lots on 15 acres. This is our final phase of the subdivision we're connecting the existing Sarah's crossing to Maple Valley back to the east. I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

Kevin Bailey: Okay, Mr. Derrel?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, we reviewed it and it does meet the requirements for the subdivision codes. So, we would recommend approval.

Kevin Bailey: Commissioners, any comments or questions? Anybody ready with a motion?

Paul Ford (Commission): Ford, make a motion to approve.

Monroe Pointer (Commission): Second, Monroe.

A motion was made by Paul Ford, seconded by Monroe Pointer, that the matter be approved, and the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (5): Jim Little, Jimmy Cooper, Monroe Pointer, Paul Ford, Stephanie Nelson

Nay (0)

Absent (3): Dennis Zolper, Jeff Steiling, Lonnie Roberts

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

8. Rezoning

RZ-25-13

Rezoning 2106 Bridger Rd. Rezone Approximately 6.79 acres

Kevin Bailey (Chair): Okay, our next item is our first rezoning request. Rezoning RZ-25-13 at 2106 Bridger Road. Looking for a rezoning of approximately 6.79 acres, do we have the Proponent?

David Baker (Proponent): Good afternoon, I'm David Baker. With me today is Mr. Garret Dunham. We're with Fisher and Arnold, the address for the record is 404 Creath Avenue. As with

any rezoning, we have to provide the justification or request for that rezoning. We feel that there's a significant need. With this, with the way the housing is the interest rates and so forth, there's a need for quality affordable housing, and the second part of that we feel like more importantly that there's been significant change in the area since this property was originally zoned. If you look at it with the justification, our subject property is located here. This is Johnson, Bridger Road is here. If you look to the southeast, there is a higher density assisted living community, directly across Bridger Road to the west there is a mobile home community there as well. That is a higher intensity type use. As you look at future growth in the area along East Johnson, there's more and more commercial developing every day and then at the intersection of Johnson and Bridger, I feel like that will be a major retail as well, and office type area. Additionally, I request as with the comprehensive land use plan, this area calls for high intensity use and we feel like all these justifications are in line with our request. So, having said that, I'll be glad to try and answer any questions, that y'all may have.

Kevin Bailey: Thank you, Derrel?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, we have reviewed it and like he said the area is in a high-intensity growth sector. So, with that in mind, we would recommend approval with the following conditions, that the proposed site shall follow all requirements of the city engineer, all requirements of the current stormwater drainage design manual, and floodplain regulations regarding any new construction. 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. Any change of use shall be subject to the planning department approval in the future.

Kevin Bailey: Okay, with this being a rezoning request, I'm going to open it up for public comments. Is there anybody here from the public that would like to speak on this matter tonight? If you would come to the microphone, name and address, and we're going to try to, there's a lot of you here tonight, we want to hear everything we can, but about five minutes is about all each person can have, okay?

Dave Nance (Public): My name is Dave Nance I live at 5017 Eden Cove. I'm also a representative of the Eden Hills Estates POA and I've also spoken to several people, Mark Morris and Paul Willis, and you know some of these other people who live up in the area here. Haven't had much time to look at it very much. In fact only today. But with everyone I've talked to the opposition is pretty much united. And united basically on 3 reasons. First, the property values of the properties that are already owned in the area. Second, quality of quality of life. Third, infrastructure. With property values, apartments, you know most of the upper area as I understand it, is R-1 single family, sometimes multi-acre, and those kind of properties are almost always, every place I've ever lived, been devalued by multiple family apartments. And that's my experience now. I've lived 14 years down in Naples, Florida which is a very highly developing area, has been developing for 40 or 50 years. That's my experience there. Raliegh, North Carolina, Montgomery, Alabama, Memphis, Tennessee, I've lived in all of these places and seen

the same thing. So, one of the other things is, no matter how nicely these things are built, they are going to deteriorate because ownership almost always devolves to somebody who doesn't live here in town. They always look beautiful but they always deteriorate because ownership has no particular commitment to the values. They just want to basically build it and either sell it to somebody else who sells it to somebody else, and you know the drill. Okay. Quality of life you start pushing people more crowded like this. Crime is an issue, not necessarily major crime but petty crime and petty crime affects quality of life, and so you've got that. Traffic is an issue we already have a lot of traffic there. That brings me to the third thing. Which is infrastructure. Down in Naples I was there for 14 years. That area is growing and has been for a long time and it's beautiful. And they've maintained the beauty but the way they did was some of the planning that one of your people earlier was talking about, but some of that planning involved the nature of the infrastructure because what they did in Collier County, and a lot of other places in Florida, they required impact fees from developers. These impact fees were comprehensive. They had to account for anywhere from a half a mile to a three-quarter mile radius from the proposed development. The developer was responsible for building out all of the roads in those areas, whether they were brand new or they were just redone. All of the intersections, all of the coverts, all of the bridges. They were responsible for the water drainage. Bridger Creek right now is pretty much unworkable on the north side of Peachtree. And we've tried to talk to some people about it and they've sent some people out and the workers you've sent have done a great job but the job is not done. This kind of stuff needs to be involved in these impact fees. Now, the other thing, police, they were required to pay for the increase of police patrols, police equipment, police stations, if the population was such that it needed that. They were required to improve the fire stations, the fire equipment, to hire the firemen. They were required to improve the EMT, the responses, the emergency rooms, and even the parking lot of the emergency rooms. If it was determined that the population would affect this stuff. They had to do the sewers. They had to expand the sanitation facilities, that the sewers drain into, sewage treatment plants, and of course, all of this is based on you all determining the level of the impact, but I'm trying to help you understand from my perspective and the perspective of the people, I've talked to is how much this is going to impact and who is going to pay for it, because if you don't require the developers to pay for this in some way or another with the impact fees, then, all of us as taxpayers are going to have to pay these things. So, basically, all of the people that I've talked to, we are seriously opposed not to development, Jonesboro is going to grow, but this kind of development in this area.

Kevin Bailey: Thank you, yes ma'am.

Carol White (Public): Hello, I'm Carol White, this is my husband, Rick. Our address is 5001 Nicole Cove which is directly off of Bridger Road we've lived there since 2013. I've never spoke publicly at a meeting. So, I'm just going to read my notes. I thought them out. Okay, so I am opposed to the rezoning of the property at 2106 Bridger Road for the following reasons. Traffic on 49 is already extremely congested. Cars take Bridger Road as a cut through. Bridger is very

narrow with no shoulders, and traffic is already heavy on this road. It's very dangerous to try and get out on 49, especially turning left, which we experience tonight, it took us quite a while. The increased number of vehicles will make it increasingly dangerous and difficult. With 80 to 100 new housing units, plus approximately two cars per unit will put added difficulty, time, and danger to those who travel this route especially in the mornings and afternoons for school and work. It will increase the Brookland and/or Nettleton bus traffic, picking up and dropping off children in the mornings and afternoon. The crime rate has the crime has the potential to increase because of the increased rental population. We already have a mobile home park directly across the street from this property. Which seems to be extremely well managed. But typically that is not the case, as the previous man mentioned. More renters creates a greater potential for crime. Homeowners having a vested interest in the community typically tend to take better care of property and do not offer the same threat of theft, violence, noise, and property damage as do large numbers of renters who have no vested interest. Noise levels, pollution, trash, and vehicle traffic will be greatly increased by this large number of new residents to this area. The access to NEA hospital will also be negatively impacted by the increase in traffic. In summary, this is a dangerous and unacceptable use of this property, please vote no on the rezoning of this property. Thank you.

Kevin Bailey: Thank you. Name and address.

Lynn Childers (Public): Good evening, my name is Lynn Childers. Thank you council for letting us talk. I live at 5108 Tracy Drive. I've lived there since 2009. It probably means something that I've been 19 years full time realtor, in 2023 I was the president of the Northeast Arkansas Board of Realtors. My front door is no more than 500 feet on the same side of the street as the subject property. So, everything that's already been said are things that I would have said, so I'm not going to belabor that, but I will say this, I've been an advocate for home ownership, I continue to be an advocate for home ownership. I know that Jonesboro needs more housing. I would be happy with a nice subdivision going in this property. I think that would be something that would at the very worst not hurt our property values but maybe even help our property value. I'm not as enthusiastic about high density multi-family housing going in there. I did want to elaborate just a little bit on the safety of Bridger Road. Bridger Road is a narrow 2 lane there is no shoulder whatsoever and if you turn off of Johnson, the subject property, my drive, Tracy drive is the gravel drive and it's exactly a mile from Johnson. It's in the middle of an S curve. Once again we're about 500 feet between our street and the subject property. When I come to the end of Tracy Drive to turn left or right on Bridger which I do every day. When I look to the left toward, the subject property, I can't see very far because of woods, trees, it's a somewhat blind corner. When I look to the right, toward Peachtree, there is a blind hill, you have limited visibility either direction. The speed limit is registered at 35 and people regularly drive at 45 miles per hour and probably faster than that on that street and when they come through that S curve, they regularly and when I say that I don't know if I've ever seen anybody who does not, they cross the center line and straddle the center line when they come through. They're going through at a high rate of

speed. They're probably afraid of the ditch because in that S curve the ditch is deep. If your wheels were to go off the pavement, you would need a tow truck to help you out because it's a relatively deep ditch and there's nothing for your wheels to grab purchase of. I will say this on May 19th of this year, my wife was pulling out of Tracy Drive, she was turning left to go to Johnson. She looked, my wife's a very safe driver she's never had an accident. She looked left, looked right, and then she proceeded to turn out left. Well, someone came from Johnson at a high rate of speed flying around the corner probably driving 50 miles an hour. My wife's car was totaled. That happened on May 19th of this year, we knew it was just a matter of time. She was not injured but it did total our car. So, I submit to you that if you approve this rezoning request and they add 50 or 100 doors on that street, traffic is going to increase 10 times or more. I suggest that we're going to have a real problem with safety. It's going to go up to a considerably higher level. That's all I have to say.

Kevin Bailey: Thank you for the comments. Mr. Baker would you like to comment on any of that?

David Baker: Yes sir, thank you. It seemed like there was a pattern with that with traffic and infrastructure improvements. As we move forward, if we're fortunate enough to get rezoned and get to move on to the next stage, part of that will be a traffic impact study. We'll have to go into a lot more detail of infrastructure, water, so forth and we understand that, that is at the developer's expense. Typically with this, I think Bridger Road is scheduled for a three-lane cross section. As a collector, which we will have to dedicate and improve our portion as well as look at the signalization and so forth along Johnson. So, we will be addressing a lot of those concerns as we go through the process that's kind of standard procedure with that. And infrastructure as well. There is yes, water and sewer in the area. But as well, as we move forward with detail design, we'll understand that we will have to if there is a need for improvements, to upsize or extend water lines or sewer lines, something like that, that is at the developer's and owner's expense for that. So, yes, sir go ahead?

Kevin Bailey: There is one more person who would like to speak once you're done.

David Baker: No, that's fine.

Kevin Bailey: Trying to get everybody in here.

Joanne Nalley (Public): Thank you, and thank you for your service to Jonesboro, Arkansas. My name is Joanne Nalley. I've lived here about 80 years now. So, I can tell you about Jonesboro growing and I can tell you about Jonesboro expanding. I used to live at 808 Strawn and then we moved out to Bridger Road. We weren't even in the city and we never had to worry about not having any water and we didn't have to worry about sewer and getting up in the middle of the night and flipping that switch because we had city utilities. There's questions I have to ask and I don't know whether this is the time or not but I would like to ask them. So, I understand there's additional acreage there besides the 6.79, so if this were to be rezoned, then would these people

have the opportunity to add additional apartment complexes there? Because I've heard some talk about it might be 80 or it might be in 100, that it might expand. So, how many of you have gone down Bridger Road here lately? Gone down there? How many have tried to get to work in the morning as they have already alluded to. So, let's see. I believe from January the first to June the 30th, there were over 100 accidents, day before yesterday when I was going to work, there was an accident. How many cars are usually involved in an accident, how many families? How many vehicles does that road hold, 24,000 a day or is it 47,000? I've heard two different things, y'all probably know that better than I do about the traffic on Johnson. And then if you go past Johnson and get on Red Wolf there's about 76,000 accidents every six months. Those are people coming from Brookland, from Paragould. Those people all come into Jonesboro to work. I have some questions about that, we have a few petitions too. I don't know who we submit that too but we have over 325 petitions. We're in opposition of it. So, just want to make that very clear. I appreciate your board and even had a cousin on it at one time, so I hope you will take careful consideration when you think about this rezoning. Do we care about our outlying towns and how this may affect them because one day we may be a big community. So what that's going to do and how will that traffic be? So please think about this critically and how it will impact our community out there. Please consider this, there is talk about high density housing, we have all kind of homes out there. You have people who want to live in apartments, and when you have apartments you can rent to multiple families. I was part of a housing project and they promised to keep it clean and organized, but that property went down. I could talk more but I'll go sit down.

Jared Woodard (Public): One more, my name is Jared Woodard. I'm an attorney here in Jonesboro but I'm here on behalf of my grandmother, Anne McAllister, she's 93 years old, she owns the land just south of it, the 38.9 acres there on Johnson and Bridger, my great great grandmother was Mary Bridger and hence the name of the road, she has asked me to here multiple times via call, text. She will probably call me in a minute to voice her opposition against this. There was mention by Mr. Baker making an assumption that there's redevelopment along Johnson and Bridger, of retail, apartments, or housing. I'll tell you my grandmother is stubborn, she likes it just the way it is. It's 40 acres of pasture, of hay, a pond, fence rows, deer, and that's what it's going to be for the foreseeable future. She wouldn't let me put a billboard on it years ago, so she's not going to put any kind of massive structures on anytime soon. And she has echoed everything today that has been said about Bridger Road and how narrow it is and how dangerous it is and that intersection being at the top is extremely dangerous. The owner who is purposing this property lives in Cherokee Village as previously mentioned, he's an internist, he's a doctor in Cherokee, his organization is part of the Secretary of State, includes Doctor Sra, he is the president and the one that I understand to be proposing this. The other doctors are Natasha Sra and Karam Sra. This seems to be a family outfit not a real estate operation or a bunch of members that are pulling their resources together to build it. This is just a doctor who wants to make an investment an hour and a half from his home. That's concerning. He doesn't have to look at it or drive by it every day. The guy wants to make a little money obviously but not on our backs, he can do that in Cherokee or Sharp county but I don't think it needs to be here. The

growth in Jonesboro has been talked about at length, we want growth but we don't want bad growth. We want our median income to increase, we want Jonesboro to continue the way that it's going but adding 80 more apartments in a place it probably don't belong, I don't think is where we need to be. Possibly a nice residential subdivision with large acreage, there's a lot of woods back there, it's pretty rolling land. That seems to be most appropriate. But I just want to speak on behalf of my grandmother that she is against this. I don't want it there and no one else seems to think it's appropriate or needed.

Kevin Bailey: Thank you for coming. Mr. Baker do you have anything else to say before commissioners have their discussion?

David Baker: Just a couple of things. Yes, to address Ms. Nalley's comment we did a concept plan on this just to see how it could potentially be developed and so forth. Based on this configuration and requirements for retention, parking, and so forth. The 80 units is what this property can feasibly hold and sustain on that. Having heard and listened to everyone's comments, I don't know if it would be appropriate to table this until the next meeting for us to continue to maybe look at a lower zone and talk with the neighbors, I would open it up for y'all's input and discussion on that.

Monroe Pointer (Commission): I would like to ask a question, say that again?

David Baker: The property the reason why we did a concept plan on this was to see what the property could hold viably. Based on Jonesboro's regulations for parking, setbacks, areas for storm water detention that would be required. Right of way dedications. The concept plan that we came up with meets those requirements and yielded about 80 units on that. The expansion of that to go up to 120 units. The property can't really handle that just because of some of the landscaping requirements in Jonesboro.

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Your conceptual plan has nothing to do with this rezoning. I'm sorry.

David Baker: That's correct, yes.

Jimmy Cooper: It's nice that y'all do that but it has nothing to do with this rezoning. We can rezone it, and y'all come up with a different project.

David Baker: That's correct. Like I said, we just-

Jimmy Cooper: I don't like to get into your conceptual plan or any plan because it has nothing to do with the rezoning.

David Baker: That's correct, I was just mentioning the yield requirements, but yes you're correct sir.

Monroe Pointer: Another question, so if that was allowed to be tabled, you would still come back and ask for a rezoning of the same or lesser but it would still not remain R-1.

David Baker: That's correct. We would look at, and because of the comprehensive plan, does call for higher intensity but also if you look at your typical traditional land use planning you have your higher intensity at roads and highways and then, you look at lesser intensity as you move away from the traffic and areas of concentration. So, that would give us an opportunity to talk to Dr. Sra and also meet with some of the neighbors and maybe look at a different concept or lesser zoning on that.

Carol Duncan (City Attorney): I just want to make clear that according to your rules, that an applicant can withdraw as of one time and ask that it be set for another hearing. Just so y'all are aware of that. That's in your rules. After the second withdraw they'll have to wait 90 days before they can bring something back. But they do get and I know we've done this in the past and most of you are familiar. I just wanted to make sure that you understood that in the rules they have the right to request a withdrawal one time as of right.

Monroe Pointer: And it don't matter what the reasoning is for?

Carol Duncan: It does not say that in your rules, it just says as of right, after the 24 day of the month following the applicant's filing for the rezoning or conditional use. And then it talks about the second withdrawal. You have to wait 90 days. If that's what he's asking, I guess a withdraw is different from a tabling but I just wanted to make that clear.

Monroe Pointer: I feel like for everybody who has shown up for this meeting for us to table this would say, we need you all to come back and I'm not real sure if that's what I would want them to do. Especially if you're going to come back with the same rezoning. I'm only one vote.

Kevin Bailey: Okay, with that said we can continue with questions and comments from commissioners or you can ask to withdraw, and we can take action on that. So, that will be up to you.

David Baker: Okay, can we do questions and then withdraw?

Carol Duncan: I think you can withdraw at any time, once.

Jimmy Cooper: If he asks to withdraw, we don't vote on that?

Carol Duncan: That's correct, that's just his withdraw.

David Baker: Okay, I want a vote to table it and then after that we can look to withdraw.

Kevin Bailey: Okay, you're asking to have it tabled?

David Baker: Correct. To re-evaluate it on lesser density and also have some discussions with the neighbors.

Kevin Bailey: With that statement I would ask for a motion to table. Is there a motion?

Jimmy Cooper: I'll make a motion to table.

Kevin Bailey: I have a motion is there a second to table?

Monroe Pointer: Second.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Monroe Pointer, that the matter be tabled, and the motion was FAILED with the following vote:

Aye (0):

Nay (5): Jim Little, Jimmy Cooper, Monroe Pointer, Paul Ford, Stephanie Nelson

Absent (3): Dennis Zolper, Jeff Steiling, Lonnie Roberts

Kevin Bailey (Chair): The matter is not tabled, that motion failed. So, we will continue with questions and comments from the commissioners.

Paul Ford (Commission): What school district is this property located in?

David Baker (Proponent): Brookland.

Kevin Bailey: Any other questions commissioners?

David Baker: We would ask to withdraw it please.

Carol Duncan: Just to be clear that is a one time, if you withdraw a second time, you have to wait 90 days.

Kevin Bailey: You're asking to withdraw?

David Baker: Yes, correct. Withdrawing the application.

Carol Duncan: Just to be clear for the public, the way the withdrawal works is once they prepare something to present back to this commission, they would have to renotify you guys of when that's coming back. So, it may or may not be the next meeting. But they have to renotify you on when that's going to happen. It's kind of like starting over.

Public: Would they renotify the 300 or so?

Carol Duncan: They would renotify what they were required to notify the first time. But it will still be on the website and in the paper and all those things.

The matter was withdrawn.

RZ-25-14

Rezone 7 acres +/- from PD-M Planned Development Multi-family to PD-M Commercial

Kevin Baley (Chair): Okay, next item, rezoning 7 acres plus or minus from PD-M Planned Development Multi-family to PD-M Commercial. Proponent?

Carol Caldwell (Proponent): Carol Caldwell, we got a grocery store that wants to relocate on that 3 lane street and so I want to change it from multi-family to commercial so I can get a grocery store. That's good for the whole area. The reason for that location is because the 3 lane will be hooked up to Culberhouse real soon. So, we're required to change our pattern book. We have and y'all have that. This is like 145 acres and right here is where it is. This 3 lane will hook onto Culberhouse in approximately 2 months. There's going to be a whole lot of traffic through there. It's designed for that. I'm asking to rezone from multi-family RM-16, to commercial for a grocery store, and then on spot here is Kum n' Go. We're wanting to expand this one lot that's already been sold to just about a half-acre. So, we're going form on zoning to another for that. I don't think it's any big issue, we didn't mess with any of the green spaces. We're still above the green space requirement.

Paul Ford (Commission): But you're taking stuff from senior citizens in that half acre?

Carol Caldwell: No sir, not there.

Paul Ford: Not in that spot? Okay, I just misread that.

Carol Caldwell: Not in that spot. I've still got lots of spots. And what happens is, the same that's happened to me for 50 years. On a big development like this, what you start out with is not what you end up with, because you got to go with the market. I've been trying to get a grocery store out there for 3 years. Need one.

Kevin Bailey: Derrel city comments on this?

Derrel Smith: We have reviewed it. The zone is going to remain PD-M. It's just inside the zone that's going to change. So, it's a change of the pattern book but it does meet all the requirements for rezoning and we would recommend the change with the following conditions, that the proposed site shall follow all requirements of the city engineer, all requirements of the current stormwater drainage design manual, and floodplain regulations regarding any new construction. 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. Any change of use shall be subject to the planning department approval in the future.

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the rezoning.

Monroe Pointer (Commission): Second.

Kevin Bailey: Motion and second please cast your vote.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Monroe Pointer, that the matter be approved, and the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (5): Jim Little, Jimmy Cooper, Monroe Pointer, Paul Ford, Stephanie Nelson

Nay (0):

Absent (3): Dennis Zolper, Jeff Steiling, Lonnie Roberts

9. Staff Comments

10. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned.