



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, April 8, 2025

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 9 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

3. Approval of Minutes

[MIN-25:030](#)

Minutes: March 25, 2025

Attachments: [3.25.25 MAPC Minutes](#)

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

Aye: 9 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

4. Miscellaneous Items

[SP-25-03](#)

Site Plan: 1625 W. Parker Road - Reliance Health

Ozark Civil Engineering is requesting site plan approval for 1625 W. Parker Rd. - Reliance Health Facility. The proposed structure is approximately 81,856 square feet and located in the C-3, general commercial district.

Attachments: [Reliance Health Facility Letter](#)
[Parker Hollow Subdivision](#)
[Overall Site Plan](#)
[Aerial View](#)

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): First item on the agenda, do we have the proponent for this item?

Todd Butler (Proponent): Todd Butler, with Ozark Civil Engineering, I'm here to answer any questions you guys may have.

Lonnie Roberts: Is there anything you would like to add to the beginning of my description?

Todd Butler: No, it was a challenge to get the sidewalk all the way to the side, but we got that done today. And they will put a variance in to try and get an access to the east, to get to the property over there, but over to the west side,

we put the driveway right next to the property line there so there's cross access.

Lonnie Roberts: Sure, I'll open up for the city planner staff comments on this?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, we have reviewed this, we will continue to review it after this, it's coming to you because its over 75,000 square feet. It will go through the full review process before it's approved.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, with that I'll open up for commissioner comments or discussions for the applicant or city staff, it's here because it's just over the 75,000 square feet threshold.

Monroe Pointer (Commission): If this facility does not let's say, move forward, does that mean anything that may be on this property in the future, will have to brought to the board to be approved again?

Derrel Smith: It's only for this facility right here, now if it's under 75,000 square feet it would just go through the regular planning staff review, but, if this is not done, they will have to come back.

Monroe Pointer: Okay.

Lonnie Roberts: Any more questions? I'll entertain a motion.

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

Aye: 8 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford;Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

[SP-25-04](#)

Amended Site Plan Review: 1925 Race Street - Jonesboro Sportsplex

Associated Engineering, LLC is requesting site plan review for the Jonesboro Sportsplex. The proposed structure is approximately 180,125 square feet and located in the R-1, single family medium density zoning district.

Attachments: [Letter](#)
[Site](#)
[Aerial View](#)

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): So, it was to my understanding we were requiring a conditional use and I think that they have a different opinion on that.

Carol Duncan (City Attorney): So, for those of you that weren't at the premeeting yesterday, initially what happened was that we had initially classified this as government services, instead of a park, and in reviewing the definitions for government services, this is actually excluded, recreational is excluded under that definition, and it best fits under a park. As you know, A&P funding is used for parks, that's one of the things that it legally can be used for, under state law. So, we just wanted to put it back on the record as to why the change was being made and let you guys consider removing that condition from the site plan approval. Under the park designation it's a permitted use in R-1, so they wouldn't need a conditional use permit.

Lonnie Roberts: So, commissioners do you have any questions about the process for tonight? Okay, then I'll entertain a motion.

Jeff Steiling (Commission): Steiling, I make a motion that we approve the request to remove the conditional use requirement because it's no longer needed.

A motion was made by Jeff Steiling, seconded by Jim Little, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 8 - Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

[CU-25-04](#)

Conditional Use: 1925 Race Street - Jonesboro Sportsplex

The Jonesboro A&P Commission is requesting a conditional use approval for the Jonesboro Sportsplex at 1925 Race Street. This request is for 35.34 acres located within R-1, single family medium density district.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)
 [Notification Letter](#)
 [Signs Posted](#)
 [Site](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

Withdrawn per applicant.

8. Rezoning

[RZ-25-07](#)

Rezoning: 5905 E. Johnson Avenue

Anh Vu is requesting a rezoning from R-1, single family medium density district to C-3, general commercial district. This request is for 1 acre located at 5905 E. Johnson Ave.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Letter](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)
 [Deed](#)
 [Plat](#)
 [Rezoning Signs](#)
 [Site Photos](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): Would you state your name for the record please?
Anh Vu (Proponent): My name is Anh Vu, and I would like to request rezoning at my location as 5905 East Johnson Avenue from residential to commercial C-3. This rezoning request is for the future development of commercial business. We believe it would fit in the area and with the city comprehensive land of use plan.
Lonnie Roberts: Okay, city planner, do you have staff comments on this?
Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, we do. We have reviewed it, it does meet

all the requirements for the zoning criteria and we would recommend approval with the following stipulations, 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 and the site shall comply with all the overlay district standards.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, and this is a zoning request, I'm going to open up, is anyone here to give public comments regarding this rezoning request? Any neighboring property owners want to give input? Okay, seeing none, I'm going to turn it over to the commissioners for any questions of the applicant or the city staff or any discussion on the matter?

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

Aye: 8 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford;Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

[RZ-25-08](#)

Rezoning: 2800 & 2809 Greensboro Road

Hammerhead Consulting & Development is requesting a rezoning from R-1, single family medium density district to TC-O, town center overlay district. This request is for 33.28 acres located at 2800 and 2809 Greensboro Rd.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Deed](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)
 [Notification Letter](#)
 [Renderings](#)
 [Sign Photos](#)
 [Site Layout](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Original Pattern Book for Greensborough Village Town Center](#)
 [Greensboro Road Letter](#)
 [Plat](#)

John Easley (Proponent): John Easley with Associated Engineering representing Hammerhead Construction. We're asking for property to be rezoned. Hammerhead owns the 38 acres which is now currently within the TC-O for Greensboro Village. They're asking for the property to the west of 22 and a half acres and then 10 and a half acres on the south side of Greensboro to be brought in under the TC-O banner of Greensboro. Meet the same regulations, and requirements as the TC-O.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, city planner do you have staff comments for this one?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, we do. We have reviewed it, it does meet all the requirements for the zoning criteria and we would recommend approval with the following stipulations, 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 and the site shall comply with the existing Greensboro Village Town Center Development Guidelines. The development must amend the pattern book prior to approval by the City Council to conform to the 70 percent residential to the 30 percent multi-family ratio for construction as previously approved and design guidelines provided in the pattern book.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay so now with this rezoning request is there anyone here who would like to give public input on this before we proceed with the commissioners? If you would come up to the mic and state your name for the record.

Grant McDaniel (Public): Sir, my name is Grant McDaniel, property owner on the southern side of the apartment. And I'd like to ask for stipulations for a minimum of 50 foot buffer, from the property line. And to leave as many trees as they can or plant back trees in that buffer.

Lonnie Roberts: As untouched as possible within that buffer would you say?

Grant McDaniel: Yes. And I think the design now has the parking on the inside, make sure that's in the stipulations to leave the parking inside of the complex. Those three things.

Lonnie Roberts: Rather than against your property?

Grant McDaniel: Right.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, anyone else her to give comments? If not, I'm going to open to commissioners questions, comments, discussions? We talked about this a lot yesterday.

Paul Ford (Commission): You said that Hammerhead owned a certain amount of this land inside the TC-O already but I couldn't determine where you were saying that, that was.

John Easley: They currently owned 38 acres right there on the north side. The original Greensboro Village.

Paul Ford: So, they own three tracks already?

John Easley: Yes.

Paul Ford: My next question is where in that property currently owned by Hammerhead in any of these three tacks that we've identified is there sewer service for?

John Easley: The 10 acres on the south side is served from the south. It starts from what is now the landing, phase one. The sewer line comes up to the south line of that 10 and a half acres.

Paul Ford: So, I'll call it the triangle, within the TC-O that Hammerhead owns is not served by sewer?

John Easley: At this time it is not served by sewer.

Paul Ford: Okay, and the larger track north of Greensboro that Hammerhead owns that they're seeking to bring into the TC-O is not served by sewer either?

John Easley: No sir, anything to the north of Greensboro is not served at this time. We are currently developing plans to bring sewer from Mays Road all the way across to Greensboro. So, we have a route defined. We have talked to the property owners between Greensboro, Hammerhead, and Mays Road. They're in agreement on the easements given. Right now, it's in design, ready to go to City Water & Light for review. We're in the process of developing sewer plants at this time.

Paul Ford: So, I'm going to call the upper right hand quadrant. There at that 29.35, where Monica has her cursor there?

John Easley: Yes, sir.

Paul Ford: Is that where the current plan book lays out for multifamily to be permissible inside the TC-O?

John Easley: Yes, sir.

Paul Ford: The concepts that you showed us at the premeeting yesterday, how many doors would that add in the multifamily that was shown to us yesterday?

John Easley: 192.

Paul Ford: And maybe you're helper can tell us how many doors are in landing phase one that has been built already?

John Easley: 260.

Paul Ford: 260, give or take? How long do you estimate it will take for you to build and complete sewer, in order to service the design concepts we were shown yesterday?

John Easley: Sewer would be complete by the end of the year. With the verbal agreement of the owners it's affected. We have around 3 of them we have verbal agreements that they will give an easement that's required for sewer.

Paul Ford: Okay, the last question that I have, the two tracks that you're seeking today to be brought into the TC-O are those the same two tracks of land that rezoning was sought six months ago that was turned down?

John Easley: Yes, sir.

Paul Ford: So, the current proposal is really just another proposed method to able to build the apartment complex that was previously rejected by this Planning Commission?

John Easley: I want to say no, it's not. It's all part of one big development. I don't know that building the apartments now, versus the residential and the sewer and everything else. How that schedule is dictated. I mean the multi-family can be built cause the sewer's there. The 55 plus, the sewer is coming within 6, 7 months. So, it's not a question of build a multi-family, forget the rest of it, until a later day. It's all one process. It's all in one ongoing project.

Paul Ford: Would you agree that if we approve the rezoning and it comes into the TC-O, no one has any control over when and if any of this gets built, in the next 2 years. As opposed to what got built in the last 8 years.

John Easley: I would say no, there's no control over that. There's no control over anything you do like that.

Paul Ford: Okay, I'm just, I mean, making sure that, I agreed that there was no control but was just asking if you thought there was still no control.

John Easley: There's control over how it gets done and how soon it gets done or at least gets started. That's where it falls to the owner.

Paul Ford: And this is my last question. What was discussed yesterday afternoon at the pre meeting of a 55-plus development that would enter in that would be accessible off of Canera Drive, if that's the pronunciation of that street.

John Easley: Yes, sir. Canera Drive is already constructed.

Paul Ford: And that Canera Drive would provide the entrance into the 55-plus development.

John Easley: Yes.

Paul Ford: Which so that could have been done at any, that could be done tomorrow without any rezoning approval today.

John Easley: The Canera Drive?

Paul Ford: No the building of the 55-plus, that could've happened a year ago with the current zoning. Am I not right?

John Easley: It could have happened a year ago with the same situation we have now with sewer. It would've had to have sewer a year ago or two years

ago.

Paul Ford: So, at least in part some of the delay has been no sewer.

John Easley: Part of it, yes.

Lonnie Roberts: Please come up and introduce yourself into the mic.

Tim Cooper (Proponent): Tim Cooper, architect, representing the owner. I think one of the biggest differences y'all can correct me if I'm wrong. Is from the one that got turned down to this one, that there's no additional mixed use being added to the pattern book percentages or anything like that, so what they're doing is they're taking what's already by right, able to do mixed use up on that upper corner, and because of Old Greensboro Road being widened, it lends itself to more of a commercial use and basically instead of having multi-family up there, 10 acres of that is going to be put in this area. So, the other one wasn't that, it was different.

Paul Ford: So, you're saying that no multifamily would be built at any other location within this TC-O beyond what you showed us last night or there would still be some?

Tim Cooper: Right, and it would be, I believe it would be more of an urban version of that compared to this. So, you may have commercial below, you may have, is that correct? You'll have more of an urban environment. So that would lend itself to be more up on that area that is closer to the larger road.

Paul Ford: So, there's still, just to make sure I understand. Whatever it gets zoned is what it's zoned and you can do whatever you want, it doesn't matter if you change your mind after it's rezoned. It's just rezoned, that's all we have control over. Right?

Tim Cooper: It would have to go back through a whole another pattern book change. It can totally be changed by that process, I mean we can come back to y'all-

Paul Ford: And that's what I'm trying to make sure, that I am clear and that, this is not really a question, but a commissioner comment, is that if we approve this rezoning, then, any of the concepts that we saw at the pre-meeting, none of that has to occur because it just works within, because it's already rezoned. I've been told before that I can't ask questions about what are you going to do with it. You just get to approve it or not approve it. There's no binding obligation to do anything that was discussed. It's just either rezoned or not, everything else is up to this plan book.

Carol Duncan (City Attorney): They can do a voluntary stipulation. If they want to volunteer to stipulate to a requirement they can do that.

Tim Cooper: I think to add to that, the owner would actually hire a team, an architect to put together renderings and plan this in a way that it's workable. I mean, it's basically in the computer, a built environment and to make sure all that will work and that it meets the pattern book and so forth. So there's no reason to think that that's not what's going to be done there. But you're right they're definitely renderings and it's hopefully an intent to show what we're trying to do. There's square footages we have for a clubhouse and we have that, I can show you later, or we can pull it up, but the green space that we have on this site is unbelievable. It's like over 13 acres of green space. We have just that inner area there of park is over a half mile and if you start in the top right corner up there and you take that trail down to this other entrance over here. That's another half mile, a trail you know, I don't know any other development that's coming in and doing that.

Paul Ford: Alright, and how much of it is north of Greensboro? All that remaining triangle is that north of the street?

Tim Cooper: Yes, you can see right here where the road is, everything above

that is

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Mr. Ford I know, that back in 2014 is when this was originally approved and you probably haven't had a chance to review the pattern book in that time. But it goes into building materials, colors, setbacks. It's probably the most extensive zone we have besides what we've started to trying to do downtown. So, I mean, even if they show that here, they're still going to have to meet where the garages are set. What kind of building materials it's made out of. All that's going to have to be followed out of that pattern book.

Paul Ford: I understand that.

Derrel Smith: Okay.

Paul Ford: I did understand that it was quite restrictive.

Derrel Smith: Yes, sir.

Paul Ford: Requirements architecturally and for building materials, etcetera all in an effort to create a good project instead of a poor project.

Derrel Smith: Yes sir.

Paul Ford: I understand that, I do.

Derrel Smith: I just wanted to make sure since we weren't here then.

Paul Ford: But, I mean, I've looked at it six months ago as well and just generally aware.

Derrel Smith: Alright.

Dennis Zolper: If we approve this, are they required to build this?

Gary Harpole (Proponent): Derrel do you mind if I? Gary Harpole, 512 West Jefferson Avenue. Representing both Hammerhead and Greensboro Village. Couple of things about the zoning just historically, to talk about some of the things that are kind of baked in and then to hopefully try and answer some of these questions. When it comes to some of the stipulations, the actual Town Center City Ordinance for the City of Jonesboro allows for 50 percent single family, 50 percent multi-family. When we rezoned Greensboro Village, we amended the ordinance ourselves and we placed a 30 percent cap on multi-family. So, actually, Greensboro village is more restrictive when it comes to multi-family than the standard TC-O zoning that the City of Jonesboro has and we did that on purpose to cap it at 30 percent. So, we did place some of those in and comparing and I may get this wrong, and Derrel and Carol can tell me if I do, the way I always operated, either as a member of the Planning Commission or the City Council. A straight rezoning Paul, you're exactly right. If I just come and say I want to rezone this from R-1 to C-3, you're not supposed to be able to ask me, well, what are you going to build in C-3? You just gotta look at the use and if it fits the land use? Does it not? Some of the advantages that you have when you come into a planned unit development, you get density, you get some of the mixed-use things, you get things that you normally wouldn't get in a traditional zoning and because of that the way I've already treated it, is both Planning Commission and a Council member is you give up some of that ambiguity because my understanding is in a planned unit development, you do have to ask some of those questions. What are you going to do? What's the use gonna be? That's the trade off in getting a little bit more flexibility in how you're able to develop is you've got to be a little bit more accountable to the governing bodies, be it the Planning Commission or the City Council or whatever. So, we can't just take a TC-O, nobody can just take a TC-O and do whatever they want with it. We submitted a plan as part of that designed book that says, we're going to do commercial here, and it was all very well thought out based on traffic patterns and how things were going to move in transition zones, between heavy commercial and mixed use and

residential. But we baked that into the zoning that says, yes, we have a TC-O and this how we plan to develop this. Now, can we come back and say hey look, the market's changed. Prim example, they're going to make 351 five lanes. They weren't going to do that in 2014 when we zoned it. So, we think we'd like to do that commercial instead of multi-family. So, can we move our multi-family over here and develop that commercial? We have that right but we can't do that arbitrarily or else we would just come and ask for a TC-O and move it however we wanted to. So, to think that we have just complete freedom and flexibility to do what we want to after the rezoning is not the case. We make commitments to this body and to the city council of this is how this is going to develop. So, in short answer, you know, if he says this is what he's going to build, this is what he has to build. Now there's still site plan approval that has to go through with the planning department where they'll look specifically at right-a-ways and easements and the infrastructure that goes in the utilities the building plans, all those kind of things but we can't come up here and say this is what we're going to build today. You rezone to TC-O and then us come back and do something completely different because it's just, we don't have that right. And so I think just to clear that, at least that's the way I have always understood it. As a commissioner, what I understood from before, that when you go into a planned unit development there is a different commitment than you make on just a straight rezoning. Because there is advantages to doing a PUD. Am I completely off base or am I close?

Carol Duncan: No, I don't think so, I was looking at the plan requirements now and they do put a whole lot more requirements on what they do but also you come in with the planned development unlike a rezoning where they can say I wanna put multi-family here and they might show you a beautiful drawing of an apartment complex and that's not what they build there on a regular residential. I don't know if that's the case here.

Paul Ford: But based on your comments earlier when I was asking about, you just put it in there, you know, we're either approving the zoning or not and if they offer a stipulation, they can offer one but we hadn't heard one. And then Mr. Cooper's question, if we approve this, does he have to build this and I think the answer is no, they have to build something within the guidebook or the plan book but they don't necessarily have to build.

Carol Duncan: Once it's in the plan book they have to build it.

Unable to transcribe

Gary Harpole: Yeah and the whole idea is we would submit the plan book. We'll have to update the plan book at the rezoning with the council. Now, Brandon's here and I'll let him get and speak, but I will say this, I don't think anybody has any problem, stipulating that this is the project that's going to be built.

Carol Duncan: I think we need to be clear about what the stipulation is, if it's going to be 55 and over or, you need to be clear about what the stipulation is.

Paul Ford: But I can't ask for one.

Carol Duncan: You can't ask for one, but you need to be clear.

Gary Harpole: My point is we're presenting a plan, and unless I'm told different when I step aside, I don't think anybody is presenting this to get passed tonight and then planning to do something else. And to speak to the elephant in the room with the multi-family piece and shifting the 10 acres. Just laying all the cards on the table, the 15 acres in the northwest corner, like we said yesterday in the pre-meeting, that would be more of a urban style development. And to develop all 15 acres of that, would be a higher density then you're going to develop on a garden style apartment, with what we're looking to do with

phase 2 on the landing. The development on phase 2 of the landing will actually be for the current owners of the landing. They stay at 95-98% occupancy, they're one bedroom apartments are starting at 1400 dollars, 1388 dollars a month. They would like to expand and have a bigger complex than where they are right now. So, the opportunity to build that for them, now.

Paul Ford: So, if I understand that, Hammerhead owns the property, Hammerhead is going to build the apartment complex but sell it back to the same owners?

Gary Harpole: It's going to be sold to the people who own Phase 1. And the thing that I think should give a little bit of comfort, is if you look they have done a masterful job managing and maintaining that property.

Paul Ford: Who's they?

Gary Harpole: The owners of the landing, I don't know who they are, but Brandon does. But, if you look the complex looks just as good today as the day it got built and sold. You can pull the police reports, cause we have, since the day it opened, this is not a complex that gets a lot of calls, this is not the kind of complex that provides a lot of issues for the police department. There aren't a lot of break ins and robberies, and disturbance calls. It's just not one of those kind of complexes when one bedroom rent starts at 1400 dollars a month that's pretty high end, class A type property. He's actually better off in the long run to leave the 10 acres where they are, it'll cost a hundred units in development to go from an urban style development in the northwest corner, to garden style on this side.

Lonnie Roberts: Are you saying there's less total unit then?

Gary Harpole: I'm saying that a 3 story garden style apartment complex, like the landing is, there will wind up being a 100 less units built. By building that product on this 10 acres, then if an urban style gets built in the corner. So, you wind up with less units. Now, in the long run that's less money for Brandon. Because you're never not gonna have a buyer for a class A apartment complex. But the difference is it's a project that can be done now. So, that's why he would like to move it over because there's opportunity to develop for the current owner. But instead of asking to get more multi-family land put in, he's saying we don't want any more multi-family, I just want to relocate it to over here. And I'll let him stipulate, I know there's been some talk about, well what if you just build the apartments and never do the other? To dig up the land and put down sewer infrastructure is gonna cost between 3 and half to 4 million dollars. If you do the math, with today's interest rate, the interest carry alone on taking down the land and bringing that sewer across is about 25,000 dollars a month. It's about 300,000 dollars a year. Once he commits to putting that sewer in unless he's got more money than I think he does. He can't afford to just sit there and not develop the 55 plus, once that commit is in you have got to keep developing it, and start selling product in order to make cash flow. So, I think he would stipulate that he would not pull a permit on the apartment complex, until he started pulling permits and started putting in the sewer. I think that you would want to put that sewer in and that 55 plus, before you start putting in apartments. Why give up the extra 100 units? If you have to wait build them where it's already zoned and that's an extra 20 million dollars when you get ready to sell that complex. So, I think it's a win, win all the way around. Let's him develop now, you get 100 units or so less than you did if you put it all up in the corner, and he would make the commit that he wouldn't start pulling permits until he pulled permits and started to put in the sewer. Even then the amount of time it would take to build an apartment complex that size, versus once the sewer does get there and you start building those 55 plus,

you'll start having occupancy most likely close to the same time. Because those single family, 55 plus units will go up a whole lot faster. Than, the 3 story apartment building. So, just to clarify this a little bit, I don't think anybody is afraid of committing to stipulations we just need them to be reasonable. These are real dollars nobody is trying to do anything underhanded, no one is trying to sneak something through, we're trying to lay it all on the table and be honest about why he's trying to do it. And build in any safeguards that need to be built. Whether is the buffer for the adjoining property owner, whether it's having the permits pulled, or the sewer project started before he starts on the apartments. To, what you see is what you get. This is the 55 plus we're gonna build and that's what we're gonna do. I don't know any other way to do it.

Monroe Pointer (Commission): Sounds like Brandon has some stipulations he wants to talk about.

Jeff Steiling (Commission): Can I ask a couple questions real quick before you do that? One, is all the property south of Greensboro Road developable? Does it already have sewer to it?

Gary Harpole: It is, and the 10 acres we're talking about here doesn't have sewer connected to it. But the sewer infrastructure that is there south from the landing, when we did that, the way that the sewer flows, we brought a new main line in from Johnson Avenue and up that way. So, sewer is not to that property, not trying to split hairs there is a difference, but it does have the means to come down and attach to sewer and that infrastructure is already in. Where everything on the north side the infrastructure has to come across from Mays Road. And we've already met with the property owners and like John said, we already have the route. One thing I would like to clear up, Paul if I can, I think, John misspoke, Brandon does not currently own the 30 some odd acres, in the big part of the triangle, he owns the 22 and the 10, and the reason the sewer hadn't already been brought across is the original developers of Greensboro Village, from day one intended for whoever bought that to bring the sewer across or they would bring the sewer across when it was sold. So the reason sewer hasn't been brought across yet, is because it hasn't closed. But Brandon, has both the 15 acres and when he bought that he put it under contract and that's how it was negotiated that he would bring the sewer over.

Paul Ford: Okay. Is sewer anywhere on this property?

Gary Harpole: Yes, there is sewer, starting there, there is access to sewer. We're just now putting it in but the main lines of sewer, do you see, Canera Drive to your left? That now is already built all the way to Greensboro Road. And sewer, water, and electric runs down that road.

Paul Ford: Okay, so the extension that John was talking about is that one?

Gary Harpole: No, coming from Mays Road and the north side of Greensboro.

Paul Ford: So, there are two sewers that have to be done?

Gary Harpole: No.

Unable to transcribe

Gary Harpole: No, that comes from the same line as the top. That northwest corner will not be serviced by the sewer on the south side.

Paul Ford: When we were here six months ago and I asked, why you didn't just build multi-family here, I thought someone said it was cause there was no sewer.

Gary Harpole: That's right. It's coming across the top with the 55 plus.

Paul Ford: So, there's no sewer now for this?

Gary Harpole: No, it's because of that ridge through there. It'll be serviced from the sewer that comes with the 55 plus.

Lonnie Roberts: Mr. Steiling you said you had another question?

Jeff Steiling: You mentioned that the density difference if you build in the east versus the west, by comparison because, you have the development other by the old service center, same developer. How many acres are you developing there in the more urban style?

Gary Harpole: Is that 15 acres?

Brandon Winters (Proponent): Yeah, so the 15 acres I have in the contract, that is zoned multi-family currently.

Jeff Steiling: So, we're basically saying you could build something similar to that, at a third the scale, if you leave the 5 acres at the east end.

Brandon Winters: Yes sir, if we leave the 5 acres multi-family, and the 10 goes to commercial then, we can have one third of multi-family, and then two-thirds would be commercial.

Unable to transcribe

Jeff Steiling: And so, if I can ask, has that already been stipulated tonight? To relocate the 10 acres?

Monroe Pointer: So, Mr. Winters I do have one question, I did drive out there because it was quite a lengthy conversation yesterday as well, but I think there is a lateral on the north of Canera, looked like it comes across the street.

Brandon Winters: Power?

Monroe Pointer: No, sewer. Is that gonna be the portion that is for the single-family? Because they're doing some work there if you come off of. Is there a lateral across the street already for that?

John Easley: There is a main sewer that goes up to Canera, all the way to Greensboro Road. That's in service right now. Back down from Canera to the east, what's been cleared, there will be a line going east through that cleared area for residential development. It does not go back out to Greensboro. The sewer runs all the way down Canera to Johnson Avenue.

Monroe Pointer: Okay, so there is one sewer pipe, that's on the north side of Canera, I'm trying to see is that ready for service to go in to where they're pushing all the dirt?

John Easley: No it goes up to almost Greensboro but it drains but to the south.

John Easley: It picks up what's being developed now.

Monroe Pointer: Which is gonna take care of single-family homes?

John Easley: Yes. There is no sewer across from Greensboro, that's the Ridge we can't go over.

Monroe Pointer: And I think that's the same section that me and Mr. Ford was talking about, in the beginning with the why has that not been done already, but they do have sewer that can make that happen?

Gary Harpole: Yes.

John Easley: The thing about Greensboro when it was first done, all the sewer was down from Johnson. So, we've had to work our way into it.

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Commission: Derrel, I want to ask you, what if we approve this, we're just approving rezoning?

Derrel Smith: You're approving the Town Center-Overlay zone and then before it goes to council they will update their pattern book, and that will be what goes to city council. Is the updated pattern book along with the TC-O zone.

Paul Ford: Is that where the stipulations would be? In the pattern book change?

Derrel Smith: It'll be here tonight, and it will also be in the pattern book so it will be in both places.

Lonnie Roberts: So, the rezoning tonight will be subject to the stipulations we're about to discuss.

Lonnie Roberts: Mr. McDaniel asked for a 50 foot boarder, is that agreeable I

think we talked about that yesterday.

Brandon Winters: Oh yeah, absolutely, a 50 foot buffer. I appreciate you guys listening to us again for the second time, I know we were here 6 months ago. So we have, two tracks of land as you all know, one on the north side of Old Greensboro Road and on the south side, that we would like to bring into Greensboro village, and so we have 60 acres total with what I have bought and what I have contracted. On the northside of Greensboro Road, for the 55 and older and then we would like to move 10 acres of the multi-family, that I have under contract on the northeast corner of Greensboro Village to behind the landing at Greensboro Village for the 10 acres that we're asking to be rezoned and brought into Greensboro Village on the south end. I know that there is worry that we will build apartments and never build the 55 and over. That is not the case, I have designed the 55 and over of the property, with floor plans and so on. So what we're looking at is not just some buildings we stuck in there, it's blue prints that have been built into a rendering. So, I offer a stipulation that if this is not going to be approved that we do not move 10 acres of multi-family to the landing and Greensboro Village phase 2. But approve the 55 and older but go ahead and bring the 10 acres on the south end, that has been proposed to the landing and Greensboro Village phase 2. But approve the 55 and older but go ahead and bring the 10 acres on the south end, that has been proposed to the landing at Greensboro Village phase 2, and just make the property the same zoning as the 55 and over and take that 10 acres and do the same thing there. (Minutes continue in next section).

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

Aye: 6 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Jeff Steiling;Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Nay: 3 - Jimmy Cooper;Stephanie Nelson and Paul Ford

(Minutes continued for RZ-25-08)

Gary Harpole: May I, I think what he's asking is we're gonna offer the stipulations that we talked about, and he's asking that if those stipulations aren't going to be sufficient, we don't want to not bring the land into the TC-O, but we'd first like to offer the stipulations that we discussed, this evening, the first one being that we stipulate, that if this is approved as designed that we will move 10 acres of the current multi-family in the design pattern book, over to this 10 acres and redesignate that as commercial. And that can be a stipulation in this ordinance that goes forth to the council, and we would have to show that on the plan book, with that submission to the City Council showing exactly where that 10 acres has been redesignated as commercial and moved over here.

Carol Duncan: And that would only happen if the rezoning is approved.

Gary Harpole: Right, that only happens if the rezoning is approved.

Lonnie Roberts: So, Gary once it's in that plan book, does that mean it has to be built this way? I mean, that's pretty much the guide?

Gary Harpole: The failsafe piece for that is that we have to develop what we said we would develop. Then once it gets handed to the planning department they know what's been turned in, and they're the hammer that drives the nail on that piece if something is to be done different. The other stipulation that no

permits will be pulled for construction of the multi-family as moved till he pulled permits and the sewer project was in motion, moving across the north to show that, that utility was coming across so that 55 plus is gonna be built. And hopefully those two stipulations will help alleviate concerns and questions on whether you're going to build what you say, you are. And quickly, he wants to start both of those at the same time.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay.

Gary Harpole: Now, I'm asking for feedback do those stipulations do that?

Kevin Bailey: Yes, along with the 50 foot buffer.\

Gary Harpole: Of course, and the buffer too.

Unable to transcribe

Paul Ford: I think it addresses a number of concerns, I'll just say that it doesn't address all of my concerns. I don't know if you can address all of my concerns so, I'll just share them. I used to own an apartment complex known as Fox Hollow Townhouses, it's at the intersection of Melrose and Belt Street, near to what many people would call apartment city. I remember when those townhouses at Fox Hollow were where the sorority girls lived, and would rent while they were in college, where there was a wonderful swimming pool. That at one time was a wonderful place for people to live, by the time I bought them I was hoping that we could turn them around and make that a good part of the neighborhood again. Didn't work out very well for me. So, I have an opinion that when you concentrate a large amount of apartments in one location, that in time it becomes a very difficult place in the community. I remember when the Gladiolas were built they were pretty nice apartments. I don't think the police department would say that's a great place these days. So, that's number one, number two is, I haven't been on this committee as long as others, but when someone is here asking for multi-family, there is typically someone else here wondering if it will be good for their property values. And usually they're older people who have lived in an area for a while. So, I guess that I have an opinion that people 55 and older aren't real keen to living next to apartments. I just think that there's resistance of older people who don't want to live near an apartment complex. So, I have some challenges with these two things side by side, in time coexisting well. So, that's the issue for me. And lastly because of my lawyer training, I'm aware that Arkansas, is the only state in the country I think, where you cannot sue a landlord for problems within their development. Every other state you can, Arkansas you cannot. It's renter beware and efforts to change that law in Arkansas have been unsuccessful at the legislature and they are being challenged by people who mostly own apartments. Who own a lot of multi-family developments they don't want to be in that situation. So, they like Arkansas, Greensboro village is owned now by a gentleman who's last name I can't pronounce, but he has a LLC and lives in New York city. I don't know if he has any long term interest in Jonesboro, Arkansas. He may just have long term interest in making money. So, because of that, I think it's a great concept, it'd be wonderful if it all turned out that way, I just have a lot of reservations for the long term, in 20 years, have we built another apartment city?

Gary Harpole: And I'll do what I can to address that, take the first one the apartment city piece, I think the biggest problem you have in apartment city is you have multiple owners in a high concentration so you have an inability to manage multiple landlords. The difference here is the quality of the product. And I can let Brandon talk until past supper time about how they've been built, the amount of money they're gonna spend on soundproofing and insulation. The quality of the construction that's there is more than anything we have in

general multi-family let alone apartment city. This would be a control access, under one ownership group that like I said, we've now had 4 or 5 years of them watching this property and maintaining this property. And part of that is going to be economics. I'm not going to tell you anything that isn't already public record, but when you pay close to 50 million dollars for a project, you're going to take care of it. And because you're trying to get 1400 dollar one bedroom rent, not 400 dollar one bedroom rent. So, I think, what you're saying about the overall risk of high concentration multi-family would be hard to argue with, I think this is more apples and oranges, this is a much higher quality constructed project that is in a controlled environment it'd be under single ownership and the amount of money they have invested, basically makes them keep high rent and take very good care of the property. I think there's a argument for that, but the 55 plus I think that's a market piece, there is a road separation, there's buffers. If you look at the plan for that 55 plus there's a heavy tree buffer along there, there's internal green space. This particular piece there's 50 ft next to Mr. McDaniel, there's 40 feet next to the single family. These things are gonna be well buffered and managed. I don't share the concern in this particular instance, that those apartments being across Greensboro Road and being tucked into those trees is gonna be any deterrent to the 55 plus, houses on the other side that are also going to be buffered and managed. I don't know what to do about the landlord law but I certainly think that you're talking about a different level of property where that's at play versus this particular property.

Proponent: Getting back to Mr. Cooper's question about do we have to build what's shown on there and that sort of thing, and it comes back to a pud and what are you're requirements for that, they're pretty strict because there's materials and that sort of thing. But when it's something like this where there's a pattern book, you do have some flexibility in the development, like for instance, laying this out we don't have all the engineering yet, to know whether this street needs to be moved this way or that way, there's different nuances there but what you see is what you get. The feel, the number of houses you see, all that intent is there, and I think that we're willing to give stipulation that, that is what we're gonna build. I think the flexibility we need is the same flexibility that with the pud if you have materials, you can change those materials but you have to go back to the planning staff and we've done this with Derrel and many other projects, but they make sure it still falls in line with the requirements. There's also things where you can change density in some cases, as long as it doesn't hit a certain criteria and that's usually staff's thing where they look at it and go yes that is, or we need to go back to planning commission and that sort of thing. But what we're looking at is exactly what we're showing here. Those houses have square footage, it's not just a placeholder.

Gary Harpole: Their actual floor plans made to fit in that development.

Proponent: So, that could be entered as a stipulation Derrel.

Gary Harpole: We're stipulating what we can to try and alleviate the concerns.

Commission: So, you're stipulating that you will build the 55 plus community in line with the presented concept?

Gary Harpole: That's correct.

Unable to transcribe

Lonnie Roberts: Any questions?

Carol Duncan: We'll probably need a version of that shrunk down to give to the council.

Lonnie Roberts: Anyone ready with a motion? Anybody have any questions

before we read off the stipulations?

Derrel Smith: We had four stipulations that were typed in prior to the meeting, we added the 5th that the development must amend the pattern book prior to approval by City Council, to conform with the 70 percent residential to the 30 percent multi-family ratio for construction and design guidelines provided in the pattern book. Number 6 must have a minimum of a 50 foot buffer of existing trees and parking to the interior of the project,

Gary Harpole: Derrel will you stipulate for that 50 foot to be on the west side, there's not enough on the other side and there's not a need for it.

Derrel Smith: So 1. 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.

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 the planning department approval in the future and the site shall comply with the existing Greensboro Village Town Center Development Guidelines.

4. The development must amend the pattern book prior to approval by the City Council to conform to the 70 percent residential to the 30 percent multi-family ratio for construction as previously approved and design guidelines provided in the pattern book.

5. The development must amend the pattern book prior to approval by city council to conform to the 70% residential to 30% multifamily ratio for construction and design guidelines provided in the pattern book.

6. Must have a minimum of 50' buffer of existing trees on west side of project and parking to the interior of the project.

7. Move 10 acres of multi-family on the northeast corner of Greensboro to commercial and then the 10 acre tract on the southeast parcel will be multi-family.

8. No multifamily permits until the sewer permits have been approved by City Water and Light on the 10 acres.

9. Build the 55 plus community as designed by the concept presented.

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

Aye: 6 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Jeff Steiling;Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Nay: 3 - Jimmy Cooper;Stephanie Nelson and Paul Ford

9. Staff Comments

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): Okay, for the next item, I believe we have someone who would like to make a request of the planning commission.

Dennis Zolper (Commission): I'd like to make a motion to reconsider the project that y'all talked about at the last meeting for a conditional use of 5500 Stadium Blvd.

Unable to transcribe

Lonnie Roberts: So, for the April 22nd meeting you're requesting to be reheard is that for-

Dennis Zolper: For 5500 Stadium Blvd, Mr. Heatherly believes there may be a misunderstanding about what he's going to use that property for.

Lonnie Roberts: Do I have a second motion so we can discuss it and then vote?

Jimmy Cooper: Cooper, second.

Carol Duncan: Okay, so he came in and asked at my office, apparently the property owner was not here for a doctor's appointment for a health situation that he could not reschedule. So, someone was here in his stead and he believes some of the questions that were answered were answered inaccurately. That you had about how long the cars were gonna be there and things such as that. That you had questions about, so he asked if he could have it reconsidered. So, when I looked at your rules you do have a process for a reconsideration that can be made at the next meeting but then it can't be discussed till the following meeting to give people notice that it will be rediscussed. But that is his request.

Lonnie Roberts: So, a motion and second to reconsider hearing.

Carol Duncan: Yes. He's asking that you reconsider and let him answer the questions about the vehicles, fencing, and storage and what it's actually gonna look like.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper, seconded by Jimmy Cooper, that this be Approved. The motion CARRIED with the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

10. Adjournment