



# City of Jonesboro

900 West Monroe,  
Jonesboro, AR 72401  
<http://www.jonesboro.org/>

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, February 10, 2009

5:30 PM

900 West Monroe

---

**1. Call to order**

**2. Roll Call**

**Present** 8 - Ken Beadles; Ken Collins; Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Marvin Day; Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

**Absent** 1 - Paul Hoelscher

**3. Approval of minutes**

**A motion was made by Secretary Marvin Day, seconded by Joe Tomlinson, that the minutes be Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 7 - Ken Collins; Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Marvin Day; Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

**Absent:** 1 - Paul Hoelscher

Meeting Minutes for January 13, 2009

**4. Site Plan Review**

Nordex USA request site plan approval for a manufacturing facility to be located at the corner of C.W Post Road and Cook Road. The project exceeds the 75,000 building area threshold.

**A motion was made by Secretary Marvin Day, seconded by Jerry Halsey Jr., that this site plan be Approved subject to FAA and other governing bodies approval, and final approval by staff . The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 8 - Ken Beadles; Ken Collins; Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Marvin Day; Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

**Absent:** 1 - Paul Hoelscher

**4. MARY HORNE 627 W. PARKER ROAD.**

APPLICANT REQUESTS SITE PLAN REVIEW AND APPROVAL FOR A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED REZONING - RZ 08-27 (SPECIALTY TOY AND GIFT SHOP ON .55 ACRES)

Site Plan will be presented at the meeting.

**A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by Ken Collins, that this Site**

**Plan be Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 8 - Ken Beadles;Ken Collins;Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Marvin Day;Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

**Absent:** 1 - Paul Hoelscher

**5. Final Subdivisions**

5. CRAIGHILLS SEVENTH ADDITION, PHASE II - Final  
**Applicant/Agent:** Owner: PDW Properties, LLC request final approval of 28 lots located north of Craighead Forest Road, west of Harrisburg Road, east of Forest Hill Road and south of Russell Hill Drive. The site is further described as being a portion of the former Craighills Golf Course

**A motion was made by Secretary Marvin Day, seconded by Jerry Halsey Jr., that this Preliminary Subdivision be Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 8 - Ken Beadles;Ken Collins;Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Marvin Day;Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

**Absent:** 1 - Paul Hoelscher

**6. Conditional Use**

**7. Rezoning**

7. RZ09-02: Prairie Meadows Part 2 Rezoning  
Ridge Estates, LLC requests the rezoning of 3.22 acres from AG-1 to RS-6 Single Family Residential for property located at rear of 3700 Flemon Rd; on the North side of Flemon Rd., East of Hwy.226 and 2,000 ft. West of Friendly Hope Rd. and lies within the Prairie Meadows Subdivision which is now under construction.

**Mr. Carlos Wood, Engineer for the owner stated I have submitted a rezoning plat. Somehow he purchased this subdivision in 2 parcels from 2 separate people. Somehow the southwest corner was platted for rezoning but was not filed and submitted to the MAPC. We are requesting that it be rezoned to comply with the zoning.**

**Mr. Spriggs commented that as stated in the Staff report, this was reviewed based on a recent finding of inconsistency in the zoning. The Planning Commission added stipulations to the previous rezoning that the applicant was to add an open-space park and other items. As part of the final plan the detention pond was placed in this area of the site.**

**MAPC approved the preliminary plat based on the aforementioned rezoning, but the added components were actually overlapping within an AG-1 District; and that was overlooked. The subdivision was platted and recorded. This type or rezoning is consistent with the area; and you will be getting what is already platted and approved- single family homes.**

Staff recommends that MAPC approves the rezoning and send it to City Council, contingent upon it being developed as approved in the final subdivision of Prairie Meadows; a rezoning from AG-1 to the RS-6 with the L. U. Overlay.

Motion was made by Mr. Day, to recommend approval to City Council that this request be granted contingent upon it being developed as approved in the final subdivision of Prairie Meadows from AG-1 to the RS-6 with the L. U. Overlay. The applicant did not object to the motion; 2nd by Mr. Lonnie Roberts. Mr. Tomlinson- Aye; Ms. Norris- Aye; Mr. Roberts- Aye; Mr. Halsey- Aye; Mr. Collins- Aye; Mr. Dover- Aye; Mr. Day- Aye; 7 to 0 vote passed.

**Aye:** 8 - Ken Beadles; Ken Collins; Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Marvin Day; Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

**Absent:** 1 - Paul Hoelscher

RZ -09-01: Vineyard Development- A rezoning from R-1 to PD-MU (Planned Development-Mixed Use, including RM-16, C-3 LU, C-4 LU and RS-4. Vineyard Development Group, LLC, David Tyler, Agent request Planned Development District approval for 63.04 acres located on the North and East side of Christian Valley Drive, the South and West side of Christian Valley Drive, and West side of Mt. Carmel Road

Mr. George Hamman presented conditions and objections to the Staff Report. We agreed with comments 1-9, 11, 12, 15, and 18. We agree to do the traffic study, once approved and it will be incorporated into the final; they didn't want to make that investment. The developer has determined that they need a minimum of 278 units to make it economically feasible. The 278 units is 34 units less that the RM-16 classification will allow.

He presented the layout with open space, lake, detention, club house, second swimming pool, tennis court and car washing area in the northeast corner. Staff report requested the time schedule and it will be included with the preliminary and final plans once it is refined. May request that the club house and management building be granted a C.O. to hire staff. The land will be platted if approved and we do not object to the condition. MAPC requested information from police and fire; we visited with both chiefs and they did not object. We have modified and provided a second entrance to the apartments (exit only with a knock box).

Mr. Spriggs commented on participation in lieu of traffic improvements. Staff had concerns that after a traffic impact is completed that a condition need to be placed in there to take care of any improvements. Mr. Hamman stated that the streets will be public dedicated streets except for the interior drives in the multi-family.

**Public Input:**

Howard French, 2110 Winterhaven - commented about houses in that area. He moved there because he wanted an atmosphere with a small town feel. The 278 units will overload the schools. They just put in an intermediate school and its overloaded. Speaking of putting another school (3-6 grade); we pay a high mileage. This too many multifamily units. We have no objection to

single family. It is just a few years and full of crime. Clayola farms has been in the paper with fire crews and police cars out there 3 to 4 times a week. Property values will go down and crime will go up. The street they put in is so curved and its hard to see at Valley Drive. I have seen lot of close accidents. There is too much traffic out there at rush hour. Quiet commercial is fine.

Richard Rhodes, 4408 Ginny Lane- Opposed live ½ mile north. Wife and he takes children to Valley View. The traffic is backed up north on Mt. Carmel, where it "T's" into Lawson Rd. That will be one of the entrances for the single family homes. It's usually backed up going east on Lawson Rd., because it comes in at that pinch that is trying to enter the school.

Mr. Spriggs stated that there are 21 single family homes. Don't think that area is appropriate for commercial. There is enough on Southwest Dr. where appropriate. That is not a commercial node. Please don't over burden that area.

Tyrus Teeg, 1313 Layman Dr. – We bought out there because it's a quiet area with no apartments. Now you are putting Multi-family and it will back up to Mt. Carmel. We will get an increase in crime and the property values will go down. Traffic is backed up down Craighead Forest drive; add that and you will get a mess. I'm opposed.

Barry French, He lives 6 miles from Valley View shools. Traffic is there. I drive through every morning to get to my farm. There is a 10 minute wait, and traffic will back up. If you do this you will have a lot of traffic diverted through the school. If you want to go through Valley View School; The roads are overloaded. The school is growing fast. There needs to be an intensive traffic survey.

David Blair, 1221 W. Lawson Rd., between Mt. Carmel, Lawson and Christian Valley Dr., I agree with everyone. We have to leave an hour early to get out of our driveway. It's worse than chaos in the morning.

Carol Snail, 5108 Mt. Carmel Rd. For them not to do the traffic study first is a big mistake. The police force, fire everything will have to be enlarged to accommodate this. A right turn out only will not help the overall traffic issue. I don't know the history, but if they sell off it may be an issue, so we need more detail.

Pamela Alexander 4505 Summit Ridge, with her parents, 4501 Mt. Carmel rd. It seems their business model dictates they sell off after 6 years. I would like to address the issue of what they call greenway areas.

They have used the term open space. There is either confusion or there is deliberate decision to decision to ignore the definition of open space vs. the greenway plan. The greenway plan is a swath land that includes a trail that is either surrounded by greenery.

Open space does not lead to connectivity to connect our communities. Communities that are considered forward places to live, include greenways. They add value, and lend themselves to people being less obese and a lot of positive things. She spoke of her family's plan to participate and conserve to link to the master plan for the City's Greenway. Mention was made of the greenway on Christian Valley Drive. It is an asphalt sidewalk that doesn't lead to anywhere. As it is right now if this plan goes forward, it will not contribute to the connectivity of our community. I would encourage as you look at their plan; imagine to get anywhere that you have to get into your car to enjoy the

amenities.

**Staff Report:**

Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments about previous hearings/meetings. There was a lot of deliberation on density, traffic issues. Reference was made to the previous minutes and different approaches to the traffic issues such as right-turn out only. The recommendation of the traffic study is essential. The greenway connection; the parks department is working on the greenway plan. It was stipulated that language that provides for connectivity in terms of the greenway. The planning commission is considering the single family portion, and the commercial phase. The open space issue was also covered. There were no further inconsistencies in terms of the listed conditions. Fire and Engineering departments are present to answer any specific questions as well.

Mr. Halsey asked if we can force them to adhere to the traffic study findings.

Mr. Spriggs stated that there is a condition of the findings that the developer would anticipate.

Mr. Day stated, that the Land Use Committee looked at this general to be developed similarly; we don't deal with specifics. In general terms having a commercial node there is what you have at Highway 49 near the old mall site where you have a huge commercial area. When you consider the multi family, if you look at each part of Jonesboro that portion of town is underserved as opposed to others. We were trying to avoid having large areas of multi-family similar to what we see in other parts of the city. This would fit in some respects to that. That's not saying this is a perfect fit.

Mr. Halsey stated that the traffic study needs to be done. My last thing is the second entrance and you mentioned the police might have an issue with that. The traffic issue is how much this development will impact what is there is the problem. What will the differential will be.

Mr. Spriggs asked if the applicant has looked into doing a traffic study and acquiring an engineer.

Mr. Day, stated personally he does not have a problem with apartments. He is not in love with their specific layout or the density. He feels that one approach to rectify that is to just set a number. That the developer will pay "x" number of dollars towards the improvement in that area. It is obvious that you don't have to do a major study to determine there is a problem. If we were to say "X" number of dollars will be for an impact fee, to take care of traffic alleviation in that area. The other big issue is that the developer proposes to do this as a PUD. There is usually a defined time frame. The developer will give us that, and this isn't a 2 year project. The city will have no recourse in a long term perspective unless it was required to be a bonded improvement as part of a PUD.

Mr. Tomlinson stated concerns over the impact to this area. People on Culberhouse are backing up at Parker road and using this as an alternative to miss Parker Road. It was never addressed in terms of the traffic in the immediate area. We are starting out with a problem before we add all the density. I haven't heard anything to relieve the problem.

Dr. Beadles, the schools are all in one place.

Mr. Spriggs stated that the timing of the traffic study requirement needs to be dealt with. And secondly, what level of committee will the developer agree to participate in.

Mr. Day, asked if you look at Staff 's recommendation- would it address items like the greenway? The condition dealing with the greenway is that it will be provided as an easement at Mt. Carmel.

Mr. Day stated that we could add in the caveat of the greenway, traffic study , the number units to the staff recommendation; how many commissioners are comfortable with that.

Mr. Spriggs when staff calculated the density based on the providing of a lower density level than what the developer proposed. Mr. Hamman explained that the RM-16 would allow more than 300 units; we would be doing 34 less than the request would allow.

Mr. Halsey stated that his big issue is traffic; we have to implement something to deal with it. You are confined to this development. If you are going to grow the community, traffic and things will cause problems and we have to address them. I think it is a good development.

Mr. Collins pointed out that it seems several people that spoke preferred single family residential. You are looking at 667 cars versus 604 cars, if it remains single family; with 4 homes per acre. Mr. Day added that if you look at the minimum 8,000 sq. ft. lots; you can put 4 lots to an acre.

Mr. Collins stated that the main concern is the traffic, and there has to be a traffic study. We should make it a stipulation. Mr. Spriggs stated that he as seen on the record where a traffic impact study has been stipulated prior to Council receiving the recommendation.

Mr. Day stated that it seems the 3 issues are the greenway, traffic and number of units. He asked can we say a dollar amount for an impact fee, and that they provide traffic stud?

Mr. Crego stated that conceptually I have a little problem with the mechanics of it; The City of Jonesboro has not levied any impact fee. That is a specific process and art form that has not been proposed or authorized. The second part of that is that this body does not have ability to impose on the City Council that thou shall make this type of improvement on behalf of the City of Jonesboro. Even if we got past the mechanics, still you have the question of if the City Council will agree with doing the development with the other priority roadway projects being looked at. If we call it an impact fee it is a definite "no".

Mr. Day stated that if the developer came back and said I would like to give the city a certain number of dollars. Mr. Crego stated that if we make it a condition I don't agree with that; I am not sure that the mechanics could be worked out. The discussion for impact fees has not even begun in Jonesboro.

Mr. Collins stated that the commission is trying to confine the multi-family to smaller areas as oppose to what has occurred in north part of town.

Mr. Halsey stated that the City Council needs to see what they are getting a

hold of. They need to know that we think it is a good development but there are some issues. Mr. Spriggs stated that the Commission does have that authority to condition it as a recommendation to Council.

Mr. Day made the motion to recommend approval contingent upon City Planner's conditions; item #9 (278 units) and item #19- that traffic study is required prior to City Council for further review and that the greenway be better defined and better planned for in this overall development in connecting it within the City's Greenway Plan.

A motion was made by Secretary Marvin Day, seconded by Ken Collins, that this Rezoning be Recommended to Council. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:

**Aye:** 7 - Ken Beadles;Ken Collins;Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Marvin Day;Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

**Nay:** 1 - Joe Tomlinson

**Absent:** 1 - Paul Hoelscher

**8. Staff Comments**

**9. Adjournment**