



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes - Final Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, June 28, 2016

3:00 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

[play video](#)

2. Roll Call

[play video](#)

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins and Rick Stripling

Absent 1 - Jimmy Cooper

3. Approval of minutes

[play video](#)

MIN-16:080

Approval of the MAPC Meeting Minutes for June 14, 2016.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [MAPC Meeting Minutes June 14, 2016](#)

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

Aye: 7 - Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Jimmy Cooper

4. Preliminary Subdivisions

[play video](#)

5. Final Subdivisions

[play video](#)

6. Conditional Use

[play video](#)

7. Rezoning

[play video](#)

[RZ-16-11](#)

Rezoning: RZ 16-11: 3423 Hudson

Cole Stevenson is requesting MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to RM-12 Residential multifamily classification; 12 units per net acre, includes all forms of units, duplexes, triplexes, quads, and higher District, LUO for 8.29 acres of land located at 3423 Hudson.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Staff Summary](#)
 [Plat](#)
 [Application](#)
 [Rezoning Questions](#)
 [Aerial View](#)
 [Zoning Aerial Map](#)

Applicant: Mr. Cole Stevenson requested a rezoning for 3423 Hudson from R-1 Single Family Residential to RM-12 Residential multifamily classification. Mr. Stevenson explained that he wanted to get the property rezoned so it would be easier for someone to develop the property. He went to explain that he was asking for RM-12 multifamily because they felt like that was the residential zoning that would work best with the surrounding commercial zonings.

Staff: Mr. Ron Kelton stated that he had concerns about Hudson road and the intersection of Hudson and 351. Mr. Kelton wanted to know if Mr. Stevenson planned to do any road improvements if this property were rezoned from R-1 to RM-12.

Applicant: Mr. Stevenson said they did not have any plans on doing road improvements but that was only because they did not have a site plan for any project at this time. Mr. Stevenson went on to say that he agreed with Mr. Kelton's statements regarding a need for road improvements in this area.

Staff: Mr. Brant Perkins wanted to know if the applicant planned on securing another access to this property other than Hudson Road.

Applicant: Mr. Stevenson said that his client did not have access to any other access points to their property other than Hudson Road.

Staff: Mr. Otis Spriggs presented the Staff comments directly from the staff summary that the requested Zoning Change submitted for subject parcel, should be approved based on the above observations and criteria of Case RZ 16-11, a request to rezone property from "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "RM-12" L.U.O., Multifamily Residential District subject to final site plan approval by the MAPC.

No issues were reported by the various departments. The applicants will have to comply with the list of uses in the conditions:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Stormwater Drainage Design Manual and Flood

Plain Regulations regarding any new construction.

2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to Planning Commission approval in the future.
4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering etc. shall be submitted to the MAPC prior to any redevelopment. New screening outdoor storage and dumpster enclosure requirements shall be implemented if stipulated by the MAPC.
5. The maximum units shall be 96.

Public Input: Mr. Rick Chester spoke during the public comment period. He explained that this property was part of a mass annexation into the City of Jonesboro in 1998 and there was no sewer out by that property. He wanted to know where the sewer for this development would come from.

Staff: Mr. Otis Spriggs explained that this information was not available yet because there were no site plans submitted for review. This question would be answered at that point in the process by City, Water, and Light. He went on to say that any rezoning would be subject to a final site plan review.

Mr. Jerry Reece explained that developers would be responsible for paying for getting sewer to their property.

Mr. Jim Scurlock asked Mr. Spriggs a question about lot coverage.

Mr. Spriggs explained to him that it only meant lot coverage. It did not matter if the buildings were 2 or 3 stories high.

Mr. Perkins asked Mr. Spriggs if all of the property was in what the Land Use Map classified as a low-intensity growth sector and or high-intensity growth sector.

Mr. Spriggs explained that the lines on the map were not intended to be hard lines.

Mr. Perkins also pointed out that he was not sure if this area had the infrastructure to support the additional housing units that could be placed on this lot if the committee were to approve the rezoning.

Mr. Kevin Bailey suggested that the applicant needed to do a traffic study to determine how this rezoning would impact traffic in the area.

Applicant: Mr. Stevenson agreed but restated that it would be difficult to do a traffic study at this time since they do not have site plans for any development.

Public Input: Mr. Chester also asked about a secondary entrance for this property

Staff: The board reiterated that the issue would be addressed during the site plan review.

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

Aye: 5 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Ron Kelton;Jim Scurlock;Kevin Bailey and Rick Stripling

Nay: 2 - Jerry Reece and Brant Perkins

Absent: 1 - Jimmy Cooper

Abstain: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

[RZ-16-12](#)

Rezoning: RZ 16-12: 5921 Southwest Drive

Valley View Storage, LLC is requesting MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to I-1 Industrial District, for 3.63 acres of land located at 5921 Southwest Drive.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Staff Summary](#)
 [Conceptual Layout](#)
 [Plat](#)
 [Application](#)
 [Questions](#)
 [Warranty Deed](#)
 [Aerial View](#)

Applicant: Mr. Jay MaCloud requested a rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to I-1 Industrial District for 5921 Southwest Drive so they can build and operate a storage business on this lot.

Staff: Mr. Otis Spriggs presented staff comments directly from the staff summary that that the requested Zoning Change submitted for subject parcel, should be approved based on the above observations and criteria of Case RZ 16-12, a request to rezone property from “R-1” Single Family Residential District to “I-1” LUO Limited Industrial District subject to final site plan approval by the MAPC.

No issues were reported by the various departments. He explained that staff has no issues with this request as long as the applicant adheres to all conditions attached to the request. He also mentioned that staff has received no negative feedback regarding this request.

The applicants will have to comply with the list of uses in the conditions:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Stormwater Drainage Design Manual and Flood Plain Regulations regarding any new construction.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to Planning Commission approval in the future.
4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering etc. shall be submitted to the MAPC prior to any redevelopment. New screening outdoor storage and dumpster enclosure requirements shall be implemented if stipulated by the MAPC.

Public Input: There was none.

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

Aye: 7 - Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;Jerry Reece;Jim Scurlock;Kevin Bailey;Brant Perkins and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Jimmy Cooper

[RZ-16-13](#)

Rezoning: RZ 16-13: 5110 Southwest Drive

Prestige Statewide, LLC is requesting MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to C-3 General Commercial District for 2.46 acres of land located at 5110 Southwest Drive.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Staff Summary](#)
[Application](#)
[Questions](#)
[Plat](#)
[Aerial View](#)

Applicant: Mr. Jeremy Moore representing Prestige Statewide requested a rezoning for 5110 Southwest Drive from R-1 Single Family Residential District to C-3 General Commercial District Limited Use Overlay. They want this rezoning so the land could be easier developed for something like a restaurant or gas station.

Staff: Mr. Otis Spriggs presented staff comments directly from the staff summary that that the requested Zoning Change submitted for subject parcel, should be evaluated based on the above observations and criteria of Case RZ 16-13 a request to rezone property from "R-1" Single-Family Residential to "C-3"

General Commercial District, Limited Use Overlay; the following conditions are recommended:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Stormwater Drainage Design Manual and Flood Plain Regulations regarding any new construction.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC, prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Adequate visual screening shall be provided to buffer all surrounding residential uses remaining.
4. If and when possible, consolidated curb cuts shall be adhered to and from the site, to allow crossaccess to other adjacent future developed neighboring tracts of land.
5. The following uses shall be prohibited:
 - Airport
 - Cemetery
 - Entertainment, Adult
 - Recreational Vehicle Park
 - Off Premises Sign (Billboard)
 - Agricultural, Animal

No issues were reported by the various departments. He explained that staff has no issues with this request as long as the applicant adheres to all

conditions attached to the request. He also mentioned that staff has received no negative feedback regarding this request.

Public Input: Mr. Claud Smith lives at 502 Southwest Drive and his property is adjacent on two sides to the property in questions. We talked earlier today. I am in favor of the C-3 zoning. I think the restrictions that you put on it are probably adequate to my concerns. I do have about 2 1/3 acres that are going to be property locked. The creek that runs through there is referred to sometimes as McDaniel Creek. I own property on both sides of the creek. What we have here, like I said, I have 2 1/3 acres that will be bounded on one side by the creek, on two sides by the school property and one side by the developers. Anyway, my concerns have been met with what I have heard here so far.

Mr. Bryan Russell, Superintendent of Valley View School District also showed up and gave his support of this rezoning.

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

Aye: 7 - Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Jimmy Cooper

8. Staff Comments

[play video](#)

COM-16:046

Staff Presentation: Planning Director Otis Spriggs will present information to the MAPC regarding Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction standards/guidelines as it relates to subdivision/platting allowed by the Arkansas Code.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Presentation Document](#)

No Vote Required.

No vote required.

9. Adjournment

[play video](#)