



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, September 12, 2023

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 7 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Kevin Bailey; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Absent 2 - Jimmy Cooper and Monroe Pointer

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-23:084](#)

MINUTES: August 22, 2023 MAPC Minutes

Attachments: [August 22, 2023 MAPC Minutes](#)

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

Aye: 6 - Kevin Bailey; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford; Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Absent: 2 - Jimmy Cooper and Monroe Pointer

4. Miscellaneous Items

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

PP-23-09

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION: Savannah Hills Phase 6 & 7

SSP Investments, LLC is requesting preliminary subdivision approval for Savannah Hills Phase 6 & 7; 65 lots on 26.18 acres. This property is zoned R-2, multifamily low density district, and located at Dena Jo Drive.

Attachments: Savannah Hills ph 6 Record Plat
Savannah Hills ph 7 Record Plat
Savannah Hills, Ph - VI & VII Application
Staff Report

Michael Boggs (Proponent): We are looking to get preliminary approval for phases 6 & 7 for this development. We went through pre-planning meeting

yesterday with no comments, looking to get this approved and submitted.

Lonnie Roberts: City planner, do you have any comments on this?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes we do, we would like to table this until the traffic report is settled. The City Engineer has numerous questions about the traffic study, and until that is taken care of we can't support this moving forward.

Michael Boggs: Can I ask a question? This was submitted on 8/17, almost a month ago. No comments on traffic study was brought up yesterday or any time until today. Can we not work that out through the staff approval process instead of tabling this at this time?

Derrel Smith: We don't feel that this needs to be through the staff approval process. We've been talking about this for over 2 years and we want to make sure that everything is done correctly and there's just too many questions on that report to go forward with it right now.

Lonnie Roberts: Commissioners, any comments on how you want to proceed?

Dennis Zolper: Motion that we table the matter until our next meeting.

Lonnie Roberts: Do you have any more comments?

Sid Pickle (Proponent): I'm Sid Pickle, SSP Investments. Just wanted to express my disappointment in the whole process. We require a traffic study, which is fine, I spent a crap-load of money on it and apparently nobody has time to review it or even tell us they haven't reviewed it until we get to the meeting and tell us we need to table it. It's ridiculous. I have no choice. I understand, I respect what y'all do, but somebody dropped the ball and it makes no sense to me. We have been working on it for 2 years, we had traffic studies that we reviewed not even a year ago, and this was added to it, but just expressing my disappointment in the process.

Jim Little: I have a question. So, how long has the City had the traffic study?

Has the traffic study been in their hands for a month or two years or whatever?

Michael Boggs: The traffic study was submitted 8/17 with the plans and all the required documents for the submittal. We will work with the City on the review of that, you know, through the traffic engineer.

Paul Ford: I have a question. Maybe it's due to my hearing, but did I hear that there was a drainage issue or a traffic study issue or both?

Multiple People: Just a traffic study.

Jeff Steiling: Can someone summarize what the traffic study said? Has anybody read it? It was never provided to us.

Paul Ford: Or what the traffic study concern is so that it may or may not be properly addressed to the staff's satisfaction in relation to the traffic study.

Michael Morris (City Engineer): So on one of the previous phases that says that there was so many units, and this phase is larger and it says the AM peak is the same number. So you know, we know that is a discrepancy there. That was one of them. And then we've looked at it and it said, because that right there is we're looking at, hey, all the other impacts of, you know, because there is going to be additional traffic, then we want to make sure that all of the analysis that runs that follows along with that. Just basically it's an, you know, they basically used a number of units, multiply, multiplier, get you a number of peak hours and the peak hours is what their numbers from the previous development to the new development is the same on an AM peak. So we know that that is the wrong number. So we know that that is a discrepancy that needs resolved.

Paul Ford: So you're saying that the same number was used despite the known number of additional units?

Michael Morris: Yes.

Paul Ford: And your response? (To Michael Boggs)

Michael Boggs: Looking at that, we can look at the numbers, there may be an error, the number may go up, but I believe it probably will go down because I believe there was just a mistake there, I have to get with the traffic engineer to verify that. You know, it's not my stamp on that report. Anything that we do, if there's any kind of impact or anything that's going to be done, it's going to be done outside the development that we are looking at. So it's going to be street improvement or something that's outside of this development. So looking at that, I believe we go ahead and approve the preliminary plat of this and work through the traffic study through the staff. Right now the traffic study shows no impact to the surrounding. You know, no change from what's existing out there now, but looking at those extra numbers, there could be or there could not be. I mean, like I said, it could go either way, but it's again, those impacts would be constructed outside the limits of what we are looking at as far as phase six and phase seven. We're not going to change anything about phase six and phase seven to make improvements for the traffic.

Paul Ford: So am I right that this is a preliminary approval and it will come back for a final approval?

Multiple People: Yes, after the construction.

Paul Ford: After the construction of the streets or after the construction of the streets and the units?

Michael Boggs: It's construction of the streets. We have to come back through for site plan approval for each of the site plans for the lots. This traffic study is for phases six and seven to get this constructed.

Lonnie Roberts: So now that we've had the discussion, do the commissioners feel comfortable proceeding?

Lenny Hogan: My address is 4122 Forest Hill. I have a retention pond on the end of there. If they build up any of that, I'm going to have a pond in my backyard. I've got a retention pond that there's water that's still running through that was from the last big rain. If they build the lot up, they're going to put the water on the other gentleman there on Craighead Forest Rd. And the next thing, there's about 8 houses on Forest Hill there that is not on City sewer. Without any type of utility easements there, we'll be left to dry for no City sewer forever. You need to go by there and look at what they're talking about doing with all the trees there, doing away with. That was me as a citizen. Then I'm here as a representative of the Nettleton School District. I'm on the school board at Nettleton and we're concerned with that many houses built right now the buses have to stop on Craighead Forest Road. The school district is concerned with all the cul-de-sacs and stuff up there we can get school buses up there for the safety of the children. Thank you all.

Michael Boggs: Just to address a couple of those comments, we will look at, we'll make sure to ensure that the water from the West will pass through our development getting the system to route out. Looks like on lot 12, on the North side of lot 12 there's a sewer, he's meant to run sewer to the West to the backside of the lots there, so if sewer ever needs to be extended out there's a way to do that. There are also in phase seven in the cul-de-sac lot there's another sewer stub that to the West there between lots 9 and 8, so sewer is being addressed in that situation. The cul-de-sacs are 50 foot diameter, back of curve, back of curves. So when it's constructed it will be above handle. That's required for fire code so fire trucks can turn around so school buses will be able to make that same turn. Everything meets the requirements there to address those concerns. Again, the drainage issue will be addressed through the construction.

Paul Ford: In regard to the school buses, are they able to make a radius turn there if there are residents parked on the street?

Michael Boggs: One of the two comments that I had for this project, since we're doing 27 foot back at curve back at curve, we put a note on my plan saying no parking on the street allowed, so there should be no parking on the street, but again, the fire code requires a 48 foot radius or 96 foot back of curve back of curve, we go ahead and do a full 50 foot back of curve back of curve for the radius, so you have a 100-foot diameter cul-de-sac so the school buses and the fire trucks are able to make the turnaround in the cul-de-sac.

Paul Ford: So that means they could turn around even if there are residents parked on the perimeter of the cul-de-sac? They just often do.

Michael Boggs: This development will have all street parking, so there will be very minimal parking in the street, if any. And part of the plans, part of the design, there should be no parking in the street.

Paul Ford: I understand the issue of enforcement, but when there is an issue of lack of enforcement and awareness of normal people activities and just some of the cul-de-sacs I've been in and people seem to park on the streets, then that creates a concern. The school bus one creates more of a concern than anything else I've heard so far. So that's the reason I'm asking.

Michael Boggs: The streets are designed to handle the school bus making the turn. What I can say, I can't talk to anything else.

Lonnie Roberts: Derrel, do you have staff comments assuming we don't get a table?

Patty Lack: The question here is whether you guys table this because of the traffic study. You know, if it hasn't been properly reviewed, I see no reason why we continue right now from what Mr. Smith has said.

A motion was made by Paul Ford, seconded by Kevin Bailey, that this matter be Tabled . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Kevin Bailey;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford;Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Absent: 2 - Jimmy Cooper and Monroe Pointer

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

8. Rezoning

[RZ-23-09](#)

REZONING: Hancock Road

Dale and Darlene Wood are requesting a rezoning from I-2, general industrial district, to RS-2, single family residential district. This request is for 10 acres located west of 7520 Hancock Road.

Attachments: [Rezoning Application-Hancock Rd](#)
 [Hancock Road Rezoning Plat](#)
 [Notification Receipt](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

Dale Wood (Proponent): I'm Dale Wood, I'm requesting a rezoning for 10 acres on Hancock Road from I-2 to RS-2.

Lonnie Roberts: So, based on our discussion yesterday, that kind of clarified a lot for me, you're going to build one residence on the 10 acres, is that correct?

Dale Wood: That is correct, yes.

Lonnie Roberts: City Planner, have comments?

Derrel Smith: Yes sir, we've reviewed it and we would recommend approval based on the following conditions:

1. The proposed site plan should satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current storm water 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 planning department approval in the future.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, and with this being a rezoning request, is there anyone here to give public comments on this rezoning request? If not, I'll open up for commissioner questions or comments.

Paul Ford: Question for Derrel, if we approve it to the residential zoning, with the proponent telling us what his intentions are, is there any limit? Because I noticed in the staff summary that I reviewed before the meeting that it didn't meet the City planning if it might be zoned and then want to put in 40 lots.

Derrel Smith: In RS-2, the minimum lot size is half an acre. So if he wants to put in 20 lots, he can still put in 20 lots.

Paul Ford: So can we put a condition on this rezoning that it not be made that in light of his statement, or does that violate the process?

Derrel Smith: I don't think you can put a condition on the rezoning.

Dale Wood: So there's no City sewer. The nearest sewer is two, two-and-a-half miles away from this property.

Michael Morris: And another thing, the Health Department when you do a 10 acre they do a 10 acre exemption for the sewer. So that's why it's 10 acres. So he can get an exemption for sewer.

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

Aye: 6 - Kevin Bailey;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford;Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Absent: 2 - Jimmy Cooper and Monroe Pointer

RZ-23-13

REZONING: 5601 Pacific Road

Southard Construction, LLC is requesting a rezoning from R-2, multifamily medium density district, to RM-12, residential multifamily. This request is for 7.58 acres located at 5601 Pacific Road.

Attachments:

Application
Rezoning Plat
Mail Cert. Receipt
Sign Photos
Staff Summary

Garrett Dunham (Proponent): Garrett Dunham, I am here with Fisher Arnold on behalf of Southern Construction LLC. We are seeking a rezoning from R-2 to

RM-12 simply to be able to use the property to put multiple units on the property instead of subdividing the property. So using a multi-family usage, which is prohibited in R-2 however is permissible in RM-12.

Lonnie Roberts: City Planner, do we have any comments?

Derrel Smith: Yes sir, we recommend approval with the following conditions that the proposed site plan shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current storm water drainage design manual and floodplain regulations regarding any new construction. The final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning department prior to the redevelopment of the property and any change of use shall be subject to Planning department approval in the future.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, I'll open this one to public discussion, is there anyone here to give public comments?

Penny Newton: Penny Newton, 5701 Pacific. I would like to ask that this be tabled and the reason why I'd like it to be tabled is because they did send me a certified letter and on this letter it says that this meeting is going to be Tuesday the 19th at 5:30. And I have spoken with several other property owners there and they wanted to be at this meeting night but they had further obligations with the school. I mean, we don't want any apartments there and I know that it's zoned for apartments, but we don't want any extra apartments. We've already got apartments being built on the new MLK and we've got apartments being built on Kathleen and we just feel like there is an issue out there with drainage. There's an issue with crime out there, and we also feel like they've not been upfront, they've not asked for a neighborhood meeting with any of the neighbors around there. That's why I'm asking for it to be tabled because there are a lot of other property owners that would like to be here for this meeting.

Dennis Zolper: What if we could see the letter?

Paul Ford: That definitely says Tuesday the 19th.

Dennis Zolper: That makes it an easy decision for us, I move to table it to the 19th.

Lonnie Roberts: Well, we don't meet again until the 26th, so table it until the next meeting?

Heather Owens (City Attorney): It needs at least 15 days' notice, so it will have to be the next meeting after that.

Dennis Zolper: Mr. Chairman, I believe the developer should re-send all of the letters with the next date which will be the first meeting in October. But I believe the developer should send these notices back out so everyone knows exactly when they should be up here so they can have a voice in the matter.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper, seconded by Paul Ford, that this matter be Tabled . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Kevin Bailey;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford;Jim Little and Dennis Zolper

Absent: 2 - Jimmy Cooper and Monroe Pointer

9. Staff Comments

10. Adjournment

