

BZA Meeting Tuesday June 3rd, 2026

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present (3): Kevin Bailey, Matthew Millerd, Doug Gilmore

Absent (1): Rick Miles, Casey Caples

3. Approval of minutes

MIN-26:048 MINUTES April 21st, 2026 BZA

A motion was made by Matthew Millerd, seconded by Kevin Bailey, that the minutes be approved, the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (3): Kevin Bailey, Doug Gilmore, Matthew Millerd

Nay (0)

Absent (2): Rick Miles, Casey Caples

4. Appeal Cases

VR-26-11 **VARIANCE: 1601 Granger Dr**

The applicant WCMC, LLC is requesting a variance from the subdivision regulations for the creation of two single family residential lots at 1601 Granger Dr

Doug Gilmore (Chair): Item number one, WCMC, LLC what's going on?

Unable to Transcribe

WCMC, LLC(Proponent): Our goal is to create two single family residential lots. They'll construct up a home on each lot.

Doug Gilmore: Okay, I can understand that. The lot won't be the proper size when you plat this into two?

WCMC, LLC: On that drawing in front you, there's property to the north and there's an existing house, and to follow the subdivision regulations we would have to include that in our survey and then we'd be plotting three lots instead of the two lots that we're trying to create. Because the subdivision regulations say three lots or more is considered a subdivision and then you get into

stormwater management. So, we'd have to do a detention pond to even serve the existing house. It's owned by somebody else, potentially a sidewalk in front of that existing house. Then, they would have to sign the survey. So, we're giving, a neighbor's signature authority, so to speak. So, we're trying to get a variance to create two single-family lots, on that .44 acre tract.

Doug Gilmore: If that property isn't owned by them, then why would they need to do?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): This was originally one piece of property.

Doug Gilmore: Right.

Derrel Smith: And, they did a lot split. Well, you can do a lot split without planning to go to commission and without meeting subdivision requirements. After it's sold, then they turned around and tried to split the lot again. So, we don't have any time limit on that split. So, what we're finding, is some people are doing a lot split, turn around and sell on the other lot, and then they're trying to do a split again. To get around the subdivision requirements.

Doug Gilmore: Yes, but this has been split for years.

Derrel Smith: I don't know how long it's been split.

Doug Gilmore: How long has this been split?

WCMC, LLC: About 14 years, was the previous plat.

Derrel Smith: We had talked one time about putting a time limit on a lot split. We never really got..

Doug Gilmore: Just X amount of years. To try to avoid them?

Derrel Smith: To avoid doing this.

Doug Gilmore: Right, got you. Okay, questions from the panel?

Kevin Bailey (Board): Mr. Derrel if we granted them this variance, would we or have we already set a precedent of doing this in the past?

Derrel Smith: We've done one other of these that I can remember in the last, probably year. The thing being, that with there being no time limit on that, that's where, we need to come up with a time limit. And I would take any suggestions from y'all as far as on what you think a proper time that should be, before that second lot is considered not part of the original tract.

Matthew Millerd: I have a question Derrel, if they make the split like they want to, would both lots have to conform with our policies?

Derrel Smith: Both lots would have to conform to the zoning requirements, yes.

Doug Gilmore: Are you going to split the lot down the middle?

WCMC LLC: Yes, I think Anik (Senior Planner), would be able to pull that up, but we're going to split that down the middle and each lot would be .22 acres and each lot would have a single family home and we're in the middle of a rezoning. I know that's different from this meeting but we're in the middle of a rezoning, it's currently multi-family, RM-8, and we're zoning it to a single family like RS-5. That's going to Planning Commission and it's in the process of going to all three readings at the council level. But that's the rezoning aspect.

Unable to Translate

Doug Gilmore: Any other questions?

Kevin Bailey: So, the two lots that are proposed, are they being sold? Are they being built on by the current owner of the lot?

WCMC LLC: So, I've worked with this builder and he builds homes on those lots. He

Kevin Bailey: Right, I'm trying to find the hardship for a positive vote.

WCMC LLC: I think it's that property north of us, it has a different owner. It's been 14 years and then making that existing home and lot north of us, part of the subdivision, it triggers things like sidewalks, stormwater management for a home that's been there for decades and decades.

Unable to Transcribe

Matthew Millerd (Board): I make a motion to approve the variance.

Doug Gilmore: Okay, second?

Kevin Bailey: Second.

A motion was made by Matthew Millerd, seconded by Kevin Bailey, that the matter be approved, and the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (3): Kevin Bailey, Doug Gilmore, Matthew Millerd

Nay (0)

Absent (2): Casey Caples, Rick Miles

VR-26-12 VARIANCE: 803 Hubble Cv

The applicant Jerod Monette is requesting a variance to resolve the setback issue at 803 Hubble Cv

Doug Gilmore (Chair): Jerod Monette?

David James (Proponent): I'm actually David James, Jerod Monette is here, I'm the agent on this.

Doug Gilmore: Okay, go ahead and give us your name and address and then speak.

David James: David James, 442 CR 4242 Jonesboro, Arkansas. The variance that we're asking for is basically just an acceptance, in 1973 the original developer did not complete the cul-de-sac that was supposed to be there. So, whoever constructed the house just went with the setback off of the road that was current. So, we're in the process of trying to get the house sold. Something came up on the title and so, the title requested us to get a variance and acceptance from y'all saying hey we're good. We can clear the title and give a clear and marketable title to the next available buyer.

Doug Gilmore: Basically the setback on the front of the home, towards the cul-de-sac?

David James: Correct, yes sir. As you can see, the front porch is about a foot and a half away from, just so we're clear, that cul-de-sac is not there. It's not where it says Hubbell Cv is, that is where the actual road is.

Doug Gilmore: So, you got the actual Hubbell Cv, but the cul-de-sac itself has never been developed.

David James: It was never constructed. Correct, yes sir. And they're not requesting to change anything. They're just simply wanting a clear and marketable title because we're currently under contract to close and then, of course, this popped up and we wanted to do our due diligence to make sure everything was clean.

Doug Gilmore: When was this house constructed?

David James: We are not sure on the actual date of construction, we have owned this house for 4 or 5 years and it wasn't caught on the title then. Now, it's on the market. It's under contract currently and then, when they requested a survey, that's when this came to knowledge.

Unable to Transcribe

Derrel Smith (City Planner): If y'all decide to grant this variance that will clear up the title, but if I was the property owner, I would start working to get that right of way abandoned. I would try to at least get that portion of the right of way, abandoned that way you're not a foot and a half off the-

Board: Right.

Derrel Smith: This is a little different, but we have several where they started the subdivision, they built about half a road and then they didn't finish it. We've had lots that are platted lots, that don't have a street in front of it, that we've had a look at variances for curb and gutter and sidewalks, that type of thing. So, everyone of them are a little different but it seems like back in the seventies, that was pretty prevalent. To just stub out a street and start building houses around it.

Kevin Bailey (Board): So, the only thing we're looking at today is the variance for the setback.

Derrel Smith: That's correct.

Matthew Millerd (Board): If we were to say no to this, what would be the recourse for this? How would they ever be able to sell the property, tear down half the house?

Derrel Smith: I mean, an appeal from the BZA goes to Circuit Court. So, that would be their next step. But, I mean either that, or work to abandon the right of way itself. This is the quickest option to get the title work completed and get a sale done for the owner.

David James: And this will be the primary residence for the gentleman that's purchasing the house. It's a primary residence, it's not an investor and he's just wanting to move into it and call it home.

Kevin Bailey: Derrel, we can't tie the abandonment of the right of way to this variance, can we?

Derrel Smith: Once you do the variance that's it. I mean, there will be about a foot and half or so, that'll be the new setback for this building.

Doug Gilmore: It'd be up to the landowner to get that abandoned?

Derrel Smith: If they ever wanted to do anything else, they would have to abandon that right of way. If they ever wanted to add anything to the front of the house, it would have to be.

Unable to Transcribe

Doug Gilmore: Any other questions?

Kevin Bailey: Mr. Chair, I move that we place the variance on the floor for a vote.

Matthew Millerd: Second.

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey, seconded by Matthew Millerd, that the matter be approved, and the motion was PASSED with the following vote:

Aye (3): Kevin Bailey, Matthew Millerd, Doug Gilmore

Nay (0)

Absent (2): Casey Caples, Rick Miles

5. Staff Comments

6. Adjournment

Meeting was Adjourned.