



# City of Jonesboro

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

## Meeting Minutes - Final Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, March 13, 2012

5:30 PM

900 West Monroe

---

### 1. Call to order

### 2. Roll Call

**Present** 7 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White; Jim Scurlock and Beverly Nix

**Absent** 2 - Brian Dover and Ron Kelton

### 3. Approval of minutes

**MIN-12:020**

Approval of the MAPC Minutes for February 14, 2012

**Attachments:** [MAPC Minutes February 14, 2012 Draft](#)

**A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Joe Tomlinson, that the minutes be approved as noted. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White and Jim Scurlock

**Absent:** 3 - Brian Dover; Ron Kelton and Beverly Nix

### 4. Preliminary Subdivisions

### 5. Final Subdivisions

PP-12-05

FP- 12-01 Abigail Crossing II- Final Subdivision

Mr. Mark Morris requestts MAPC approval off a Final Subdivision Plan  
Locatton: North off Flemon Rd, South off Ridgeway Circle Haley Lane (Friendly  
Hope Crossings I & II)  
Lotts: 14Tottal

**Attachments:** [Abigail\\_FinalSubdivisionDrawings](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

**Carlos Wood presented on behalf of the applicant asking for approval of the Final. Mr. Spriggs stated that the plans are in compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance.**

**A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White and Jim Scurlock

**Absent:** 3 - Brian Dover; Ron Kelton and Beverly Nix

PP-12-06

FP 12-02: Dogwood Acres Subdivision Phase III- Final Subdivision

Scott Throgmartn requestts MAPC approval off 16 lott Preliminary Subdivision  
**Locaton :** Eastt off Paragould Dr Northt off Prospectt Rd Northt off Natthan Drive  
(Dogwood Acres)

**Attachments:** [Dogwood Phase III Final Subdivision Drwgs.](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

**George Hamman, Civilogic, presented on behalf of the applicant asking for approval of the Final. He is working with Engineering on some last minute questions. Mr. Spriggs stated that the plans are in compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance.**

**A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be approved. The motion carried by the following vote.**

**Aye:** 6 - Margaret Norris; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White; Jim Scurlock and Beverly Nix

**Absent:** 2 - Brian Dover and Ron Kelton

[PP-12-07](#)

FP 12-03: Barrington Park Phase VI- Final Subdivision

**Jim Abel requests MAPC approval of a 15 lot Final Subdivision Plan.**

**Locaton : South of Woodsprings Rd., South of Annadale Dr./Cir., Off Farmingtton  
Dr. (South off Barringtton Park Phase)V**

**Attachments:**     [BarringtonPark\\_FinalSubdivisionDrawings](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

**Carlos Wood presented on behalf of the applicant asking for approval of the Final. Mr. Spriggs stated that the plans are in compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance.**

**A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by Jim Scurlock, that this matter be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Margaret Norris; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White; Jim Scurlock and Beverly Nix

**Absent:** 2 - Brian Dover and Ron Kelton

**6. Conditional Use**

[CU-12-03](#)

Condittonal Use: Shadreka Hardison requestts MAPC approval off a Condittonal Use Approval wittthin an R1 Single Family Disttrictt ffor a Familjyn-home Day Care att property locatted at 605 Freeman Sttreett

**Attachments:**     [Application](#)  
[605 Freeman\\_Aerial Vicinity Map](#)  
[Staff Report](#)

**Shadreka Hardison presented her request to the MAPC for a Conditional Use for a daycare.**

**Mr. Spriggs summarized the Staff Report findings. He noted that this is an R-1 Single Family District. Details on the home were noted. All issues of concern were listed such as fencing in the area for child play to be in compliance with the state rules and regulations. Staff has no issues with the request with a maximum of 8 children. The applicant agrees to stagger the time of drop-off/pick-up to minimize traffic impact. Ms. Hardison concurred.**

**Ms. Nix asked what the typical procedure is for notifying the neighbors. Mr. Spriggs explained the ordinance requirements for Conditional Uses, having notified all residential owners within 200 ft. of the subject property as well as the legal ad requirements. All were done in this case.**

**A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be approved subject to Staff conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 6 - Margaret Norris; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White; Jim Scurlock and Beverly Nix

**Absent:** 2 - Brian Dover and Ron Kelton

**CU-12-04**

Central Arkansas Land Development LLC requests MAPC approval for a Conditional Use Application to install a communications tower ~~606~~ Gladiolus Drive (Parcel located at the far west terminus off Gladiolus Dr) in C-3 General Commercial District

**Attachments:**     [Application](#)  
                              [Staff Summary CU12-04 Central Arkansas Land Development Survey](#)  
                              [Site Plan Drawings](#)  
                              [AT&T Letter](#)

Mr. Randy Alberia, Arkansas Land Development Co. - Applicant, presented the case requesting MAPC approval. Mr. Spriggs presented the staff findings of the monopole cellular tower. The Zoning is C-3 General Commercial. The proposal is in compliance of all setbacks and screening requirements. Mr. Alberia concurred.

Mr. Spriggs noted also that there is a need of coverage on the AT&T network in this area. The conditions were read.

Ms. Nix asked what the tower will look like. Mr. Alberia noted that it is a monopole and will not have any supports; you cannot see any antennas: Nothing obtrusive. It is a clean and slick white pole. The notifications were questioned. Mr. Spriggs noted that the case was advertised and notices were sent to everyone within 200 ft.

Mr. Hoelscher asked about future changes or modifications. Mr. Spriggs stated that is very rare. Mr. Tomlinson asked about proximity to the existing building. Mr. Alberia noted that it will be to the northwest of that building.

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Joe Tomlinson, that this matter be approved with the conditions stipulated. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 6 - Margaret Norris; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White; Jim Scurlock and Beverly Nix

**Absent:** 2 - Brian Dover and Ron Kelton

**7. Rezonings**

[RZ-12-02](#)

**NO NEW INFORMATION RECEIVED- AS OF 5/8/2012**

Kevin Sarttn requestts MAPC consideratton off a rezoning requestt ffor property locatedt at 404 N. Second St/300 W. Gordon, bettween Gordon Sttreett and Allen Stt ffor 0.26 acres: A requestt to rezone propertyt ffrom 3RMultt-family to C3 General Commercial Disttrictt

**Attachments:**     [RZ12\\_02 Application](#)  
                              [Kevin Sartin Rezoning Plat](#)  
                              [Staff Summary RZ12\\_02 Sartin](#)

**Mr. Tim Sartin presented his request to the MAPC. He purchased property back to Second Street with the exception of one property. There are 4 or 5 houses left on that street. He is trying to buy all of the vacant lots. There is one house that is empty and they are about to tear that house down. He would like to add it to the rest of his commercial lots and fence it in, to allow his employees area to park.**

**Mr. Sartin stated he has been there for 35 years; the business was first opened by his father. They want to use it for parking in the daytime. There are two houses across the street.**

**Mr. Spriggs summarize the Staff findings in the report. The request is not consistent with the Land Use Plan which recommends high density single family. The street right of ways are 50 ft. in that area as oppose to the 60 ft. requirement. We provided the standards for the C-3 as stated in the report, in terms of setbacks and the list of uses permitted. We attempted to explain to the applicant the need to narrow down the list to what is being requested.**

**The applicant is requesting a change to a C-3 because the lot that is adjacent to his other property is also C-3. Currently, the site is vacant and the applicant is requesting that all of his property be tied together, in order to use it for parking and storage. Immediately north of the site is a residential property, commercial property to the east, as well as other residential property to the west.**

**The Street setback for C-3 is 25 feet for Nonresidential uses, the Rear setback for Nonresidential uses is 20 feet, and the Interior side setback is 10 feet for Nonresidential uses.**

**The following list of permitted uses is listed in the Zoning Ordinances of which most may be considered undesirable in a residential neighborhood: Animal Care General, Animal Care Limited, Automated Teller Machine, Bank or Financial Institution, Bed and Breakfast, Carwash, Cemetery, Church, College or University, Convenience Store, Day Car Limited, Day Care General, Funeral Home, Golf Course, Government Service, Hospital, Hotel or Motel, Library, Medical Service/Office, Museum, Nursing Home, Office General, Parking Lot Commercial, Parks and Recreation, Pawn Shops, Post Office, Recreation/Entertainment Indoor, Recreation/Entertainment Outdoor, Recreational Vehicle Park, Restaurant Fast-Food, Restaurant General, Retail/Service, Safety Services, School/Elementary/Middle/High, Service Station, Sign Off-Premises, Utility Minor, Vehicle and Equipment Sales, Vehicle**

Repair General, Vehicle Repair Limited, Vocational School, Agricultural Farmer's Market.

Due to the proximity to single family homes in the area, Staff has major reservation of mixing a commercial storage yard in the requested fashion. Furthermore, the request causes a small island of R-3 Multi-family property (50' X75'), which would represent poor planning. With the summary above, Staff cannot support this petition as submitted.

The applicant has demonstrated to Staff a need to use the subject property for parking of employees, and to utilize the land for the parking of semi-truck trailers by which he ships in tires for his business use. The scope of this petition should be limited by means of a Limited Use Overlay (L.U.O.); and, it should be specified clearly to the MAPC which uses will ultimately occur on the premises. Consideration for the residential uses to remain is important as well.

The current parcel has been covered with some amount of gravel and is currently not in compliance with city codes for the parking of vehicles or trucks nor is it in compliance with the allowable uses for R-3 Multi-family Residential. Any approvals for this site for commercial will have to follow all City ordinances related to commercial parking lots.

There are number of questions that need to be answered as recommended by Staff. Sample motions were given.

Mr. Tomlinson: If we approve this, will it be a deviation of our Land Use Plan. Mr. Spriggs stated yes. Mr. Tomlinson added that the C-3 District is pretty wide open in terms of a number of uses. Mr. Spriggs noted that there were issues raised by residents abutting the property who have complained to Code Enforcement.

Mr. Sartin: Stated that that owner wants to sit on his front porch and watch to see when he put stuff back there. He calls the City when he can't see through there. His son is Ray Prunty, Mr. Sartin added.

Mr. Sartin commented on the alley way noting that they gave him the alley way. It is not there anymore.

Mr. Spriggs raised questions of the truck storage and duration. Mr. Sartin stated that they are there no more that 2 days. He noted that he could haul in 1 a month instead of 2. Mr. Sartin stated that he has property on Cate St. where he has the other trailers.

Ms. Nix gave comments of her concerns; it is inconsistent with the Land Use Plan and it is surrounded by residential area. She noted that she understands his plans but she feels that he is about 2 years away.

Mr. Scurlock concurred and agreed with Ms. Nix; noting that he likes the idea of growing, but we have a park there. Until the people move away we are not representing the City, if we change the Zoning to Commercial.

Mr. Hoelscher: Tire storage, visually, is one of the worse hazardous storage being adjacent to the one house.

Mr. Spriggs: Do you have storage of tires on the outside on this parcel? Mr. Sartin: That is a yes and no question. We pick up at Gateway and 3 other big stores here. We go through it and put it on the ground and then bring it to the landfill. We then bought an additional trailer. They are not there more than an 8 hour period.

Mr. Hoelscher asked if the applicant could have parked commercial vehicles within the existing residential district. Mr. Spriggs replied, No. The code allows for shared parking; however, there are no adjacent properties with that opportunity. From a safety perspective Staff would not have issue with that. From an enforcement standpoint and for clarity, the preferred option is commercial zoning.

Mr. Hoelscher stated that he agrees with Ms. Nix in terms of procedures because of the existing residential. Mr. Sartin counted 9 residential properties and an unused park because of needles on the ground and people drinking over there. The property is in the Flood Plain.

Mr. Scurlock referred to the boundary of Lot 64 and suggested to have it squared up with Lot 65; and keep a buffer to the west. He noted that he is not comfortable in going to the extreme west with the adjacent houses.

Mr. Spriggs suggested to Mr. Sartin that he consider either a withdrawal or continuation to allow time to discuss with the surveyor and work out the details; and that he would speak with the neighboring owner of Lot 64 to weigh options there. The case can be resumed in the next meeting. That will cause a buffer to the west. The Commission was polled and concurred. Ms. Nix asked if this would make the Land Use Plan recommendation consistent. Mr. Spriggs replied no, however it could be justified with the buffer and he would be increasing the C-3 area. Mr. Sartin asked if he could install the fence around his property.

A motion was made by Beverly Nix, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be tabled to allow time for the noted items to be clarified. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 6 - Margaret Norris; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; John White; Jim Scurlock and Beverly Nix

**Absent:** 2 - Brian Dover and Ron Kelton

## 8. Staff Comments

Shameka Williams

Requests MAPC Approval:

Location: 213 N. Main Street, Building A- Daycare request for additional children.

Mr. Spriggs presented the request. A conditional use was approved previously at the location for a daycare with the capacity of 24 children with 3 shifts. Ms. Williams is requesting an additional 6 kids in compliance with the rules of D.H.S.

Ms. Nix asked for the area of the building: Ms. Williams responded that it is 2,000 S.F. She has made changes to the front desk area that led to D.H.S. approval of additional children.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that subject to all fire department and code compliance, it would still have to be approved by D.H.S. He stated that he did not have any problems with the request.

A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by Jim Scurlock, that this matter be placed on the floor for consideration.

Mr. Hoelscher asked for clarification on the numbers. He stated that he sees parking issues with having to accommodate 30 cars.

Ms. Williams stated that there is a rear gate access. Ms. Nix asked where the children's play area would be. Ms. Williams stated that the land owner is fencing in that area. Ms. Spriggs stated that D.H.S. controls the details required of the play area. They are strict on those requirements.

Mr. Scurlock stated that MAPC's role is to see if it will fit into the Zoning and Land Use. I don't see it being a neighborhood problem. Mr. Roberts: We limited it to only 24, because of D.H.S. rules.

Mr. Spriggs stated that the MAPC is specifically looking at the Zoning. This was formerly an Industrial District. Mr. Spriggs added that the use was already approved by the MAPC. The modification necessitates it coming back to the MAPC. Mr. Hoelscher further explained issues with the number of cars.

The motion carried by the following vote of denial:

**Aye:** 3 - Margaret Norris; Joe Tomlinson and Jim Scurlock

**Nay:** 2 - Paul Hoelscher and Beverly Nix

**Absent:** 3 - Brian Dover; Ron Kelton and John White

## 9. Adjournment