



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, April 9, 2024

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

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

Absent 2 - Monroe Pointer and Dennis Zolper

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-24:034](#) Minutes: March 26, 2024 MAPC

Attachments: [3.26.24 MAPC Minutes](#)

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Jeff Steiling, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

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

Absent: 2 - Monroe Pointer and Dennis Zolper

4. Miscellaneous Items

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

PP-24-03 Preliminary Subdivision: Wolf Trails

McAlister Engineering is seeking preliminary subdivision approval for Wolf Trails Subdivision; 30 lots on 7 acres. The site is located at 305 N. Airport and within the RS-8, single-family residential zoning district.

Attachments: Application
Subdivision Plans
WOLF TRAILS DRAINAGE REPORT
Staff Report

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): The first item we had for tonight was a preliminary subdivision of Wolf Trails, and we're going to leave that tabled per request of

the applicant.

Tabled

[PP-24-07](#)

Preliminary Subdivision: Southwest Village Phase 1

Mark Morris is seeking preliminary subdivision approval for Southwest Village Phase 1; 64 lots on 27.4 acres. This property is located in the R-1, single family medium density district.

Attachments: [Application](#)
[SOUTHWEST VILLAGE PHS PRELIM](#)
[Staff Report](#)

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): The first item we have open tonight is a preliminary subdivision this is Southwest Village Phase 1. Do we have the proponent for this item?

Mark Morris (Proponent): Good morning, my name is Mark Morris, I'm the owner of this property and we are seeking preliminary approval on 64 lots.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, anything you want to add at this point?

Mark Morris: This is going to be the first phase of 7 or 8 phases.

Lonnie Roberts: City planner do you have the staff comments for this one?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, we reviewed it, it does meet the requirements of the subdivision code, and we would recommend approval.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, so I'll open up for commissioner questions for the proponent or the city staff. Or I'll entertain a motion.

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

Aye: 5 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling and Jim Little

Absent: 3 - Monroe Pointer;Paul Ford and Dennis Zolper

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

[CU-24-04](#)

Conditional Use: 2109 Flatrock Cove

Amy Soto is requesting conditional use approval for an in-home daycare. This property is located in the R-1, single family medium density district.

Attachments: [Application](#)
[Certified Mail](#)
[Lot 3 - Block B](#)
[Sign Photo](#)
[Staff Summary](#)

Nelson Soto (Proponent): Hello, I will be representing my wife, Amy Soto, Nelson Soto.

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): Alright and tell us what you would like to do there.

Nelson Soto: So we would like to have a small in home childcare, it's going to be roughly 8 kids, and we're requesting approval for that.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, city planner do you have any staff comments on this one?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, if you decide to approve it, we would put the following conditions on the conditional use permit, that upon issuance, all required local and statewide permits and inspections be applied for and obtained, the site shall be limited to a maximum of 8 children, and child drop off and parking shall not occur on Rockport Drive or Flatrock Trail.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, and before I open up for commissioner comments is there anyone here who has public comments on this conditional use request for Flatrock Trail. Okay, well I'll open up for commissioner questions or comments.

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Mr. Chairman I will say what I said in the pre-meeting yesterday, I am not happy with the way they drop off, have to pull in the driveway and back out.

Nelson Soto: Can you repeat that I'm having a hard time hearing.

Jimmy Cooper: You have on drive going in, where they'd have to pull in and back into traffic, and I am not in favor of that. That's just me.

Nelson Soto: We are offering transportation and on the far right side where my pickup truck is, will be an extra space so we can park our own cars and they could park in there. In our parking spaces.

Lonnie Roberts: Now are you saying, you've added on to the driveway?

Nelson Soto: We will create another parking spot for our own vehicles, and normally childcare, not everybody comes in at once, there's only 8 kids, and we can phone them to come at different times, but normally people don't come in at the same time to pick up their kids.

Lonnie Roberts: Any other commissioners have questions for the applicant at this time?

Kevin Bailey (Commission): He just said 8 kids, is that by conditional use or is that the amount he's allowed or is that?

Derrel Smith: Maximum that's allowed in residential.

Kevin Bailey: Maximum that's allowed, okay.

Lonnie Roberts: Anybody else have a question or is anybody ready with a motion?

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey, seconded by Jim Little, that this matter be Approved . The motion FAILED with the following vote.

Nay: 6 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford and Jim Little

Absent: 2 - Monroe Pointer and Dennis Zolper

8. Rezoning

[RZ-24-10](#)

Rezoning: 607 Airport Road

MC Paperchase, LLC is seeking a rezone from R-1, single family medium density to RM-16, residential multifamily. This request is for 3.28 acres located at 607 Airport Road.

(This item was originally submitted under RZ-24-04 and tabled at the March 26th meeting.)

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Cert. Receipts](#)
 [Deed](#)
 [Plat](#)
 [Sign Photo](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Letter from Bill Smith](#)

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): I'll entertain a motion to untable this for discussion.

Jimmy Cooper (Commission): Cooper, I'll make a motion to untable it.

Lonnie Roberts: Motion to untable do I hear a second?

Jeff Steiling (Commission): Steiling, second.

Lonnie Roberts: Motion and second all in favor say Aye.

Commission: Aye

Lonnie Roberts: Anyone Opposed? So we are untabled so take it away.

John Easley (Proponent): John Easley with Associated Engineering, on behalf of the owners, the owners have met and discussed, revised and request a RM-8 zoning request from our discussion two weeks ago. They are in agreement with the RM-8.

Lonnie Roberts: Is that it?

John Easley: That's it.

Lonnie Roberts: So we're amending it to a RM-8 application so, city planner do you have staff comments?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes sir, we would recommend approval with the following stipulations:

1. The proposed site shall satisfy all requirements of the city engineer, all requirements of the current storm water drainage design manual and flood plain regulations regarding any new construction.
2. The 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: So, with this rezoning request do we have anyone here to give public comments regarding this request? Yes sir, if you would please make your way over to the mic, state your name the record.

David Handlework (Opposed): David Handlework at 3817 Marchbanks Estates which is the subdivision south of this property, if it pleases the chairman I have some handouts to give to the committee. So, that will be some documentation that I will use for some comments as I go through some narrative here. I'm speaking in opposition of this rezoning, and Imma go off of 4 points, as far as our opposition. The first really goes to the documentation that came with y'all's packet we're really just looking at the zoning if you go to page 7, or pull it up there's a criteria that's part of a table when you evaluate any rezoning and of course whenever I was a part of this commission this was one thing that we looked at. And evaluated as well, when you look at rezonings. Two of the 6 criteria are not met, and some of this rezoning request is to be part of this. But the one I want to point out is, this whole area is really heavy residential R-1, there is existing properties there, that I acknowledge, anybody else who may be in opposition would acknowledge, but this is a district we feel like needs to stay R-1, and to keep the integrity of that, all of the development that's planned, for this area of town, even south on Airport Road, is looking at R-1

and so I just oppose that zoning to bring more multi-use in. I would also question the criteria E & F and how that might be accessed. So any type of heavy R-1 district where you put any type of multi-family, close to it, you're going to change the valuation of properties, that's a fact, now if the property values and in an area with R-1 is suppressed which is not the case in this area that could be that multi-family could actually elevate it. So, I'm not discounting that putting a multi-family in an R-1 district devalues the property but in this case it would. Point number 2 Airport road safety. So, it's our understanding the folks who have reviewed this, my understanding looking at the last minutes and the video, I wasn't able to be here for the last meeting, that one of the primary entrances is coming off of Airport Road, for this development. If you live in this area you know Airport Road, is a heavy concentrated traffic road, and it's even shown in your packet on page 4, on the master street plan as a minor arterial, in the paragraph under function, I want to highlight the statement, since a minor arterial is a high volume road, a minimum of 4 traffic lanes is required, there's only 2 currently so adding a higher density of multi-family in this location is going to put, if we're going to a RM-8 somewhere around 24-26 units possible so if you say one car per unit, is the conservative number, the more likely number is that 1.5 or 1.2 number, so you're adding around 30-40 cars at times, in addition to density and if it was single-family it would be nowhere near that. The development of the overpass and also the recently reviewed, connector through Red Wolf Blvd. and ASU property coming out on Airport just north of the railroad tracks is going to add additional traffic. So all this additional traffic combined with the multi-family is going to create other issues. We in this area, I have personally seen with just the single family and with the multi-family that's there, an increase in pedestrian traffic on Airport Road, there's no sidewalk, so if we add more multi-family that's going to increase traffic, I applaud the lowering of the speed limit, I don't applaud when you get a ticket but I'm glad it's at least slowed down a little bit, for not just vehicular traffic but for pedestrians walking on the shoulder of that street. Point number 3, I already kind of covered that, I got ahead of myself, so Airport Road improvements are going to happen, and that's going to increase traffic on that road. The last point, I'm really concerned about the drainage, I handed out, to you some documents and I pulled that from the USGS type of plot plans, type of survey plans, phase 1 of 3 shows the development of the site, it's kind of an overview, it shows the area what is maybe not clear on that visual, there is a drainage channel, a waterway that leads up to this developed property. If you go to page 2 you'll see from some of the older GIS type of surveys and aerial maps there used to be a water retention area there. I'll talk about that a little bit in a second. That's no longer there because the roadway that used to Cricket Lane which is a private lane extended over to I think it's Hill Drive or maybe Vicky Lane, that was cut prior to my building of property on Marchbanks Estate or it was washed out, so it's no longer there but there still is a depression there. On page 3 it kind of gives a little bit better shaded area, is an approximation of this requested lot. On the screen you'll see over on the southwest area a little drainage channel comes out of that property. The history of this property may not bare a lot with rezoning requests but I think it's important. This is a Clorox bottle that predates 1960, the reason why it's here is that used to be either a barrel pit or a gravel pit, the reason I know this is because during my time at Arkansas State, there was an aerial photo of that area, that I had access to and when I bought this property on Marchbanks I looked into that area and it showed and even demarked a gravel pit, it's not a gravel pit anymore, over the years the

occupants that were on Cricket Lane, have told me it was filled and it was a dumpsite, the reason I know it's a dumpsite is there's trash that comes outta that. So, I have great concerns of what's there and what could be developed even if it's R-1 so I think that's a relevant issue but certainly if it's multi-family I think that it could be a challenge because that site has some challenges as far as development, for drainage, and what's underneath. That's all I have to say.

Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for your comments. Anyone else with to comment at this time? Yes sir, state your name for the record and your address please.

Thomas Horton (Opposed): Yeah, my name is Thomas Horton and I live at 3901 Marchbanks and I agree with the points that he made and mostly I just wanted to emphasize about the infrastructure on Airport Road and the traffic and as he said it's already a busy road, and I really think that, obviously I've never been on a commission. But I think that what we want to look at is, is this what is best for the city, especially for the area and if the infrastructure can't handle it than I don't see the benefit for the city, I don't know, what benefit rezoning would have. I don't know what all goes into your decision but I just want you to consider how it affects the people that live around there. And I just want to re-emphasize everything he said so, thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Thank you for your comments, anyone else? Okay, commissioners have any questions?

Kevin Bailey (Commission): Before we go back to the applicant, to John, can everybody who is here in opposition can you raise your hand? Besides the people who spoke? Okay thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Yes sir.

John Easley (Proponent): Well, the property as we have it right now is just over 3 and third acres, it's R-1, some quick calculations based on R-1 requirements this property could yield, 2 maybe 3 lots, as it is right now R-1, by the time you add in the right away that is required, you're more than 600 feet off of Airport Road. You're required to put in a 96 foot round about. Not to mention the drainage that leaves you an area of 8,000 square feet, you can get 2 maybe 3 lots, my opinion is maybe not the highest or the best but, the property itself lends itself to multi-family, simple reason, the right of way is not a requirement, you have a 24 foot driveway or aisle coming into it the owners also own the property on Hill Drive, one of our discussions in the past was to make a back exit entryway onto Hill Drive. That way in turn we can relieve any kind of overburden on Airport Road, you'll have Hill Drive back into Airport, but you'll also have Balding Lane down to the south. Drainage wise we have city requirements, I have to meet what comes off that property right now, I either have to meet it or make it less than what it is now. That requires retention facilities and other amenities. As far as Airport Road I don't know what they're going to do with it as far as infrastructure widening or anything, but the utilities are there and they can handle what's supposed to be coming in. As far as the history of the property, I really can't address that, I'm not aware of it. It's my opinion and the owner's opinion that the best use for this based on the way it's shaped is in fact multi-family.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, thanks for your comments on that. Commissioners have any questions for Mr. Easley while he's up here or city staff? Ready with a motion?

A motion was made by Jeff Steiling, seconded by Jim Little, that this matter be Approved . The motion FAILED with the following vote.

Aye: 1 - Jim Little

Nay: 5 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Absent: 2 - Monroe Pointer and Dennis Zolper

[RZ-24-05](#)

Rezoning: 2800 Industrial Drive

Ozark Civil Engineering Inc. is requesting a rezoning from I-1 and I-1 LUO, limited industrial district, to C-3, general commercial district. This request is for 6.7 acres.

Attachments: [3-14-24 SIGNED Rezone Application](#)
[3-11-24 Cover Letter](#)
[0554-ALTA SURVEY-FINAL-2.1.2024](#)
[Mail Receipts 2](#)
[Signs](#)
[Vesting Deeds](#)
[Vicinity Map](#)
[Staff Summary](#)

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): Do we have the proponent for the item?

Todd Butler (Proponent): Yes, I'm Todd Butler with Ozark Civil Engineering, representing the owners Brian and Mary Carolyn Marsh.

Lonnie Roberts: Have anything you'd like to add to that?

Todd Butler: No.

Lonnie Roberts: Then I'll open up for my city planner's staff comments on this request.

Derrel Smith (City Planner): We reviewed it and would recommend approval with the following conditions:

1. The site shall satisfy all requirements of the city engineer, all requirements of the current storm water drainage design manual and flood plain regulations regarding any new construction.
2. The 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 will be submitted to planning department in the future.
4. The site shall comply with all overlay district standards.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay with that I'll open up, with this being a rezoning request is there any public comments on the request at 2800 Industrial Drive? If not then I'll open up for commissioner questions.

Paul Ford (Commission): Can y'all roll on the screen real quick the green checks, or the red x's that typically go with this?

Monica Percy (Planner): One second to pull that up.

Paul Ford: Alright, thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, commission do you have any other questions or requests for information?

Jeff Steiling (Commission): I have one other question, Derrel in your comments you mentioned, that it comply with the overlay district. Is it a district or does it qualify for a certain number of feet off the interstate there, is that what you're referring to there?

Unable to transcribe

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Jim Little, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

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

Absent: 2 - Monroe Pointer and Dennis Zolper

[RZ-24-06](#)

Rezoning: 5415 Southwest Drive

Jeremy Moore is requesting a rezoning from R-1, single family medium density district, to C-3, general commercial district. This request is for 0.36 acres.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Plat](#)
 [Mail Receipts](#)
 [Signs Posted on Site](#)
 [Property Info](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)

Jeremy Moore (Proponent): Jeremy Moore, I'm the owner, looking to rezone it from residential to commercial, not only do I feel that this is best use of the property, it also coincides with the city's future land use map, which calls for everything to be commercial up and down Southwest Drive. You can look at the properties beside it that are all currently commercial, the new Sonic is across, the old Ford dealership across, the only other one would be the old Floyd house next door which is residential. I realize there is a house behind it, however if you look down Southwest drive you'll see other commercial properties which have residential housing behind it as well. The Dollar General, the bingo hall, all the properties up and down, even Sonic has residential property butting up to that. I just feel that it's the best use for that, especially since that's what the city calls for.

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): Alright is that it for now?

Jeremy Moore: Yes.

Lonnie Roberts: City planner do you have the staff comments on this one?

Derrel Smith (City Planner): Yes we do, Mr. Ford it does meet all 6 criteria, so we would recommend approval with the following stipulations:

1. The site shall satisfy all requirements of the city engineer, all requirements of the current storm water 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 planning department prior to any redevelopment of the property, any change of use shall be subject to planning department approval in the future.
3. The site shall comply with all overlay use standards.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright now with this rezoning request is there anybody here who would like to give public comments, on this request? Would you please state your name and address for the record?

Mary Tucker (Opposed): Good evening my name is Mary Tucker, and I live at 5321 Darr Hill Road, directly behind this property. I'd like to point out that the only way to develop this piece of property is to get a variance to move it closer to our home. I am adamantly opposed to this zoning he mentioned a coffee shop twice in his application but there are no utilities on this lot and it's too close to the traffic light for a driveway. We have also received a notification that Mr. Moore is requesting a variance, changing the rear setback to 5 feet. I feel bad that Mr. Moore purchased a piece of land that he can't use but it's not

my fault, and I shouldn't have to give up my property to fix this. Again, I don't want commercial property that close to my property. When we purchased this lot back in 2010 it was all residential, I respect the city's plan but without me giving up land, there isn't much that can be done to resolve this issue. I appreciate your time and respectfully ask that you deny this zoning request.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, thank you for your comments.

Mary Tucker: Thank you

Lonnie Roberts: Anyone else here to give comments, would you please come up and state your name and address for the record.

Steve Floyd (Opposed): Good evening my name is Steve Floyd I live at 5421 Southwest Drive, my sister is here also Lisa Boward, she lives at 5427 Southwest Drive. That is the two residences that border this property. My family has owned this property since the 1940s we've always either been R-1 or Agricultural one or the other. You have residential property to the west, residential property to the north, you have a subdivision behind the old tractor dealership. I'm like Ms. Tucker I'm sorry that there's not a lot he can do with his property, but again I'm like her, that's not my problem. My problem is that I have to live next to it and I mean does anybody here really want to live next to a food truck or a coffee house? I don't. I've also heard a shop building, being built there and I don't want that either. I think that if you vote yes for this, you're going to be hurting more people than you're helping. I think it's going to drastically effect the value of our property. We own 13 and half acres also that hooks on to our property that's all R-1. The commercial property that's down there now, if you'll drive by and look at it, you can look at where the tractor dealership was, it's like a state sales place or something like that and today it's not too bad, but most of the time when you drive by it looks terrible. There's junk everywhere. The Dollar General that's down there, yesterday I picked up a garbage sack that was full of trash, on my property from the Dollar General. And I do that just about every time I mow our property. And it's just we have enough commercial property in Valley View right now. We have restaurants we have what we need. There's mini storages there. We don't need anything else right now. And I respectfully ask that you deny this. Thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for your comments, anyone else?

Jonnie McNaff (Opposed): Hi, my name is Jonnie McNaff, I live at 2100 Paul Drive. We're situated behind the storage units and the Dollar General. I agree with the other two who have spoken as far as everything being residential. We were here not too long ago about a rezoning that was trying to take place next to the Floyd's house on the other side. And that was turned down because it is residential and anything you put there is going to impact all of the houses that are there. The one thing I haven't heard anyone speak to right now, is traffic. All of our kids go to Valley View and if you try to get to Valley View in the morning, there's a lot of traffic, Sonic is going to throw a monkey wrench into that also, but that lot is just not very big so if you're talking about people coming and going I'm not sure how you're going to do that, in any manner that's not going to impact traffic, only a daily basis. So, I'm definitely opposed to it. And my heart goes out to the people that are directly connected to that property, if this is allowed, because you know it's going to change their value a lot and just their enjoyment of their own property. Thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, thank you for your comments. We got time for about one more, anyone else? If not, we're going to open up and let the commissioners ask some questions.

Paul Ford (Commission): Is it correct that you have requested a variance for 5

feet in the rear line? Or is that incorrect?

Jeremy Moore (Proponent): No that is correct. But I appreciate Ms. Tucker's comments on the variance but that would be for another meeting, I'm just feel this is a straight rezoning, for that issue, regardless everything worth cause would be commercial and eventually if any of the other property is sold then it would have to be rezoned for that issue as well. A variance would be a totally separate issue to go along with it. But if I wanted to build a small shop building if I wanted to put in a fruit and vegetable stand or anything like that, low impact or high impact, which high impact would be very slim due to the size of the lot itself. It's still going to have to be rezoned to a commercial. When we look at best use, which I feel is what MAPC is here to do, I don't think we can say that best use for that piece of property is a residential zoning on it.

Commission: I have a question is there room for a driveway off of

Jeremy Moore: There's currently a driveway coming off the property now, I realize that yesterday in the preliminary meeting, we were talking about having to have a variance in order to do that. But again I feel that, that would be for a separate meeting, where this is strictly for the rezoning portion of that.

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): So right now Jeremy is that the driveway I see coming out on Darr Hill?

Jeremy Moore: Yes.

Commission: Is that something you'd let him use Michael?

Michael Morris (City Engineer): We would have to allow him access to the property but that would probably be a temporary use, and then if the corner ever redeveloped then it would lose that temporary access.

Commission: What about Southwest drive is there room?

Michael Morris: We rather be coming off of Darr Hill than Southwest Drive because it has to be 225 from the signal and the piece of property is not that large.

Jeremy Moore: You know I currently live down Darr Hill road myself, so I mean I drive down Southwest drive on a daily basis, sure I pick up trash off of my lot just like Mr. Floyd does and I can respect him for that. Unfortunately this is a main arterial road coming into the city of Jonesboro and there's always going to be traffic, and I feel like that is one of the reasons why I again, with it hitting all 6 points is do, to the fact that it's going to be commercial, that's the best use overall.

Lonnie Roberts: Any other commissioners have questions? I'm trying to think is there issues that came up during the pre-meeting?

Kevin Bailey (Commission): Drives and cross access, you know the drive would be temporarily under permit.

Lonnie Roberts: Are we ready to make a motion?

A motion was made by Jim Little, seconded by Kevin Bailey, that this matter be Approved . The motion FAILED with the following vote.

Aye: 2 - Kevin Bailey and Jim Little

Nay: 4 - Jimmy Cooper;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Absent: 2 - Monroe Pointer and Dennis Zolper

9. Staff Comments

[COM-24:011](#)

Other Communication: Downtown Jonesboro Development Code (DJDC) Update

An update to the minimum building frontage requirement for general frontage lots in the Commercial Mixed Use District.

Attachments: [Exhibit A](#)
 [Ordinance](#)
 [District Map](#)
 [Streets](#)
 [Redevelopment Districts](#)

Lonnie Roberts (Chair): The next item we have on the agenda is a discussion that has been tabled, regarding the downtown Jonesboro development code, and we have a different way on how to approach this so I'll turn it over to the city planner Derrel Smith.

Derrel Smith (City Planner): We're going to leave this tabled at this time. What we're going to do is, we have decided to get a subcommittee of the planning commission together to review the entire code again, cause we know that there are other changes that need to be made, and then bring it back to you with all the changes, instead of doing this one at a time. We're going to look at it as a whole instead of a piece by piece project. So, right now this will stay tabled. And we will do press notices when the committee meets, so the public will be notified. We'll review it and come back with other options.

Lonnie Roberts: Everybody got that? Anything else tonight? Alright this has been tabled so meeting Adjourned.

10. Adjournment