



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, June 28, 2022

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 7 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer and Stephanie Nelson

Absent 2 - Paul Ford and Jeff Steiling

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-22:057](#) June 14, 2022 MAPC Minutes

Attachments: [MAPC Minutes June 14, 2022](#)

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer and Stephanie Nelson

Absent: 2 - Paul Ford and Jeff Steiling

4. Miscellaneous Items

SP-22-01 SITE PLAN REVIEW: The Reedmont Apartment Complex

John Mixon of Cooper Mixon Architects is requesting Site Plan Review and Approval for a new proposed apartment complex located off of Browns Lane Access Road in the PD-M, Planned Development, Mixed Use District. This development exceeds 75,000 square feet and requires MAPC Site Plan Approval.

Attachments: Application
Birds Eye View
Conceptual Site Plan
Reedmont Site Plan
Renderings

COMMISSION: Asked for Staff comments from the Planner.

STAFF: Monica Percy, Senior Planner, stated they have reviewed the

development and it does appear to meet the site plan requirements, and so would recommend approval.

COMMISSION: Chair Roberts opened up for commissioner discussions and will have one person from the public who would like to address the commission. Asked to catch the commission up on the discussion from the previous day's pre-meeting. Kevin Bailey said in the pre-meeting, they had pulled up and looked back at the original rezoning request and one of the things found in the application, that he feels like he made the motion to approve the rezoning request on, was that the original first phase was to have about 160,000 square feet and the first floor was going to have commercial spaces in it while the upper floor units were to be condos. What he sees in the plans brought before the commission today is different. It is substantially larger in square footage. Though we are not here today to vote on that specifically, we are to vote on it due to it being over 75,000 square feet – but it has brought up a lot of questions and a lot of phone calls from the public. He's asking why it is different. Chair Roberts agreed, that a substantial change from what was in the rezoning application, is that it would be marketed as individual ownership of condos. He knows that weighed on a lot of people's minds when they made the decision to vote in favor of the rezoning, so he asked Mr. Mixon to address that.

PROPONENT: He remembers the conversation going as the owner saw individual ownership as being the way the market was going at that time. But he thinks it was presented then that the market would determine whether it was individual ownership or rentals – that it wasn't necessarily tied to the ordinance. He did not see that the ordinance tied the owner to individual ownership. It was more about multi-family – and it if was to be individual ownership versus rental, that it would be a market-driven decision. He does not see that as a change in the project.

COMMISSION: Chair asked about the size - if there was a major change in the amount that was to be commercial.

PROPONENT: Mr. Mixon asked to be reminded, as he did not have the original application in front of him.

CITY ATTORNEY: Carol Duncan said it originally said 160,000 to 180,000 square feet.

COMMISSION: Chair read "Phase 1 would contain approximately 160,000 square feet to 180,000 square feet of total square footage area. Approximately 10,000 square feet to 15,000 square feet will be commercial area." Then today's application says 550,000 heated and cooled square footage.

PROPONENT: Said there are two things – 1. Originally it was one building. So it was the first 5 acres that the owner purchased. Also in that application, they showed the rest of the property he had under contract which was an additional 11 acres. So they showed all of the additional square footage as Phase 2 when they made the first application for the entire 5 + 11, he thinks, was the acreage of that. Phase 1 was to build on the 5 acres. That's why the square footage appeared lower. Referring to one of the drawings, he said you'll see the "L" shaped building on the west that faces McClellan – that's his first take-off of property. If you'll remember, that application was actually done by Mr. Harpole (Gary Harpole of Halsey Thrasher Harpole Real Estate Group). The property was purchased so it is all together and has been tied together now, but it was shown as Phase 1 of that first 5 acres and then a second phase that showed all the rest of it. So it was all in there. Now when we're making the request, we just don't want to have to come back to request for large scale development approval on each building application. The City will require a

full site plan and we need to be able to design this, especially for fire access, and other things, as a whole. We need to consider the drive coming in, etc. for the entire development so that's why we're coming for a large-scale request for all the buildings at once. The owner will actually be pulling a building permit application first for the building on the far southeast corner – so it's the "L" shape on the far southeast (referring to the overhead drawing) – that is the one he will actually permit for construction. So in the plan review process, they will only be looking at that building. Then they will come back for the permit for the clubhouse, then one for the northeast building, so there will be separate permits for each one. The original was always presented as a phased development. There was a nice rendering that showed a lot of detail – the one on the far west showed a lot of detail because that was the building we were actually designing and then we had all the other buildings that made up additional square footage to build out the rest. He thinks they put in the application, images from the original plan. (Scrolling through the images, they find the original drawing.) They put in the original drawing to show the difference between the two.

COMMISSION: What is the total number of apartments in this development?
Chair said they had calculated 556 yesterday based on the 4 buildings.

PROPONENT: Yes, it's like 139 units per building or something like that.
Agreed, 556 units.

COMMISSION: 556 units and one swimming pool?

PROPONENT: That is correct. One very large swimming pool. It is the owner's market, so if the amenity of the swimming pool is going to make the lifestyle for the people living there better and them rent or buy quicker, he'll certainly build a swimming pool. That's the owner's lane – Mr. Mixon lets him stay in that lane, and he stays in the lane to design the project that the owner studies the market against. The owner has had a very successful project with The Landing so he has a history of this. Referring to the rendering on the screen, said that is the building the first square footage was calculated off of. The additional are shown in the back (two more can be seen in the background on the drawing – there are 3 more on the new drawings). We had an overall top elevation view originally with that as well.

COMMISSION: Dennis Zolper asked of Chair – Usually the site plan review is pretty much approved by the commission if it meets the requirements of Planning & Zoning but what is our discretion with something of this nature? If it meets Planning & Zoning, what can we do? Chair said he thinks that is what they are trying to explore at this meeting. He asked for more questions from commissioners so they might be able to get at that issue. Mr. Zolper said he still goes back to what they originally thought they were approving with the rezoning has gone south. Chair opened up the floor for public comments.

PUBLIC: Patti Lack of 4108 Forest Hill Road thanked the commission for allowing her to speak on this request. She thanked Mr. Bailey for his comments, as there a lot of inconsistencies in this of how it is presented today and how it was presented to her, to the commission, and the public, back in 2020. A background of how Ms. Lack became involved with this project back then: (She hopes after hearing her statements, the commission will reconsider passing the request today and reexamine what the actual plan will be for that property.) Gary Harpole had called Ms. Lack and asked her to meet with him and some others about this project. She has become very involved with the city and thanks Gary Harpole and City Attorney Carol Duncan for getting her so involved and feeling passionate about Jonesboro as the commissioners do. But this plan has changed, and it's very difficult for her to stand before the

commission because it is not the same thing they'd all heard was intended. Referring to the attachments for the site plan today, as it's presented, the new design – but if you then look at the attachment called “Birds Eye View” as it was in 2020 – it's confusing which drawing to refer to as they're all attached to the site plan.

She has looked back at the MAPC meeting from February 11, 2020, and read some of application for zoning ordinance and map amendment.

Question 3 reads “How will this property be developed?” Answer: “Applicant desires to develop this site as a mixed use of commercial and residential, with residential being designed, built, and marketed as units for individual ownership.”

The next question refers to the density of the development, referring to the 160,000-180,000 total square footage, but that also there would be 10,000-15,000 square feet of commercial area that would be designed, built, and marketed for the units for those individual ownerships. And that Phase 1 building would be approximately 4-6 stories high. It shows that on the old design and on the new one, being 4 stories.

Question #6 reads: “How would you propose the rezoning to be of public interest and benefit to the community?” Once again, the answer is – “A mixture of commercial and residential is being built, designed, and marketed for individual ownership. When completed, it would provide a unique location for mixed uses of commercial and residential, and would be aesthetically pleasing in appearance from Interstate-555.” That was one of things she knows when she had talked to Gary Harpole and the others, that they wanted people, as they drive on I-555, to see this piece of property and think that it very cool and nice.

Also, on the front part of the property, she was told that it would be designed similar to the River Walk in Memphis by the Pyramid – that there would be fountains where people could walk and visit, there would be restaurants and stores there. That is what she was told and that's why she supported this then.

Question #7: “Is it compatible to the characteristics of the surrounding areas?”

Once again, it reads that it will be built, designed and marketed for “ownership.” There was a question yesterday in the pre-meeting – it was asked if whether the changes in this would still fall under the category of PD-M/LUO – she doesn't know if that was answered or looked up, but does it meet all the specifics, standards, setbacks, and requirements now, since it's changed from being condos to apartments – that question really needs to be answered on there.

At the MAPC meeting February 2020, Ms. Lack came to the podium and said she was strongly in favor of this development because she thought it was to be a wonderful asset to Jonesboro. But we were told that Phase 1 would be a 4-story building with commercial space on the first floor, business offices, a health facility, where families could get together. There would be a tanning area and a pool. And doesn't that sound pretty good? It sounded great to me. But instead yesterday, we were told that there would be no retail. So it doesn't meet what was proposed back in 2020, in what the MAPC passed, and what City Council passed. We were told yesterday there would be either a “coffee station” or a small coffee shop in the pool area but the pool is to be built in Phase 2, not Phase 1.

When she had met with Gary Harpole, it was proposed to be this beautiful building, and she actually told him that she wanted to have first dibs on that first floor condo because the whole thing had been stressed that it was to be condos versus apartments. “I started to think, is that the reason why he had

asked me to come and speak in favor of it?" Even a comment that (City Planning Director) Derrel Smith said a couple weeks ago here – is that when we rezone and we say "apartments", you know this room will be filled with people because we don't need any more apartments. This was strictly sold as "condos" and "ownership."

Yesterday, there was a lady that came in (to the pre-meeting) and talked about that she'd like to have an opportunity where older people can go and wouldn't have to do yard work and all that. That's exactly what condos would do. Not apartments – they would have that ownership with condos also.

She looked at the difference between a condo and an apartment, and as the commission knows, an apartment is defined as a residence that someone rents, and a condo is something that they own. From what the MAPC passed, and City Council passed, is not the same thing that is planned here now. She doesn't like to argue, but there is a difference between the condo that we were sold on, and what is being presented right now.

The flip side of this, is that it is 559 (556) more apartments in Jonesboro, and it's disappointing that once apartments get built, after a while they start to deteriorate, and then we see a big increase in crime. I know as I do a crime report on my Facebook page, and 70-80% of the crime within a 5-mile radius of my house, is all at an apartment building.

The traffic study – I know they said they traffic study had not been done yet – but if you add up, when this complex is built, with 556 units, Derrel Smith says to estimate 1.5 cars per unit, but if you count 2, that will be 800-1100 more cars just in that one small area. Jonesboro does not have impact fees for developers, so now you'd be looking at increased costs for the citizens for the increased usage of roads, Fire and Police Departments, etc.

She hopes that the commission reconsiders what is being asked now, because it is not the same thing MAPC passed and City Council passed in 2020.

COMMISSION: Mr. Zolper asked again – what discretion does the commission have in a case like this?

CITY ATTORNEY: Carol Duncan said she would have liked to have had a heads-up about this issue so she could have looked into it. She knows a PDM is different in some ways. Obviously, we know with a commercial development we can't ask them what they're doing with it in advance on a rezoning, but she thinks they have a little more control on a PDM, but she also thinks if certain limitations weren't stipulated, then what is allowed in a PDM is allowed. She'd be happy to look into it further, she just did not know ahead of time, or she could have done so prior to the meeting.

COMMISSION: Mr. Zolper said he thinks it would be better to table it until the next meeting to give counsel time to research and give the commission an official opinion. There's no reason to take action and then have a lawsuit come later. Chair said if it were to come to a vote tonight, he would not have enough information and would entertain a motion to table it.

PROPONENT: To give a little context, this owner owns the rest of the property down to Browns Lane Access Road, so what has changed for that owner, is the entire rest of that property is commercial. One reason to not have so much commercial interspersed within this particular area, is that is all he had access to build before. Now, he's got so much more land to create a larger area. In the way the zoning works, it's already zoned for what he needs it to be, down to Browns Lane Access. That's the main reason why – the commercial space that's there is really serving the people that are there. It will have a close to 16,000 square foot clubhouse, which is a very large clubhouse, with all of the things you'd ever hope to have if you lived there. That's sort of the quality

that's there. I'll say at the conversation we had when we went over this, although "condo" is what was presented as his goal, it was given to him, the ability to go with the market in that conversation. Finally, each one of these is about 10% smaller than the single first phase building. The first phase building we presented was about 150,000 square feet. These are smaller than 150,000 – they are – per floor – about 90% that size. So each of the buildings is about 90% smaller than the Phase 1 building we presented. We have a building that's smaller than the first building we proposed, a site that has 16,000 square foot commercial building on it, and an owner that is going to develop commercial all the way down to Browns Lane.

COMMISSION: Mr. Zolper asked Mr. Mixon that he said the owner was "given permission" – who gave him permission?

PROPONENT: It wasn't written in the ordinance that he could not, so that's the permission he has. But in the conversation, it was acknowledged, because someone asked, how can you guarantee it will be ownership? And it was acknowledged, "I can't guarantee it's going to be ownership." That's the permission, it's really in the ordinance.

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer and Stephanie Nelson

Absent: 2 - Paul Ford and Jeff Steiling

[SP-22-02](#)

SITE PLAN REVIEW: Hytrol Storage Facility

John Mixon of Cooper Mixon Architects is requesting Site Plan Review and Approval for a new storage facility located on Moore Road in the I-2 , General Industrial District. This development exceeds 75,000 square feet and requires MAPC Site Plan Approval.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Landscape Plan](#)
 [Site Plan](#)

COMMISSION: asked for Staff comments from the City.

STAFF: Senior Planner Monica Percy said the site plan has been reviewed and will continue to review it. Currently, it does appear to meet most of the requirements and based on that would recommend approval.

COMMISSION: Mr. Bailey said that during the pre-meeting it was mentioned that they should double-check and make sure that the driveways off of each side, from the intersection of Moore Road, are further than 80 feet. He asked Mr. Mixon if he has knowledge of that.

PROPONENT: He introduced Jason McDonald with Fisher-Arnold, the civil engineer on this. Mr. McDonald said that was mentioned in the comments and that they had just sent a revised site plan addressing it. It was at 89 feet, and they went ahead and moved it to 100 feet to square up the sides for them, and it actually gives a better site. So with the revised plan, there is 105 feet from the intersection of Moore Road and Shooting Lane Road.

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 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer and Stephanie Nelson

Absent: 2 - Paul Ford and Jeff Steiling

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

PP-22-07

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION: Southbound Subdivision Phase III

Fisher Arnold is requesting MAPC Preliminary Subdivision Approval for Southbound Subdivision Phase III for 6 lots on 1.89 +/- acres. This property is located on the corner of Pacific Road and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Drive and is zoned R-1, Single-Family Medium Density District and R-2, Multi-Family Low Density District.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Plat](#)
 [Staff Report](#)
 [Site Plan](#)

PROPONENT: Jeremy Bevill, Engineer with Fisher-Arnold, said it's a 4-plex project. There are 6 lots, so it would be 24 units total. They're asking for preliminary plat approval today.

STAFF: Monica Pearcy said this subdivision does meet the requirements of the subdivision codes and so would recommend approval with the stipulation that cross access easements are included in the final plat.

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer and Stephanie Nelson

Absent: 2 - Paul Ford and Jeff Steiling

PP-22-08

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION: Harrison Hills Phase 2

McAlister Engineering is requesting MAPC Preliminary Subdivision Approval for Harrison Hills Phase 2 for 12 lots on 4.04 +/- acres. This property is located at Serenity Hills Drive and Rolling Hills Drive and is zoned R-1, Single-Family Medium Density District.

Attachments: Application
 Plans
 Staff Report
 Letters of Opposition

Item was tabled as requested by applicant.

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

8. Rezoning

[RZ-22-11](#)

REZONING: East Nettleton Avenue

Easton Agricultural, LLLP is requesting a Rezoning from R-1, Single-Family Medium Density District, to C-3, General Commercial District. This Rezoning is for 3.00 +/- acres located at 5459 E. Nettleton Ave.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipt](#)
 [Hancock Survey](#)
 [Staff Summary-Updated](#)

Kevin Bailey made a motion to un-table the request. Dennis Zolper seconded. Passed unanimously.

PROPONENT: George Hamman of Civilogic, said they prepared the application and Mr. Hancock prepared the survey. Mr. Hamman was unavoidably detained from coming to the last meeting. The owner didn't understand and did not attend. If zoned, this will be a new repair facility for big trucks, trailers, heavy diesel equipment. The owner has a standing relationship with Love's Truck Stop, and Mr. Hamman understands they want to try to tie their driveways together as Love's often refers their customers to this gentleman. He operates all over the southeast. It should be a first-class operation as he's a good businessman. He'd like to rezone this property to add his facility next door to Love's Truck Stop.

STAFF: Monica Percy said this rezoning request meets all 6 rezoning criteria so the City would recommend approval with the following conditions:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all the requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Storm Water Drainage Design Manual, and Traffic Access Management Policy regarding any new development.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosures, sidewalks, etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment of the property.
3. Any change of use shall be subject to the Planning Department approval in the future.
4. The development shall comply with all requirements of the Overlay District.

COMMISSION: Chair asked for public comments. There were none.

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

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Dennis Zolper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer and Stephanie Nelson

Absent: 2 - Paul Ford and Jeff Steiling

9. Staff Comments

10. Adjournment