



# City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center  
300 S. Church Street  
Jonesboro, AR 72401

## Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, September 26, 2023

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

---

### 1. Call to order

### 2. Roll Call

**Present** 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford and Jim Little

**Absent** 1 - Dennis Zolper

### 3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-23:094](#)

MINUTES: September 12, 2023 MAPC Minutes

**Attachments:** [9.12.23 MAPC Minutes](#)

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

**Aye:** 7 - Jimmy Cooper; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling; Paul Ford and Jim Little

**Absent:** 1 - Dennis Zolper

### 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 9.26.23

**Lonnie Roberts: The first item on today's agenda is going to remain tabled, we are still waiting on extra information for that.**

**Tabled**

**PP-23-10**

**PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION: Pacific Grove Phase II**

Mark Morris is requesting preliminary subdivision approval for Pacific Grove Phase 2; 37 lots on 13.64 acres. This property is located north of Beech Grove Drive and zoned R-1, single family medium density district.

**Attachments:**      Application  
                                 Plat  
                                 Overview  
                                 Staff Report

**Lonnie Roberts:** The second item on our agenda which is Pacific Grove Phase II, the City is still waiting on more information from the developer. So I would open up for a motion for tabling that as well.

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

**Aye:**    7 -    Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford and Jim Little

**Absent:**   1 -    Dennis Zolper

**6.    Final Subdivisions**

**7.    Conditional Use**

**[CU-23-10](#)**

**CONDITIONAL USE: 1348 Medallion Drive**

Melinda Young is requesting conditional use approval for an in-home daycare at 1348 Medallion Drive. This property is zoned R-1, single family medium density district.

**Attachments:**      [Application - Signed](#)  
                                 [Certified Mail Receipt](#)  
                                 [Letter of Opposition](#)  
                                 [ADHS Compliance Record](#)  
                                 [Staff Summary](#)

**Lonnie Roberts:** The first active item we have on the agenda tonight is a conditional use request at 1348 Medallion Drive. Melinda Young is requesting conditional use approval for an in-home daycare at 1348 Medallion Drive. This property is zoned R-1, single family medium density district. Do we have the proponent here for this item? Ms. Young, could you come up, state your name, and elaborate on anything I haven't covered? State your name and address please.

**Melinda Young (Proponent):** Melinda Young at 1348 Medallion Drive.

**Lonnie Roberts:** Okay, and you're wanting to open an in-home daycare.

**Melinda Young:** Yes sir.

**Lonnie Roberts:** Okay, anything to add at this point?

Melinda Young: No sir.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, City Planner, do you have any staff comments on this proposal?

Derrel Smith: Yes sir we do. We would that if approved that the planning staff recommends the following stipulations:

1. Upon issue, all other permits and inspections required locally and statewide be applied for and obtained by the applicant.
2. The applicant will be restricted to a maximum of eight children on the site.
3. Child play area shall meet all safety and fencing requirements of local and state agencies.
4. Child drop off and or parking shall not be allowed on Medallion Drive.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, so Miss Young do you have any questions at this point?

Melinda Young: No sir.

Lonnie Roberts: Okay, and this being a conditional use application, we have to open up, is there anyone here to give public comments on this conditional use? Did anyone come prepared to speak tonight? Okay, if you would come up to the mic, we typically allow five minutes per speaker, a total of three speakers. I'd ask that each speaker only present new information from what the first person said. So, if you could state your name for the record and tell us what's on your mind.

Mike Arant (Opponent): My name is Mike Arant, I live at 1350 Medallion Drive. I'm right next door. 1348 Medallion Drive is owned by James Cooper. While I've lived there, James Cooper has had a drug house there and Terry Rodell was there. We've had Chris Agent Jefferson stayed stuff inside our house to catch him. It's been, it was a nightmare to have them living there. Next, Mr. James Cooper put in there a facility for a lady with Alzheimer's, dementia, and she was a very good neighbor, she was very quiet, every once in a while she'd get on a jailbreak and we'd have to go get her and go in. Now we've got a daycare that's going to be coming in. I tried to buy the house from Mr. Cooper, but that didn't work out. If you look at the map, Medallion Drive is a double bin curve, and what you can't see from the map is that it's got about a 10 degree angle, incline, going towards the West. It's very unusual to me because there's two times during the year during the fall, that when you're driving down, the sun rises right in your face and when you're going to the west, it blinds you going out. It is a very difficult curve. It's tricky, it seems innocent, but we've had people wipe out down here in Kevin's driveway, which is 1401. If you're going to put this daycare there, please consider putting in either a speed table or a speed bump, and then one they're going to be loading children into this facility and offloading that the City will require to have a flashing school sign like. Because we're going to have children get hurt during the time period this sunlight takes place. The last thing is if y'all do get approved-

Lonnie Roberts: Sir, could you just address the commission, sorry about that.

Mike Arant: I'm done, thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Next, if you could state your name for the record please.

Vickie Wiggins (Proponent): Vickie Wiggins. My child attends Mommy's in-home Daycare, and when I'm dropping my child off, I'm there between 7:30, 8:00 in the morning when the sun is rising, when you pull into their driveway, when you're backing out, it is a clear and perfect view to the right and to the left. When we pull up, we have been advised to pull all the way into the driveway, do not park in this road, pick our children up. It's very safe, there's no concerns on that issue, and it is a really great help to the community. I know as myself, as a parent, there's not many daycares that offer 24-hours and weekend care and this place does. That will be all.

Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for your comments. Would anyone else like to speak regarding this proposal?

Sandra Esman (Opponent): My name is Sandra Esman, I own a home and have lived at a Medallion Drive residence for 39 years. I'm opposed to this because I feel it creates a safety issue for the children and the surrounding homeowners. The house in question is on the downside of the hill the gentleman was talking about, followed by an "S" curve. So if you have up to 24 children there in the morning, pick them up in the afternoon, I misunderstood. I was under the impression they would be parking in the street, blocking driveways where homeowners can't get out. If they have to work or have an emergency, it would be difficult to get an ambulance or a fire department or even a school bus.

Lonnie Roberts: Can we say, we have limited this to eight children though. It's been limited to eight.

Sandra Esman: Yes, so that was my concern, that's why I feel like it creates a safety issue for the children in the neighborhood. So I ask that you vote "no" on this request and I respectfully ask that before you vote, you ask yourself if you would want this in your neighborhood. Thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for your comments. Next please, just state your name for the record.

Joel Olive: My name's Joel Olive, I live adjacent across the street from the property at 1347 Medallion Drive. My concern is you said there's eight children at a time, but we were told 24 different children total throughout the day at different times is what we were told. No. That's what the commission told us. I was told by the Young's that they had 16 already and they were going to get more when they moved in. I'm just going by what I was told. Two weeks ago today, my wife came from the East side coming up Medallion, because of the way the street is curved, there's always people parking from 1401 on the side of the street, when you're trying to make that curve you're trying to look across at the cars at 1350 and see past them, there were two cars parked in front of 1348 on the street. She couldn't see, she had to pull out into the oncoming traffic, not being able to see if there was oncoming traffic or not and hope someone wasn't coming over this hill fast enough to not be able to get stopped and hit her. My other concern is I live across the street and people have been parking in the street which has happened in the past from folks who's been there. When I try to back out, it's hard to get out because I'm trying to watch traffic coming over the hill, coming up the hill, and people that might be coming in or out across the street. The only other thing I'd have to say is we already have one business in our community, is this setting a precedent that we could have more and more and more business in our neighborhood which is residential which is why I moved there. Thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for your comments. Got about two minutes left, anyone else want to say anything?

Curtis Shatley (Opponent): Curtis Shatley, 1341 Medallion. Got three doors back to the West on the opposite side of the street. I've lived there long enough to sign the original deed and bill of assurance for that neighborhood, and it specifically said when we signed it in '89 that it was specifically and only for residential use. I realize the date may be out, but there's nothing changed in that community that's changed my mind nor anyone else that I know of that lives there.

Lonnie Roberts: Do you have a copy of that Bill of Assurance with you?

Curtis Shatley: I do, it's signed by the developer and my wife and I. Says on number one.

Lonnie Roberts: It says on number one, and I'll just read a quote, it says, "All lots on said plat are to be used for residential purposes only."

Curtis Shatley: Even though the developer is deceased and has gone on to his reward, my wife and I are still there. I might add that there's a number of senior adults that live in that neighborhood as well and if there were to any decrease in worth, appraisal, it would seriously affect most of those seniors.

Lonnie Roberts: Do you have anything else to add at this point?

Curtis Shatley: No I do not, thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Is there someone else? State your name for the record.

Robert Lyles (Opponent): Robert Lyles, I live at 3500 Lakewood Drive in Medallion Acres, I've lived there about 10 years since I retired from the Navy. My question is, if this gets approved with you guys tonight, does this go to City Council?

Lonnie Roberts: It does not.

Robert Lyles: Okay, I would like to request that this issue be tabled tonight, with the widespread opposition, not just in our neighborhood, but in outside neighborhoods this is so opposed. This is a residential area and that's why I bought my house in Medallion Acres. It was a residential neighborhood. It's not a business neighborhood. So I would like to ask for a motion to table the issue tonight. Thank you.

Lonnie Roberts: Thank you for your comments. So now I'm going to open up, are there any commissioner questions or comments of the proponent, city staff.

Kevin Bailey: I have two questions. The first one is, the applicant is not the owner of that residence, correct? Question number 2, is this business already in operation in this facility? (Someone answered yes to both, unsure who). Those were all the questions I had, thanks.

Jim Little: I have a question. So is this a 24-hour, do kids spend the night at this facility?

Melinda Young: They do.

Jim Little: How many?

Melinda Young: I have three. But since I've been going through this, my specialist here, prefers me not to do that until all of this is done. So I've just been having four kids. And that's from five in the morning until four or seven, it depends on the parents when they get off.

Jim Little: So, you have a total of 4 right now?

Melinda Young: Yes sir

Jim Little: But at some point they will spend the night?

Melinda Young: If I'm allowed to do, and that is up to my licensed specialist, one of them is here, yes

Monroe Pointer: I have a question, I have heard twice someone say 24 kids. And just to be clear, Derrel said they were only allowed to have 8, so in the event that there is more than 8. What happens then?

Derrel Smith: Then the city can terminate their Conditional Use Permit, we will also contact child protective services.

Monroe Pointer: Thank you

Lonnie Roberts: Do any other commissioners have any questions, comments? Anybody ready to make a motion?

A motion was made by Paul Ford, seconded by Monroe Pointer, that this matter be Approved . The motion FAILED with the following vote.

**Aye:** 3 - Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson and Paul Ford

**Nay:** 4 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Jeff Steiling and Jim Little

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

## 8. Rezoning

### RZ-23-14

REZONING: 312 E. Nettleton Avenue

Nathan & Kendy Schimmel are requesting a rezoning from R-2, multifamily low density district, to C-2 LUO, downtown fringe commercial district with a limited use overlay. This request is for 1.16 acres located at 312 E. Nettleton Avenue.

Attachments:    [Application signed](#)  
                          [Mail Reciepts](#)  
                          [Letters of Opposition](#)  
                          [Plat](#)  
                          [Staff Summary](#)

Lonnie Roberts: Rezoning request at 312 West Nettleton, Nathan and Kendy Schimmel are requesting a rezoning from R-2, multifamily low density district, to C-2 limited use overlay, downtown fringe commercial district with a limited use overlay. This request is for 1.16 acres located at 312 E. Nettleton Avenue. Do we have the proponent for this item?

Garret Dunham (Proponent): Good evening, Garret Dunham 3131 Galloway Ct, I am here representing the owners and the potential buyers of this property, 312 West Nettleton, We are seeking to be able to move the ministry of options, a (unable to transcribe) resource center to this location. The ministry currently has approximately 6 staff members, hours of operation are 10am – 4pm. Any parking improvements will be at the rear of the building. The residents at Nettleton will be undisturbed. I wanted to follow up on a comment that was made, at the pre-meeting yesterday concerning the spot zoning. It does seem as though, there might be an issue with spot zoning with the R-2 surrounding that area. However, I would if I could, like the read the C-2 definition from the Code of Ordinances, sections 1-17 says a C-2 downtown fringe commercial district provides for a transitional area, between the downtown core commercial district and the surrounding older residential areas, which have yet to experience intrusions of other types. The fringe area is characterized by mixed uses including offices, services, government facilities, and housing. I feel as though this is not necessarily a spot zoning to that effect. We're not trying to zone Industrial in the middle of a single family home residential neighborhood. It matches the definition for zoning itself. The property in question is less than two blocks away from the downtown redevelopment district. It is our interpretation that a C-2 is appropriate to this area as it is consistent to the nature of the businesses directly adjacent to the property. With monastery school to the west and Oasis for Kids Learning Center to the south. Both of which are legal nonconforming lots that even if they were to be started today would still need similar zoning, not the R-2 zoning. They would need a similar zoning that we are requesting today. My final remark is that we are requesting that this property be rezoned to C-2 with a LUO and from a R-2. The director of options is here to speak of the behalf of the day to day ministry that would be appropriate at this time.

Lonnie Roberts: That is your call, we still have some time left.

Debra Coots: Hi, I am Debra Coots the Executive Director at Options and I thank you for having us tonight. Our day to day operations is, of course as y'all are

familiar with a pregnancy resource center. We serve women who have unplanned pregnancies because of the nature we try to be very private and keep them very confidential. So, we look for a safe place, we look for a quiet place. We love the area and everything that the homeowners love about that. We want to preserve that with them, we only have about 4 clients a day because, we only schedule them like one an hour. It's not like a regular doctor's office where you have, appointments set to every ten to fifteen minutes. We wanna keep their confidentiality. So, we only have one client come in at a time so, traffic is low. We want a nice home environment for them. When their on that decision of trying to choose life and death for their baby that we have that safe place for them. That quiet place that you would feel when you're at home. We love the area and we don't wanna disturb the beauty of what homeowners love, we want to be part of that and be their neighbors.

Lonnie Roberts: Alright, thanks for your comments.

Debra Coots: Thank you.

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

Derrel Smith: Yes sir, we do, we reviewed it, it meets 5 of the 6 approval criteria. With the only one being number C, about the capability it's not achieved with the rezoning considering the surrounding area is predominantly residential. Other than that we would recommend approval with the following stipulations, that the site 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, a final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, viewed, and approved by the planning department. Prior to any development of the property, any change of use shall be subject to planning department approval in the future and the limit to use overlay shall prohibit the following uses, cemetery, golf course, nursing home, and restaurant general or fast food.

Lonnie Roberts: I'm going to open up for public comments, but before I do, I have a letter to read, the person who sent this letter asked that the letter be read, since they are in absence of the meeting, and this is coming from Greg and Bridgette Arnold. I do by the way have five letters of opposition here, I don't some more have come in but anyway, this is the letter:

Greg and Bridgette Arnold Letter (Opponent): To the planning commission regarding the zoning of 312 E Nettleton, thank you for your service and leadership to the city of Jonesboro, my family has lived at 318 E Nettleton Avenue for 23 years, our neighbors at 312 E Nettleton are purposing a zoning change from residential to commercial with stipulations. We strongly oppose any zoning change to a historical residential neighborhood. 23 years ago we fell in love with the historic and beautiful neighborhood and purchased our home, with the intention of never moving. The trend to reside back in the downtown area has grown and we have invested in this area that depending on the zoning of the area to remain as attended. Several years ago there was a push for Nettleton Avenue to become a five lane street. This was reconsidered and not accomplished because it was agreed that this was a residential neighborhood. Commercial property is not in super high demand, that residential zoning is warranted for this property based on the community needs. While we respect the nonprofit work of the organization. We do not feel their need to supersede our rights of residential zoning to remain as it is, when we purchased our house. It is likely that our home value and those of our neighbors would be negatively affected by the rezoning request. We respectfully request that this zoning request be denied. Thank you for your

consideration of this matter. We will be out of town during this meeting but we will have representation. If you have any questions or concerns please contact me at any time,

Lonnie Roberts: And I have his contact information. That being said I will go ahead and open up, is there anyone else here to give public input, regarding this re-zoning request, if you would come up to the mic, state your name for the record, we allow about 5 minutes per person and try to present new information.

Jim Burton (Opponent): Good evening everybody I'm Jim Burton. My wife Jerry and I bought our house at 320 E Nettleton. Next door to Bridgette and Greg Arnold, 43 years ago. We lived there ever since, we have over that period of time invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in our house and property. We bought it, from Pioneer family the (unable to transcribe) who also coincidentally have built the property in question here. We expected that it would always remain a residential area, we had no inkling that anything like this would ever happen. We helped to fight down the 5 lane proposal which would have turned Nettleton into a parallel with Highland about 18 years ago. We did it because we love our home. Our home is surrounded on every side by sizeable historic homes. Our home was built in 1950. The Arnold's house was built by Dr. Stroud in 1936. Bob's house is across the street at 319 had been there 35 years, these are not homes that change hands very often and we don't have an inkling as to what this operation would do to the overall property values singularly and collectively. The other letter spoke in terms of medical procedure, which this one says medical services, but it also says we provide pregnancy tests and ultrasounds. It begs the question to me, why anybody operating in limited use like that, needs a 5,000 square foot building? Unless they plan on having inpatients and turning it into a mini hospital. This is not a use that is within the zoning requirements. The owner of the monastery school is here in opposition to this. The monastery school is just as quiet as it can be and we were always happy to see it come into the neighborhood. But this is a step too far. I did learn one thing as a city attorney about zonings, once you go down from residential to commercial, there's no turning back. It's just a camel's nose under the tent, and sooner or later somebody comes along and wants to expand that commercial use to an even more liberalized basis. A doctor a few years ago wanted to put a Kum n Go across the street and we all had to campaign against that and that got stopped. Jonesboro does not have a lot of historical neighborhoods. We're not that old a city but were old enough that these homes, we love and cherish, we wanna keep the way they are. In addition, this letter is calm and reassuring to the quiet of the neighborhood, this is still a medical clinic and there are plenty commercial areas in this city that it could be established. Right now it's on Main Street and maybe it should stay there. I would vote this down tonight and give the neighbors on Nettleton Ave the confidence that their houses will be undisturbed. Thanks very much.

Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for the comment, yes sir would you like to speak?

Robert Wallace (Opponent): I'm Robert Wallace, I live at 319 E Nettleton, I wanna back up about 200 years, on November 27th of 1820 a civil war veteran named John Olsebrook was awarded a military land bounty warrant location, for his service that was for 160 acres of land that included my property, I don't know when my current house was constructed but in renovation in 1988 I found a Lucky Star sticker dated 1906 in the wall, where the previous owner installed a gas burning heater, my property today is less than an acre it is comfortable for my use. When I'm at my window in my kitchen I am looking out at discarded daycare equipment, from the daycare I share a property line with on



the west of my property. Even though it is unsightly I do not complain because the daycare does not use the yard for children, it does however cause yardwork to be done, when I was renovating my house I was told that a rock band live in the daycare building once. I'm trying to give you some history of this situation. Like, my house is limited to, an area from Main to Nettleton going to East to Caraway is one of most of historic value to the city. What was once 160 acres has been chiseled down to 1 acre as far as I'm concerned. Both ends of the street have been occupied by businesses such as the daycare monastery, FedEx, Heavenly Ham, etc. but I am told they were established before the city zone was established and now are grandfathered in. Our historic neighborhood is one that Hwy 63 was once the corner of all traffic through Jonesboro and approximately in 1999 the city decided to widen Nettleton and a man informed me that there were to be 5 lanes, the residents gathered together and fought against this. We met with the city several times and were offered 3 lanes of traffic, this community would have been destroyed with the proposed traffic coming through there. This clinic is already located downtown, if it wants to relocate then why not in the Hilltop area, where NEA Hospital is drawing attraction for their service? Another area is E Matthews where St. Bernard's goes all the way down the intersection to E Washington and has similar businesses. This would also give them access to the students from ASU. This application is just another effort to convert our historic community by moving the zoning line to another commercial development. And removes another section of historic homes that used to reside on Hwy 63. We request a no vote.

Lonnie Roberts: Thanks for your comment.

Jeremy Moore (Opponent): Good evening my name is Jeremy Moore, I am a property owner and business owner of Monastery school at 300 E Nettleton. This has nothing to do with Options on Main, we hope they're able to find an appropriate location to continue what they do, I do not feel like the location on Nettleton is appropriate for what their wanting to do. Monastery has been there for 50 years, we're the 3rd owner, we try to maintain the property how it's always has been it's a very historic place and that is how we want it to continue the house next door in question is a wonderful piece of property. The problem is when it becomes a commercial zoning, is that if something we to happen to Options on Main the zoning would not go with them it would stay with that property. With that being over an acre there is too many options that could go there, that would have a negative impact, not only on our business but along with the surrounding properties that are there. I appreciate everybody on the board, but a lot of y'all may not be on the board 10 years from now to see the impact of those decisions. I appreciate everything y'all do. Thank you

Lonnie Roberts: Thank you for those comments, anyone else at this time? If not I'm going to open up for commissioner's comments or questions. Of the Proponent or the city staff.

Jimmy Cooper: I've been on this staff for many years, and I think this commission has put out a strong effort to stop, spot zoning and no matter how you paint this, this is spot zoning.

Lonnie Roberts: Anyone else? Anyone ready for a motion?

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

Nay: 7 - Jimmy Cooper;Kevin Bailey;Monroe Pointer;Stephanie Nelson;Jeff Steiling;Paul Ford and Jim Little

**Absent:** 1 - Dennis Zolper

**9. Staff Comments**

**10. Adjournment**