



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes 2 Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, August 25, 2015

3:00 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

3. Approval of minutes

Approval of the MAPC Meeting Minutes for August 11, 2015

A motion was made by Jerry Reece, seconded by Paul Hoelscher, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

4. Site Plan

SP 15-04 4500 E. Johnson - Site Plan

Carlos Wood of Wood Engineering is asking for MAPC to approve a minor modification for address 4500 E. Johnson Site Plan.

SP 15-04 4500 E. Johnson - Site Plan Carlos Wood of Wood Engineering is asking for MAPC to approve a minor modification for address 4500 E. Johnson Site Plan. Site Plan Initial Site Plan

Mr. Carlos Wood appeared before the Commission presenting the Subdivision, stating that he presented this plan 1 year and half ago. The developers had inquired and wanted a drive- thru and we reconfigured the parking lot and moved it from the rear area to other side of the driveway, to give it a better traffic flow. We also connected the Subway site to the north and south end to give cross-access. We added 5 parking spaces on the west.

Mr. Spriggs gave summer of staff comments, stating that Staff had no issues with these minor adjustments.

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

5. Conditional Use

CU 15-06: Construction Network, Inc. on behalf of Mark & Joni McNabb is requesting MAPC approval for a Conditional Use for property located at 2100 Paul Drive to allow a pool / guest house within an R-1 Zoned property.

Applicant: Mr. Sean Stem, CNI, appeared before the Commission explaining the proposal for a conditional use to build a 2nd residence on this property.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs gave Staff Summary comments. Surrounding conditions were described. Paul Drive ends at the gate entry of this residential property. The elevations of the proposed structure were showed. There were no issues of impact because of the large tree mass surrounding the acreage. The conditions were read. Mr. Stem concurred.

Public Input: None present.

Mr. Spriggs commented that a neighbor along Paul Drive called and complained about the staging area concerns. When the main home was built , the street was used for parking and contractor staging. Will this occur for this addition/condition?

Mr. Stem agreed on locating the staging and parking area onsite.

Motion to approved subject to the conditions was made by **Mr. Bailey**, Seconded by **Mr. Cooper**.

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

CU 15-07: Namita Kumar is requesting MAPC approval for a Conditional Use for property located at 3015 Wood Street for property located within a R-1 Zoning District, to allow an accessory building to be turned into a Mother-in-law quarters.

CU-15-07:

Applicant: Namita Kumar

Mrs. Kumar appeared before the Commission stating that the property has a single family home and an out structure which has 2 levels. The structure was made as an office and she and her husband would like to add a mother-in-law suite and her mother move in.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs gave Staff Summary comments noting that a Conditional Use application is required for accessory dwellings within the R-1 Single Family District. The four conditions were read. Common utility concerns may be an issue and was noted as a condition. Mrs. Kumar stated that they wanted separate utilities for her mother-in-law and brother. Mr. Spriggs stated that the occupants have to related by blood. Mr. Spriggs added that we would have to verify the relationship and that it not be an outside renter. Mrs. Kumar concurred.

Public Input:

Mrs. Debbie Spencer, lives adjacent (“cattycorner”) to the home and stated that she has concerns that a mother-in-law suite would be like one person. They are asking for two bedrooms and two bathrooms, now they are asking for a separate meter. My concern is that they are possibly wanting to make it into a rental, although I know you said it has to be a “blood” relative. There is just a lot of evidence that concerns me that it could be just a rental. My understanding is that it would be on the second floor; I have concerns of a mother-in-law getting up and down the stairs, being older and possibly having

issues.

Mr. Spriggs: Do you know what the square footage is: The assessor's webpage state that the building is approximately 800 sq. ft. Mr. Spriggs: My concern is that you retain the usage to one floor to minimize the available square footage allowed for accessory dwellings in proportion to the main house. The idea is to maintain it less than 896 sq. ft. with possibly only one bedroom. That could be verified during the permit stage.

Mr. Scurlock: For property lines are we maintaining the setbacks. They are not encroaching or exceeding the setbacks other than what currently exists: Mr. Spriggs responded. They have no room for any additions. My suggestion is to have these types of uses evaluated over time. For example, if the property were to sell within two years, it would be re-evaluated by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Scurlock: I thought a conditional uses was condition to prevent it if the property were to sell.

Mr. Spriggs: Only if it is condition that the approval pertains to the current owner only. Abutting property owners could be notified of the reevaluation.

Mr. Reece: Can you verify the utility request. Ms. Kumar: we would like separate electricity only.

Mr. Kelton: How frequently do we allow separate utilities? Mr. Spriggs: There are currently some homes that have separate utilities for outbuildings/workshops, irrigation systems, etc. Other instances are for duplexes and suites in office situations. Or when there are dual uses on a commercial tract.

Mr. Bailey: We do not have the square footage? Mr. Spriggs quoted the assessor's number.

Mr. Kelton: If two occupants, with two extra people where would they park? Ms. Kumar: described that there is a turnaround lane. The garage in the main house is functional.

Mr. Bailey: If you finish out two floors it will be over 1,600 sq./ft. Mr. Spriggs noted that his recommendation would be to restrict it two floors. It is garage right now.

Mr. Kelton: We cannot allow more than 25% of the heated square footage of the main house; fifty (50%) of the total area of the principal structure. Mr. Spriggs asked Mrs. Kumar to verify the square-footage of the main home.

Mr. Hoelscher: Would this be a problem, if the structure were attached? Mr. Spriggs, no if it were attached by room, wall, or hallway, we would construe it as a part of the main home having the same or common entry. I was told that there is a separation currently. A conditional use is not required if it has a common entry, and it is seen as part of the principal structure.

Chairman called a 5-minute recess.

Mr. Kumar arrived at the meeting after the meeting convened.

Mr. Kumar stated that the lower floor is approximately 700 sq. ft. with 500 sq. ft. on the top floor.

Mr. Spriggs: Is it your intent to have a two level or one level? Is it a garage.

Mr. Kumar: It is a garage and a room next to it. It will become a sitting area. Currently there is a room next to a garage. We are proposing the bathroom.

Mr. Spriggs, under the separate building policies, the MAPC can approve this if it is under 25% of the main home. Mr. Kumar stated 2,246 is the square footage area.

The proposed 596 sq. ft. under the 650 sq. ft. allowance. The top floor would fit and follow the standard. Garage storage could be allowed below. Separate utilities was voiced as an issue to assure that it would not become a rental. Is it your intent to keep the structures separate. We want to attach them by roof for insurance purposes.

Mr. Roberts: Will you live in the home and the accessory dwelling? His mom will live in the unit. He and his wife would live in the main home. They are living in a temporary rental housing. We are not moving right of way, but after 6- months.

Mr. Spriggs explained the 2-year evaluation condition to Mr. Kumar. He concurred.

Mr. Bailey: Asked for clarification on connecting the roofs. Mr. Spriggs: If it has separate entrance as a granny cottage I recommend Commission action.

Mr. Hoelscher: Asked if a neighbor has issues and complains, what would the process be? Mr. Spriggs stated that it would be process as a typical Zoning violation.

Motion Scurlock made a motion subject to the conditions of not allowing separate utilities and main unit being only one floor, and other conditions as noted.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Hoelscher.

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Paul Hoelscher, that this matter be Denied . The motion FAILED with the following vote.

6. Staff Comments

7. Adjournment