



City of Jonesboro

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

Meeting Minutes - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, June 14, 2011

5:30 PM

900 West Monroe

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 5 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent 4 - Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

Approved on the Consent Agenda

MIN-11:049

Attachments: [MAPC Meeting Minutes May 10 2011](#)

A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by Margaret Norris, that the minutes be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote with the Chair voting:

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

4. Subdivisions

PP-11-12 FP 11-05: Final Subdivision - Brookstone PH 4

Attachments: [BrookstonePhase4 Drawings](#)
 [FP 11-05 Brookstone Subdivision Phase IV-Final](#)

Michael Boggs, HKB presented the case stating that this is a final subdivision submitting and he is seeking final approval. The Engineering Department has requested an additional 5 foot drainage easement to get the homes far away from the ditch. We would request MAPC to reduce the requirement of the front setbacks on lots from 25 ft. required to 20 ft. on lots 14 thru 18, 23 thru 27, if the owner agrees. Mr. Spriggs quoted the subdivision regulations that allow that if there are undue hardship caused by regulations if agreed by the owner. Mr. Bare stated that they just learned of this and it has not been agreed upon by the owner. He added that he doesn't have a problem working with the MAPC if his client doesn't. Approve the subdivision if he is will to make those concessions Motion was by Mr. Tomlinson to make the necessary adjustments on the frontyard setbacks on lots 14 thru 18, 23 thru 27, including a 5- ft. drainage easement in the rear, with the owner's consent, for Phase 4 as submitted for final subdivision approval. Motion was seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

PP-11-13 FP 11-06: Final Subdivision - Hill Park Addition

Attachments: [HillParkAddition_FinalPlans](#)
[FP 11-06 Hill Park Addition-Final](#)

Jeremy Bevell, HKB presented noted that he prepared the subdivision plans and is requesting final subdivision approval.

Mr. Tomlinson noted that on the topo plat submitted showing the existing residential lots 15 and 16, will the existing structure be removed? If so, at what point. Mr. Bevel conformed that it will be removed; not sure of timing. Mr. Tomlinson, asked if before something were built; it may infringe on both. Mr. Tomlinson also noted that at intersection West termination point of Mayfield Dr. where it insects with Ritter Dr. seems to indicate a drive cut into lot 15 at the intersection of the two drives. Mr. Bevell noted that this is an existing intersection. Mr. Terry Bare asked if he was talking about the roadway that goes to the west. This was to accommodate this property by Ritter, before it was subdivided. It was installed that way. It was built prior to this subdivision and I doubt that the curbcut will be used. It could be blocked off if the owner do not want it. Ritter requested it to be there. Mr. Morris stated that it was originally to be at the end of lot 15. Mr. Bare it was to accommodate their land.

Motion was made by Mr. Tomlinson to grant approval of the subdivision as submitted for final approval with the following stipulations: That the curb-cut indicated at the intersection of Mayfield Dr and Ritter Dr. extending into lot 15 shall not be considered as a pre-approved curbcut. All future curb-cuts shall be submitted for review of a site plan approval by the MAPC or the Planning Office which ever is applicable; seconded by John White, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

PP-11-14

Attachments: [FDP-Final Review Willowcreek](#)

George Hamman prepared conceptual plans and it is the same plan that you have seen a number of times before. We are in the process of working thru the details through the city departments and request final approval.

A motion was made by John White, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

PP-11-15 RP 11-21 Replat
Steve Schmidt represents the Owners of 1105 Roxbury Narrows, Lot 2 of Highland Forest Second Addition requests MAPC approval of a replat on an existing street having less than the required 60 ft. public right of way width.

Attachments: [highlandforrestreplat](#)

Steve Schmidt stated he represents the Owners of 1105 Roxbury Narrows, Lot 2 of Highland Forest Second Addition requests MAPC approval of a replat on an existing street having less than the required 60 ft. public right of way width.

A motion was made by John White, seconded by Joe Tomlinson, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

PP-11-16 FP 11-08 Merrell Estates Phase II- Final- **Applicant/Agent/ Owner:** Mark Morris and Engineer / Surveyor: Carlos Wood/HKB request MAPC approval of a Final Subdivision Plan.

Location: **Property Location:** Hwy. 49S to north terminus of Adam Dr.-
Total Acres: 7.60 acres +/- / (257,899.62 sq. ft.); Proposed Lots: 25

Attachments: [MerrellEstates_PhaseII_Drawings](#)
[FP 11-08 Merrell Estates Phase II-Final](#)

Mark Morris appeared before the MAPC representing the engineer asking for final approval on this second phase. Mr. Spriggs noted that the subdivision meets all standards of the subdivision ordinance and zoning requirements.

A motion was made by John White, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

5. Site Plan Reviews

SP-11-05 SP 11-132 Northeast Arkansas Exposition and Conference Center, Location:
Highway 49 (7001 E. Johnson Ave.)

Craighead County Fair Association requests MAPC approval of the Site Plan

Attachments: [NEAExpositionandConferenceCenter Drawings](#)
[SP 11-13 NEA ExpositionConferenceCenter StaffReport Site Plan Review](#)
[ORD-11 026](#)
[Traffic-Study-Report](#)

Mr. John Easely appeared before the MAPC representing the NEA Fair Board requesting approval of the site plans. We received the Highway Dept. permit and it is in hand. We have also a traffic study. The original concept is modified with the existing terrain. We include drainage and utility plans showing the sewer plan for the Oak Subdivision below is under the design phase and we will have those approved by the CWL and the Health Dept. in short order.

Mr. Spriggs noted that Staff has reviewed the site plan and given report to the Commission with comments on the minor changes such as the Amphitheater relocating to the north side of the site which is more functional and moves it away from the residential subdivision abutting to the south. All of the amenities such as walkways, buffering, masonry wall screening, were placed on the site development plans. Staff will be working with the applicant on the phasing of the build-out of the site. This approval is specifically for the conference center and the animal uses. At the time the actually fairground use is submitted we will deal with the associated parking issues. We met with CWL and others in the predevelopment meeting and we addressed issues of easements and right of way questions. The issues of Clinton School Road right of way dedication has been discussed with the applicant (40 ft. from the center of roadway). This will be made compliant in the platting submittal stage. We feel confident that all of the stipulations of Ordinance 11:026 passed by Council in April 2011, and we request MAPC approval of the site plan contingent upon final permitting processing through the departmental review. Mr. Tomlinson asked for clarification of Clinton School Road right of way. Mr. Spriggs explained and the applicant concurred they will satisfy the recommendations of the Master Street Plan.

Mr. Tomlinson asked the applicant if the highway permit granted include the right turn lane from the south on Hwy. 49? Mr. Easely: Right turn lane out of the property? Mr. Gene Vance, Vance Construction Solutions: The Highway Department has the study and it will go to Little Rock for approval. We will be working with them. Mr. Tomlinson: So there is a possibility of a traffic signal at Clinton School Road? Mr. Vance: Yes, there is a possibility at Highway 49/Johnson Ave.

Mr. Tomlinson noted that the Traffic Study said it was not feasible for one at the main entrance because it would only be loaded at 5 or 6 days a year.

Mr. Vance noted that he was talking about at the intersection of Clinton School Road. That is a ½ mile south. We will work with the Highway Dept. and if they will approve it we will be glad to have it.

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Joe Tomlinson, that this

matter be Approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

SP-11-06

SP 11-06 Site Plan Review

Mr. Robert Rees request MAPC approval of Bowers Farm Apartments, located at 1200 Commerce Dr. for 256 units (32 8-plex buildings), for property recently rezoned to RM-12, Low Density Multi-Family Residential.

Attachments: [BowersFarm 1200 Commerce Dr. Apartments](#)
 [SP 11 06 Bowers Farm Robert Rees StaffMemo](#)
 [ORD11 032](#)

Mr. Robert Rees addressed MAPC.

Stated that he met with the Predevelopment Review Committee. They noted some issues and we have addressed most of them. One of the changes we made was- we placed 50 ft. between the buildings to give a lot of area to walk the dogs, etc. Water and sewer will be approved by CWL and the Health Dept. There was a question about the fire hydrants which are within 500 ft. apart. We had to add 2 entrances; the Fire Department wanted 2 entrances, and I have that on this plan here (Offered MAPC a revised site plan). They wanted a spot at the end of these drives for turn-around for trucks at a size of 120ft. x20 ft. and it is shown on that plan also. Trash pickup locations will also be shown. Landscaping scheme was also presented by Mr. Rees.

Mr. Spriggs gave Staff Comments: As noted we presented the plan to the Predevelopment Review Committee. The Fire Department concerns serving the units with a secondary access point were noted. The distance away from the original drive was discussed in regards to the fact that one drive could get blocked due to an emergency. Mr. Morris noted that you can have more that 200 units unless you tie the other future road back to the existing there is still only one entrance to the buildings. We can limit you to a certain units until you hit that threshold to have another access. Mr. Rees ask for approval based on any problems referring them to the Planning Department for approval. Mr. Spriggs asked Mr. Rees if he has done a Phasing plan.

Mr. Rees responding that he would start on the west side and develop one drive at a time both ways which will be 64 units. Then next year go to the next drive.

Mr. Spriggs noted that he is only concerned that the plan shows 256 units with no complete connection shown but it shows future development and I do not want the cheat the MAPC here with approval an overall plan that is not complete. So my advise is you could approve Phase 1 with the notion that Mr. Rees will come back with Phase II, given a certain number of units. I feel comfortable with that. Staff has concerns that the secondary drive here shows future development and doesn't show the exact connection. Mr. Rees noted the is not interested in a building permit for all for these. If there are problems with any of the departments I will address those. Mr. Spriggs asked Mr. Rees to draw on his copy, the limits of Phase I for the MAPC's consideration. The boundary was drawn, accepted and signed by Mr. Rees.

Mr. McElroy, Commerce Drive: He commented on stormwater control and how Mr. Reese proposes to help with the runoff.

Mr. Rees stated that the Engineering Department will dictate that. Mr. Rees

stated that he will probably have 40 or 50 % more drainage detention than is required. At the south end, I will dig a pond and will take that field dirt and use it for my pad for what ever we need.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that likes the idea of bringing housing closer to the Industrial Park; however, he is not very enthused about taking 30 acres of land and closing off a traffic route to the east/west and north/south. That is my major concern that we tie up this big block. We did this in the other developed parts of Jonesboro such as the country club where there is no north/south corridor. We have a good opportunity with a flat piece of land and that we don't have to do a bunch of "curly-que" roads and culdesacs. We can plan this well. This will be taking out cross routes for traffic.

Mr. Tomlinson added: You could take your private drive running east/west and make it public; and take a public residential street north and south so that when someone else develops we start doing some real connections and real planning. that is my biggest concern about the whole project. Mr. Rees noted that he took this avenue with Otis' suggestion. This is how he suggested we go. He commented on the ditches to the east and to the south. Mr. Tomlinson: There are bridges all over Jonesboro. Mr. Rees: The property to the south is all industrial and commercial. The property to the east is a ditch there. Commerce Dr. is to the west. In talking with Otis on how to proceed he suggested we go this way.

Mr. White moved to approve Mr. Rees' request with the following stipulations that this approval is only for Phase 1, 64 units as noted on the plan tonight; that he acquire prior to permitting any department approval necessary for the project (stormwater detention primary concern).

Motion seconded by Ms. Norris. Mr. Reese asked if he finished Phase 1 could he just go to planning without going back to the MAPC? Mr. White stated he would like his motion to remain as noted. Mr. Spriggs stated that there will only be required a 10 day deadline submission to MAPC for any future phases for site plan approval. Roll Call Vote: Ms. Norris- Aye; Mr. White- Aye; Mr. Tomlinson- Nay; Mr. Scurlock- Aye; Mr. Roberts- Aye. Motion Failed. Mr. Spriggs stated that we would total/ unanimous vote for any approval. Mr. Spriggs stated that the MAPC be clear on why it is being denied.

Mr. Rees stated that it doesn't seem right that I am being denied because of the private streets and all; when I did what the City wanted me to do it. Mr. Tomlinson asked was he told to or suggested. Mr. Spriggs clarified to Mr. Rees that he cannot dictate the design of plans submitted; Staff only suggested ways to deal with access management such as a secondary access to the site.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that when we deal with private streets we have Planned Unit Developments. Mr. Spriggs clarified that this is an apartment complex served by private parking lot drives.

Mr. Scurlock: Seems like we have 2 issues. One- a secondary outlet for Fire Department outlet. I can't imagine we are requiring a developer to work out the traffic pattern. Do we have a future street planned there?

Mr. Spriggs: Mr. Tomlinson is suggesting a public right of way to be

incorporated into a plan. We cannot demand any right of way from a developer. In terms of preference (private or public), Engineering has stated that they would prefer that it remains private because we do not want an instance where the City is maintaining drives into a private development. So, I would proceed with caution in terms of requiring the public right-of-way absent a subdivision request.

Mr. White: Mr. Rees you mention earlier on the Phasing, you will create another access based on the City's requirements. Is that public or private?

Mr. Rees. It would be on the site side- I could make it either. I could make that public to the east/west. Mr. Rees what if I make the main entrance a city street. Mr. Tomlinson concurred.

Mr. White moved to approve Mr. Rees' request with the following stipulations that this approval is only for Phase 1, 64 units as noted on the plan tonight; that the plan be amended to show an East West street from Commerce to the ditch, and also that the developer acquire prior to permitting any department approval necessary for the project (stormwater detention primary concern).

Mr. Tomlinson clarified that it is not based on the fact that he did not require a city street but was through discussion and with your permission. Mr. Rees concurred. Mr. Morris noted that Mr. Rees will have to post a bond on the public improvements prior to platting/ C.O.

Motion seconded by Mr. Tomlinson. The motion carried by the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover; Paul Hoelscher; Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

6. Conditional Use

7. Rezonings

RZ-11-13 RZ 11-13 Jack Whitehead requests rezoning from R-1 to RM-8 for 1.4 acres located at 5306 Apt Drive (located on the east side between Hwy. 1 and Hwy 163B)

Attachments: [RezoningPlat](#)
[RZ11_13RezoningApplication](#)
[RZ11-13StaffReport_5306APTDR](#)

Applicant: Mr. Tobey Alexander appeared before the Commission representing the rezoning petition.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs gave a summary of the staff findings and a description of the present conditions for the surrounding properties. The plat shows 60- ft. for street right-of-way which will satisfy the Master Street Plan recommendations. Mr. Spriggs asked for clarification from the applicant on which tract is being petitioned. Mr. Alexander was unclear but presented a number of layout options which confirmed that the tract being rezoned is Tract B- 1.4 at acres. There is a 100 ft. power line that bisects the property. Mr. Spriggs stated that Staff is recommending a modification to a limited use overly district so that the listed conditions could be considered.

Mr. Tomlinson asked how close to the power-line easement can the units be built. Mr. Spriggs suggested that they coordinate with the utility company what could be placed in the easement such as parking. The three (3) conditions were read.

Commission Action: Mr. White made motion that the request be recommended to City Council for approval with the 3 staff conditions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tomlinson.

Case approved by a 5-0 Vote.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

RZ-11-10 RZ 11-10: Nina Hedger, Estate Administrator requests MAPC approval of a rezoning from R-1 to RM-8 Low Density Multi-family for 17.27 acres. Location: South side of Greensboro Rd, and East Side of N. Caraway Rd., Acreage at the rear of 1008 N. Caraway Rd. (No action taken, this Item remained tabled in the May 10, 2011 MAPC Meeting)

Attachments: [RezoningPlat_Hedger](#)
[RezoningApplication_Hedger](#)
[RZ 11-10- Hedger NCaraway Greensboro StaffReport](#)
[Conceptual Layout](#)

Mr. John Easely presented stated that they asked for RM-8 and we dropped to RM-4 for 68 units total. We developed a conceptual plan and presented it to the neighbors, and couldn't come to any consensus. Mr. Leon Hedger would like to read a statement:

Mr. Leon Hedger: I am not a public speaker but I have sat silently in the back of this room as long as I can. I have sat through several of these meetings and listened to numerous people give a rosy picture of what they own and a gloomy picture of conditions that would exist if this rezoning was approved and apartments built. This is simple not the case.

I think there are three main concerns about this rezoning- Traffic, crime, and property values. Let's take them one at a time.

Traffic First

I have made numerous trips up and down Caraway Road in the past several weeks. Trips in the morning, noon, afternoon, and night. On only one occasion did I meet as many as three cars. The rest of the trips I met from zero to two cars. I really don't think this qualifies as a busy street. Apartments are already located up and down Caraway Road close to Johnson Avenue. The added density of people if apartments are approved will not be much more if any at all than density added if single family homes were built in a subdivision. In fact if apartments are built, generally you would have two occupants where as if houses are built you would have two adult occupants plus one or two kids.

Some might say

kids don't drive. Well if you have ever had kids you know there are trips to school or nursery, trips to friends' houses, trips to movies, trips to ball games, trips to band or athletics to name only a few.

In my trips up and down Caraway Road, I noticed many students come out of the Grove Apartments and walk to school. Talk about lowering the traffic count.

Would apartments raise the traffic count on Caraway Road? Yes! Any building with occupants will increase traffic. Anyone who thinks he can live in the middle of a growing city like Jonesboro, four blocks from the second largest University in the state, and restrict traffic to the level it was forty years ago is badly mistaken.

I am certain that forty or forty five years ago when Sylvan Hills was being

planned, people along Caraway Road objected to it being built. The reasons traffic, crime and property values. The people of Sylvan Hills I'm sure don't remember that.

You as city planners must look for ways to help Jonesboro was a whole relieve traffic problems. What better way than put students as close to Arkansas State as possible. The less driving to and from the two principal places these students will spend their time certainly means less traffic as a whole. Think of the volume of traffic if students were forced to live five or six miles from the University. The three or four blocks of Caraway Road might not have more traffic but think of how many other streets in Jonesboro that would be more clogged and require more upkeep. Upkeep and traffic on one four block stretch of one street (Caraway Road) certainly means less traffic problems and upkeep than the same volume of traffic on five or six miles of other Jonesboro streets.

Besides some of these students might actually walk to school if they had only four blocks to walk.

The second concern is crime.

Anytime a city grows, crime rises. Jonesboro is growing leaps and bounds. To think that crime can be restricted to the forty years ago level is a pipe dream. Jonesboro is not only growing but the morals of today's people are vastly different than the morals of forty years ago.

Do apartments foster crime? I don't think apartments necessarily do but high density of people certainly do. This is what apartment complexes such as the Groves often do because they put people in a high density situations. This request for rezoning will not do that. It had already been stated by the engineer the requested rezoning will be little more than the old R-1 rating.

Most teachers at more than one time in their careers state the old cliché "I don't teach for the money, I'm only in it for the students. I will do anything to help them." Has it been so long that you retired professors and school workers have forgotten that students count? You seem extremely prejudicial towards students. They are noisy, they cause heavy traffic, having them around lowers property values, and all of them commit crime. How sad.

The Third Concern is Lowering Property Values

Why don't we think of things that certainly lower property values?

1. Cell tower (located 100 yards north of the property in question)
2. Cell tower two (located east of Caraway Road about 100 yards from Sylvan Hills)
3. Water tower (located north of Greensboro Road just 100 yards from the property in question)
4. Abandoned salvage yard (located on the north edge of property in question with an old tin building still partially standing)
5. Trailer Park (an old not well kept trailer park is located on south east corner

of Davis and Caraway. This is across from Sylvan Hills)

6. Cemetery (Ranson cemetery is on the north edge of Sylvan Hills)

7. Older small homes (multiple older small homes located on Caraway Road leading to Sylvan Hills)

8. Apartments (in the opposition's view these lower property values -several units are located along and either side of Caraway Road leading to Sylvan Hills)

9. Out dated houses with unkept yard located within Sylvan Hills.

How many really offensive things does it take to lower property values to their lowest point? I think they have them all. I don't think more apartments on the east side of Caraway Road will lower property values one bit. In fact the best thing to raise property values here would be to zone all the property to accommodate apartments.

Sylvan Hills is a mixture of older homes constructed in the 1960's and 1970's mingled with middle class 1990's homes. A few homes were built in the early 2000's. For the most part these homes are 30 to 50 years old. Not too far in the distant future they will require replacement. Apartment zoning will certainly be beneficial for that.

Dr. Sales, I believe you asked the question would you want these apartments next to you. One of the Lamberth girls, Brenda King, lives in one of these newer homes in Sylvan Hills. She stands to make only \$15,000 to \$18,000 on this deal yet she backs it fully. Debbie Rollins, Brenda's daughter, lives in one of the newer homes in Sylvan Hills. She stands to gain nothing in this rezoning but she backs it fully.

Warren Lambert lives on Caraway Road in a nice home next to the proposed entrance to the apartments and stands to make the same money as the rest of the Lamberth kids yet he backs this rezoning fully.

Sir, if you don't want more traffic and more people, why don't you buy the land in question and invest your money to keep it open fields?

As for me Dr. Sales, this is a picture of my home several miles from Sylvan Hills. It is 3400 square foot with a swimming pool and two nice out buildings. Some years back I was offered a chance to buy the lot next door to keep a small house from being constructed. I did not buy the lot because I did not need it and there is only so much you want to invest in land around your home.

A small house was built and still stands today. Am I sorry for my actions? No. Bob Birdsell who lives in this house is a good man and a friend.

To the members of the planning commission, Thank you for your attention here tonight. I certainly wouldn't want your job of trying to do the best for the city of Jonesboro while at the same time attempting to satisfy every citizen's wish. I do believe this rezoning is in the best interest of the City as a whole.

Opposition: 45 stood up.

Leonard Davis stated he is not a resident of Sylvan Hills, but Davis Dr. He was

eloquent but it is my understanding in the application- it asks have you spoke to your neighbors and they said yes. I own what runs to the south side of that thing; they have not said one word to me. Sylvan Hills people told me of this. They proposed a drainage on the far end of the property. They have already washed me out, when it rains. This is based faulsly on they have notified the neighbors. So how can yo believe anything they say.

Mr. Scott Darwin, 807 Sylvan Hill Dr. After our first meeting with you in early April, I invited each of you to take a Sunday drive and visit our neighborhoods so that you could see first hand the homes and families that your decisions will affect. I noted the lovely entrance to Sylvan Hill Drive with the tulips in bloom, which were replaced with yellow iris, which have now been followed by cone flowers and daisies. I asked you to look at our manicured lawns and the large spacious lots that many of our houses sit on. From there I asked you to drive east on Greensboro Road and see this lovely stretch with open fields, attractive homes and finally an avenue with trees that meet in the middle. The A-State Salvage Yard, which was once an eyesore, is gone. In its place is a beautiful view to the south toward ASU. On the north side are several hundred acres of fields, forests and creeks. All of this area is zoned R-1 and has enormous potential for R-1 development. The forested area could be bought by the city and turned into ideal urban wilderness.

With the development of Hilltop, Families Inc. and the construction of the NEA Baptist Hospital, the need for QUALITY homes will surely increase. With the ever-volatile price of gas, people will think more than twice before buying a house south of the bypass or farther north on 351. They will appreciate the opportunity to purchase a house close to town and close to their places of employment. Such was the reasoning of the people who have already bought their homes on Alex Drive, N. Caraway and Greensboro Roads, and Sylvan Hill and Smokin' Oaks subdivisions. We appreciate the proximity to our places to work and to shop.

As the Metropolitan Planning Commission it is your responsibility, it is your obligation to have the long view in developing our city. The citizens of Jonesboro expect you to have a vision of how the city should look in 10, 20 or 30 years from now. History has shown us that a lack of vision and planning has ruined once attractive neighborhoods. East Nettleton Avenue once had some very lovely homes. Highway 49 North to Paragould once was a lovely highway with beautiful homes, fields and forests. Soon it will look just like I30 between Little Rock and Benton. The historic center of Jonesboro from Main Street to Madison to Flint is riddled with apartment complexes that were allowed when spot zoning was the rule rather than the exception.

In Germany where I have lived and worked over the past 40 years, zoning laws are strictly adhered to. A city limit is a city limit. A neighborhood is a neighborhood. A shopping area is a shopping area. Consequently, Germany is known for its beautiful cities and villages that have learned to live in harmony with nature and their self-imposed limits and restrictions on where and how you can build. Our pioneer attitude, on the other hand, takes the stance that this is my land, and, by golly, I'm going to do with it as I want, and the devil take the hindmost.

In George Orwell's novel "Animal Farm," you find the quotation: "all pigs are created equal, but some more than others." I have the sense that we have

arrived at that state of affairs here in Jonesboro where all citizens are created equal, but some more than others. To paraphrase Orwell further: all R-1 zoned neighborhoods are created equal, but some more than others. Had this request for an apartment complex been proposed for one of the affluent neighborhoods south of the by-pass, such as Ridge Pointe, Upper Duckswater, or The Outback, then this commission would not have given the request a second thought and would have rejected it in April with no further discussion. But because we live in north Jonesboro, which is already overflowing with apartments, you thought that one more complex would not hurt. So, you tabled the request, leaving us hanging for not one but for two months. In my estimation all R-1 zoned neighborhoods are equal regardless of the monetary value of our homes. We have presented you with enumerable and valid reasons why another apartment complex should not be placed in the middle of our quiet, upstanding and valuable neighborhood. With the construction of these apartments the crime rate will sky rocket, the traffic will triple, the noise will increase and the value of our homes will plummet. The fact that crime follows apartment complexes was the front -page article in the May 6, 2011, edition of the Jonesboro Sun. In an interview with Police Chief Mike Yates about crime in apartment complexes the Sun paraphrased Mr. Yates, and I quote: "In most cases clusters of rental houses or apartment complexes coincide with higher crime rates."

We have already presented you with the evidence that "Apartment City" and The Grove are rife with crime. There is absolutely no reason to expect that the apartment complex proposed by the Lamberths will be any different. Regardless of whether they build duplexes, triplexes or quadra-plexes, they will still be an apartment complex with all the problems that we have presented to you today and two months ago. A sign of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again with the expectation of different results. Please do the sane thing and vote against this proposal.

Should you vote in favor of this proposal you will be guilty of spot zoning and contradicting the dictates of the law according to which you are supposed to act. The purpose of the MAPC is to "ensure compatible land use patterns by minimizing conflicts between uses; thereby, protecting property values and enhancing the urban environment." Again I say: Do the sane thing and vote against this proposal.

Finally, let us return to our Sunday drive. We are now at crossroads in the development of North Jonesboro. You can take the low road and vote for spot zoning and thereby destroy a quiet, law-abiding and upstanding neighborhood. Or you can take the high road and vote against this egregious abuse of zoning laws. You, the members of the Metropolitan Planning Committee, are in the driver's seat. The citizens of the greater North Caraway Road district hope and pray that you will take the high road.

Mr. Vance Sales gave 4 points without duplicating what has been said. 1. What we identify as the greater Caraway Neighborhood is not Sylvian Hills, Smoke Noaks, North Caraway etc. In this area there are residents of different races, and different nations. Those who are very old and young we have learned and do learn from each other, we respect each other. I do agree that it is an R-1 area and beautiful to Hwy. 351 with the church and beautiful homes. It seems to me it has great potential for substantial homes.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that several of us attended the Vision 2030; which will be food for overall planning and good for the entire city, and I assumed that many of you would lead in that.

A statement was made that in housing neighborhood and development a land use survey indicated 79 % of the respondents indicated that the city should encourage single family home type development; 17 % supported Multi-family development; It was city-wide and not a Sylvan Hill survey.

Mr. Sales: There is one other point I would like to make in the case of N. Caraway Road there are 2 hills and you can't see until you get to the second hill at the entrance. Stated concerns of speed of traffic versus safety at that entrance. It is a dangerous entrance. There will be 102 cars in this proposal; if all had one car. There are no sidewalks to walk on.

Wayne French, Alex Dr. Mr. Hedger made numerous trips which it is not a traffic count. It depends on time of day. There are no sidewalks, with children walking to school. The Grove was built without sidewalks. We have a dangerous situation. Apartments do lower property values. Single family dwellings mean stability. Apartments mean people move in and out. They reach the point where they do not care about the property or the inside. They are transient. You never have anything with them. You can't establish any kind of communication or friendship with them; here today gone tomorrow, in a constant flux. I am opposed to this and duplexes.

Mr. Spriggs: As noted by the applicant they are requesting a modification for 4 units per acre.

Mr. White: Mr. Davis commented on drainage. Mr. Easley address the drainage: Any increase run-off, we have to mitigate any increase that will not leave the property. It will decrease it to an extent. He was voicing an objection of the drainage that have come across the his property. Mr. Davis: When it rains heavy it runs across me like a river. Mr. Easley: in the area on the southeast corner will be our detention. Once it is completed and built owner is responsible for short term maintenance. The city is responsible for long term.

Pete Cruise, Sylvan Hills noted concerns about the maintenance of the detention basin. We have one at the Grove not maintained with weeds. Who will maintain it. What about mosquito problems? Mr. Easley: repeated that the owner is responsible for short term maintenance. The city is responsible for long term maintenance. Mr. Morris concurred.

Mr. White: In terms of the current land use plan what is the use intended for this area and if you can, is there any change in the plan that is under study now for this area?

Mr. Spriggs: We noted in the staff report that the recommended use on the current land use plan is single family. There are no new planning or improvements to the right of way currently underway that would deem this property to be recommended for a higher intense use that I am aware of. We will be re-evaluating the Master Street Plan and the Long Range Land Use plan as part of Vision 2030.

Mr. Tomlinson made a motion that the MAPC recommend to City Council that

this item be denied. Mr. White seconded the motion.

Mr. Scurlock noted that since we wont get a unanimous vote on this. This is a hard issue but where I come from the land use will trump. I am for property rights but I have to defer to the current land use plan.

A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by John White, that this matter be Recommended to Deny . The case was denied.

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

8. Staff Comments

COM-11:045 SFR 11-228 Location: 3125 Horseshoe Trail- Tim Rook requests MAPC approval of an accessory dwelling space above a shop-garage on 3.25 acres in R-1 - Residential.

Attachments: [Application AccessoryDwelling - R-1](#)

Mr. Spriggs presented the matter similar to an approval on Lawson Rd. for accessory pool house/dwellings on larger lots. This request is a garage workroom with a space above with a living area above.

A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson with the stipulation that the unit not be used for rental property, seconded by Margaret Norris, that this matter be Approved . The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;John White and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 4 - Brian Dover;Paul Hoelscher;Jerry Halsey Jr. and Ron Kelton

COM-11:013 Discussion of MAPC Bylaws- Voting Procedures:

*All actions taken in an administrative or recommending capacity (including, but not limited to recommendations on special use permits, subdivisions, rezonings, annexations, text amendments, site plan review, planned developments, land use plans, master street plan, or comprehensive plan amendments, shall be complete and shall include a **finding of fact**, listing what the Commission determines to be relevant facts in the case in order to eliminate misleading statements, hearsay, irrelevant, and incomplete recommendations to City Council.*

Item Remained Tabled 5/10/11 by MAPC.

Attachments: [Planning Commission Voting Procedure](#)
[MAPCBylawsFinal 2009](#)
[MAPC Bylaws 2011 Proposed Changes](#)

Item Remained Tabled.

9. Adjournment