



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, July 14, 2015

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

[play video](#)

2. Roll Call

[play video](#)

3. Approval of minutes

[play video](#)

Approval of the MAPC Meeting Minutes for June 23, 2015.

[play video](#)

A motion was made by Brant Perkins, seconded by Jim Scurlock, that the Minutes be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote:

4. Site Plans & Miscellaneous Items

[play video](#)

Barbara J. Mangrum, owner of 502 Shadow Lane is requesting MAPC waiver/approval of a Lot 8 of Lanes Subdivision to allow the lot to be improved as single family without having street frontage improved, but to allow an easement from lot 7 which is currently owned by a relative/sibling. This will require a recorded ingress/egress easement between both lots in question.

[play video](#)

Ms. Mangrum, P.O. Box 2132, Decatur, Illinois appeared before the Commission stating: I own the property at 502 Shadow Lane; my sister-in-law owns the property at 504 Shadow Lane. I would like to make the lot buildable. So I am here to request a waiver of the street frontage requirement.

Mr. Spriggs: The request before the Commission is for a waiver of the requirement in the Subdivision Code that states that a buildable lot must front on an improved public street with a minimum of 60 ft. of frontage. Shadow Lane is a street with recorded right-a-way that is not fully developed. She is asking the Commission to waive that requirement. We have received several

requests similar to this. She's on the lot that has a right-of-way dedication; there are some major drainage structures in the alignment of Shadow Lane. So to complete the right-of-way, she would have to incur the cost to do such improvements which would include major drainage structures, and the code requirement of installing new curb and gutter. Otherwise a waiver is needed.

Mr. Scurlock: What would happen if the waiver is given and the house is built and for some reason someone else buys the house? What access would they have?

Ms. Mangrum: I'm assuming that to my understanding, when I extend the street that it would be for the person buying the house.

Mr. Spriggs: We discussed, if granted, the owner on lot 7 would grant an ingress/egress easement cross access to lot 8, which would be a recorded instrument that would run with the land.

Mr. Reese: Are the Utilities available on the lot?

Ms. Mangum: It has been plumbed.

Mr. Spriggs: There would be some cost associated with utilities by City Water Light, who appeared in the pre-meeting and gave comment. We urge Ms. Mangrum to meet with CWL, to determine what the connection issues are.

Mr. Reese: If utility costs are too excessive, and you don't want to proceed. Have you thought about that? You may want to consider the cost.

Ms. Mangrum: Stated that she is looking to retire in 2 years.

Mr. Spriggs: You have other options, therefore if you want the Commission to act on this tonight, please keep in mind that we don't want to set a precedent, because we get this type of request all the time. Would you like the Commission to vote on this tonight or would you like to have it tabled? My suggestion is to have the MAPC table it, and think about all of the options. You could hire a Surveyor and see what other options or ideas they have as well such as the street abandonment process; You could then come back in August.

Mr. Perkins: Suggested that she would want to make sure that the ingress and egress is adequate to allow access for a fire truck back there.

Mr. Kelton: I'm concerned that we will set a precedent that we may have to regret. This is a bigger issue than just helping one person.

Mr. Hoelscher: We have history for denying similar things to people, and those people can come back and ask for reconsideration.

Mr. Scurlock : It seems like an easy thing to do, but we can set a precedent. If you could acquire 20 ft. of that lot it wouldn't be an issue. So many things can happen between now and then, so I feel like I have to vote no.

Mr. Reece: There is a better option. If you could visit with staff I think it will be very beneficial. I have to vote No.

A motion was made by Kevin Bailey, seconded by Paul Hoelscher, that this matter be placed on the floor for consideration. The motion FAILED with the following unanimous vote of denial:

Conceptual Review: 2506& 2510 E. Johnson Ave.

Mr. Don Parker, Attorney/Agent on behalf of the Zimmer Development Company, requests MAPC review of a preliminary review of a Conceptual Design for a new project to be developed at 2506 and 2510 E. Johnson Ave. (North of the intersection of E. University Loop). No MAPC action is required; however this concept review is to gain feedback on how to proceed with a future rezoning application.

[play video](#)

Attorney Don Parker, Jr. appeared before the Commission stating the following:

The applicant/developers (Zimmer Development Company) propose to construct upscale student housing for ASU students, given the proximity to campus (across Johnson Ave.) and consistent with surrounding multi-family and commercial development at a density level of not more than 16 units per acre through a planned development (PD-RM) process. The applicant states that the proposed development will address and provide unmet needs for student housing adjacent to the ASU campus.

Mr. Parker added that since the property was rezoned to C-3 L.U.O. six years ago, efforts to develop the property as a commercial node have been unsuccessful. With the multi-family development on both sides of the subject tract, and the desire for the developer to purchase the property for an upscale student housing development, the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Land Use and area, and is the highest and best use of the property.

Amenities included:

A detention pond is located in the rear; and, a retention pond in the front area may be provided with a water feature.

The Concept Plan illustrates 10-apartment unit buildings, to be divided into two phases. Phase 1 will consist of the first 6 buildings on the most-southern portion of the site including a clubhouse and swimming pool, gym café, and study rooms. Phase II will have the remaining 4 buildings having 24 beds in each; Maximum buildout includes 240 student housing apartment units; 2-bedroom and 4-bedroom varieties situated directly across from University Loop access to Arkansas State University. The nearest building to the property line in the rear is over 200 ft. in distance from the closest residential property. The project will be completely fenced and gated. Pedestrian sidewalk connectivity is addressed in the conceptual plan to extend it to University Loop, to provide a safe crossing for the students. Future coordination is planned with the Arkansas Highway Department to provide for a crosswalk on Johnson Ave.

Neighborhood Meeting Held:

Twelve (12) surrounding neighbors appeared and gave comment and concerns about broken promises (detention pond issues were mentioned) of the adjacent development to the west which has a similar concept. Wolfcreek Apt. Management was present and addressed issues. Previous issues of noise and

policing issues of the past were also mentioned. The attendees requested more buffering and landscaping to be provided as part of this proposal. The project team for this development went back and added significant landscaping and if adopted and approved they are willing to do whatever is requested.

Conceptual review continued with Commission deliberation and the following conclusions were drawn:

- An emergency break-thru entrance (eastern side) has been provided at the request of City reviewing staff to address secondary access requirements of the building codes.
- A management/security detail operational plan shall be provided to the Planning Commission during the Final Development Plan process illustrating procedures for on-site management.
- Perimeter fencing shall be provided and shown on the final development plan. Provision and details on gated entry shall be provided to the MAPC with plan addressing adequate vehicular stacking and accidental re-exit.
- The owner agrees to make a best-faith effort to coordinate with the Arkansas Highway Department to provide for a crosswalk on Johnson Ave. and ASU to extend connectivity along the west side of University Loop for student pedestrian safety.

Replat: Lot Frontage Variance of Lot - Tract 3 of Garner - Trosper Minor Plat Tracts 1, 2, 3 Address: 1409 Hathcoat Lane

Andy Garner is requesting MAPC approval of lot - tract 3 regarding no legal frontage on this grandfathered tract. This lot had a mobile home on it previously that burned. The plans are to build a new home on this tract. This tract is located in the R-1 Single Family District.

Applicant Andy Garner appeared before the Commission stating: We took a piece of property owned by my wife's grandmother, it is a 4.5 acre tract and we re-plated into 3 different plats. I would like to build on tract one and my sister-in-law would like to build on tract three.

Mr. Spriggs: This request deals with an already existing lot, this lot had a mobile home unit on it which was previously removed. Annexed some time ago, the problem is that Tract 3 never had frontage on an improved street right-of-way. However what the applicant is trying to do is separate the property; all the easements are already set but require some work. All easements are depicted on the plat. Utilities already exist, subject to health approval. This request is unique compared to others in the past. We would like to record this plat; this property has never been platted. The streets are in a rural area and have never had legal recorded frontage.

A motion was made by Mr. Jim Scurlock, seconded by Mrs. Kim Schrantz that the Plat be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote:

5. Final Subdivisions

[play video](#)

6. Conditional Use

[play video](#)

Jerry J. Cook requests MAPC consideration for a Conditional Use within an R-1 Single Family Residential District for the purpose of installing a Residentially Design Pre-Manufactured Housing Unit at 2713 Carriage Rd.

[play video](#)

Tabled

7. Rezonings

[play video](#)

Staff: Mr. Spriggs presented the text amendment case noting:

The City of Jonesboro Planning Staff request your review and approval of the proposed Ordinance for Text Amendment– Section 117-139 (c), Uses Permitted, Use Table Commercial and Industrial Districts as outlined in the proposed text as follows: The table is hereby amended as follows: Add a “C” under Hotel/Motel Uses, which will require a Conditional Use Review and Approval before the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission for hotel and motel uses.

The purpose for this amendment to the Zoning Code is set on the reasoning that there are currently various hotels within the Hotel Commercial Corridor area [defined and bound by I-63 to the South, Caraway Rd. to the West, Richardson Dr. to the East, and Race Street to the North] that were built within the C-2 Commercial District; this ordinance will remove inconsistencies within City Ordinances for all future hotel improvements hoping to locate in that area and zone. The current ordinances do not permit hotels in the C-2 District, nor is there a process for special consideration.

Public Input: None Present.

A motion was made by Mr. Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Mr. Brant Perkins that this Text Amendment be Recommended to Council for adoption. The motion PASSED with the following vote:

8. Staff Comments

[play video](#)

9. Adjournment

[play video](#)

