



City of Jonesboro

300 South Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes 2 Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, August 13, 2013

5:30 PM

900 West Monroe

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 6 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

3. Approval of minutes

MIN-13:065 Approval of the July 9, 2013 MAPC Meeting Minutes

Sponsors: Planning

Attachments: [Draft Minutes](#)

Mr. Hoelscher observed the discrepancies in the minutes. Mr. Spriggs explained that the minutes reflect the corrected language in bold print where Mr. Scurlock had a lapse in his reappointment. In that instance the Legistar system kicked his name off of the role call; therefore, staff had to manually type in his name on each item.

A motion was made by Jim Scurlock, seconded by Ron Kelton, that the minutes be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

4. Preliminary Subdivisions

PP-13-23 Greg Griffin, Owner requests MAPC approval of Boston Proper Third Addition. Zoning District: R-1; Lots: 22 Single Family Homes proposed.

Location: South of Boston Proper 2nd Add'n, End of Copely Ln, East of Richardson

Attachments: [Boston Proper 3rd Plat Application Report](#)

Carlos Woods presented to the MAPC the hard copy of the plans. Continuation

of the Boston Proper. It is a different ownership but same name is used for the subdivision.

Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments for 22 lots in the single family district. The R-1 standards are met. Michael Morris, Engineering gave comments noting that staff preferred that the developer provide the stub outs move so the road is extended, and change the entrances on Richardson Road to future road, and provide a turn around for emergencies.

Mr. Scurlock made motion to approve with Engineering stipulations, seconded by Ron Kelton, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Joe Tomlinson;Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover;Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

5. Final Subdivisions

PP-13-22 Final Subdivision: The Villas at Sage Meadows Ph. 2

Carlos Wood, Engineer on behalf of David Onstead, Owner requests MAPC consideration for a Preliminary Subdivision Approval for The Villas at Sage Meadows Phase 2, for 14 Single Family lots in an R-3 Multi-family District.

Location: East of the intersection of Clubhouse Road & Villa Drive.

Attachments: [Villas Ph 2 DET-1](#)
[Villas Ph 2 STR-1](#)
[Villas Ph 2 STR-2](#)
[Villas Aerial](#)
[Villas Phase 2 Final Application](#)

Mr. Carlos Wood asking for final review of the final plat. Mr.Spriggs gave staff comments and noted that the final is in compliance with the preliminary plan. the lots meet the minimum requirements of the R-1 District. Mr. Morris had no comments.

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

Aye: 5 - Joe Tomlinson;Paul Hoelscher;Ron Kelton;Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover;Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

PP-13-24 Terry Bare, HKB & Associates, on behalf of the owners (Craighead County Fair Association) of Floyred Commons requests MAPC approval of a driveway access to the development, waiving an approved covenant restriction, to allow a proposed right-in only vehicular motion of Stadium Blvd.(East Side), South of Dayton Dr./North of Parkwood Dr.

Attachments: [Floyred Record Replat](#)
[Proposed Right Turn Lane Concept Sketch](#)

Mr. Terry Bare, Craighead County Fair Association requesting the City to waive

the self composed limited access from Stadium Dr. to the property. During the development with the limited access they have determined a need to have a right in from Stadium Blvd. It discourages anyone from traveling north to turn into that area. Access to lot 2 is requested as a right in only.

Mr. Spriggs stated that staff has met on a number of occasions with the applicants with the special need for the inward movement on to the site. This is a major compromise from the original request. Lots 1, 2 of 2R were placed with a restriction by the developer and was agreed by the Commission and the Staff for the note that was on the plat. It was listed as an easement that ran parallel with Stadium. It was the City Attorney's opinion and staff's recommendation that the request be approved by the MAPC because this location has worked out a compromise with the condition that all technical requirements of that easement be satisfied by the applicant and that they gain state highway dept. approval of that drive location.

Terry there is a legal question of whether there is a legal easement on the property. If it is determined then we will ask that it be abandoned. Mr. Tomlinson asked what is the width of the drive. Mr. Bare 13 ft. we will use the Highway dept. requirement. Will it be an entrance and an exit. Mr. Bare it will be a right in only. Mr. Bare explained the motion and design of the striped area. Mr. Tomlinson asked were the original applicants denied an entrance on this lot? Mr. Bare replied that he is not aware of one.

Mr. Hoelscher asked what if the site gained a straight inward access to access the development to the west end of the property (Academy). Is it a reasonable stipulation to avoid a straight shot through the property. Mr. Spriggs stated that there would have to be identifying and directional signage to deal with that issue. Mr. Bare stated that they were desiring cross access through the property once you get into the development you can drive between the properties. It doesn't align straight through.

Mr. Kelton gave a point of clarity that when this was originally done, no-one denied access. It was a note placed on the plat by the owner.

MPO Director and Craig Light stated concurrence with the recommendation. Mr. Reese abstained.

Mr. Kelton made motion with the stipulations, seconded by Jim Scurlock, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

Abstain: 1 - Jerry Reece

6. Site Plan Reviews

SP-13-10

Site Plan Review: Large Scale Development: Existing R-3 Property: The Reserve at Sage Meadows.

Engineer Travis Fischer/TraLan Engineering, on behalf of the Owner: The Reserve at Sage Meadows, LLC is requesting MAPC site plan approval for 41 one-bedroom

and two bedroom units located on a 7.00 acre tract of land off of Prairie Dunes Lane in Sage Meadows Subdivision.

The Applicants are also requesting that Prairie Dunes Lane be renamed to Reserve Boulevard.

Attachments: [ReserveAtSage VicinityMap](#)
[ReserveAtSageMeadows Memo](#)
[Site Plan](#)

Mr. Don Parker presented before the Planning Commission. Mr. Fischer was introduced. This is a 7 acre development. Staff has reached an agreement of the turn around as opposed to a cul-de-sac off of Prairie Dunes which has been requested to be changed to Reserved Dr.

Mr. Spriggs

Staff reviewed the R-3 Zoned, unplatted property which is allowed a density of 18 units per acre;' however the applicant has designed the site to have a density less than what is allowed. Staff had initial concern about the property that remains to the east which could potentially be land-locked; (Connectivity was a concern) however, the applicant has clarified that the property to the east has purchase agreements which will address that concern.

The buffering of any homes that would be adjacent to the development was a concern of staff. Staff has no issues with the street renaming. Fire access was a concern and the issue of turn-around was addressed as mentioned. The front/side and rear yard setbacks was a concern. There was not considered front door, the buildings were originally closer to the property line, and the landscaping was enhanced as well.

Mr. Parker while this is laid out to the northern part of this site, we are planning for the southern portion to have the 25 ft. setback from the existing sage meadows homes to the southern boundary of the R-1. Whatever is appropriate for the landscaping we will also be willing to do.

Comments from Public:

Buddy Nichols: sage meadows country club, General Manager. Concerns form Sage MEADOWS WE have concern that we are a community of over 500 homes having only one entrance. We don't not know when that 2nd entrance will be done. Second Concern: What type of manmade or natural barrier are they planning on the west side of that development is a concern. A barrier of keeping the balls from going through a window is a concern.

Mr. Parker: In terms of the landscaping we are willing to do whatever is necessary. This is along the #13 green: that is not a part of this phase. We will be excavating had providing a natural berm with landscaping.

Mr. Tomlinson where is your gate where you enter in. Mr. Parker clarified. Mr. Tomlinson asked about visitors hoping to turn around, what is the alternative. Mr. Parker explained the turn-around design. Mr. Tomlinson asked about the chance of going east along the private drive, what alternative do you have? Mr. Parker explained that there will be future development there. We have that parcel under contract and we will close on that once the construction begins. Mr. Tomlinson: So there are more units that can be put in. Can you build

covered parking out to your drive like this? Mr. Spriggs explained that this will be a private drive. Mr. Spriggs asked the developers if they would provide traffic calming devices? Mr. Parker explained that because of the topo, there will be natural calming of the traffic. Mr. Tomlinson asked where will the kids play. Mr. Parker explained there is green space and a club house and pool in the future phase. Mr. Tomlinson: are these two story or one story units?

Mr. Fischer stated that to the north will be one story and the unit on the south end of each building is a 2 story building.

Mr. Spriggs asked because of the question of connectivity to the east? Are you willing to put cross access egress ingress easement from one tract to the other.

Mr. Parker explained the tracts adjacent to the east.

Ms. Sue Winstead asked about the access to this property. Mr. Parker stated that they will access from Aberdeen. Ms. Carol Duncan explained that the access is to Inverness because the extension of Aberdeen to Clubhouse has not been built yet.

Mr. Scurlock asked whose responsibility is to build the secondary access. Mr. Spriggs noted that it is a joint effort between developers, the city, and the county to extend to Macedonia. Mr. Parker stated it will be completed before the occupants of this development.

Mr. Tomlinson: Sage Meadows is developing a lot faster than most of the occupants thought. The promoter of Sage Meadows wanted R-3 wanted smaller lots. Since he left, it is going to the R-3 max. All of this is coming to a head. This is a lesson to the City that next time someone comes in and says and implies that it will be all single family homes that we get it as a legal contract.

Mr. Don Parker: Made comments about the \$400 Million Dollar Baptist Hospital and the exploded growth. Editorial Comment by Mr. Parker: There is far more traffic with single family houses than with apartments or multi-family. The fear of traffic of this being developed as Multi-family may be less than if it were developed as R-1 Single Family.

Mr. Nichols: They are going to take some time to put this together. Even if we have another access off Macedonia Rd. or Inverness Dr., they will be coming in on City Streets with traffic and construction traffic for 6-9 months.

Mr. Don Parker stated that he is involved with the property to the east. He is working out arrangement to bring construction north and east to Macedonia. Mr. Kelton asked about staff stipulations: Mr. Spriggs stated that they will be required to satisfy commercial permit submittal requirements as well as storm-water regulations compliance by Engineering.

Motion by Mr. Scurlock to accept to the plan as presented with stipulations; 2nd by Kelton. Roll Call: Mr. Reese- Nay; Mr. Tomlinson- Nay; Scurlock- Aye; Kelton- Aye; Hoelscher- Aye. Motion passed with a 3-2 vote.

(Note: The original record was corrected per the MAPC Bylaws Section D. Special Rules of Procedure, 4. Majority Vote, (a) A simple majority of those

members present at a meeting shall be sufficient to approve any administrative or procedural action and the passage of all motions; except that the adoption amendments to the Land Use or Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Code/Zoning Ordinance text, and the Subdivision Regulations shall require a majority of all appointed members.)

Mr. Spriggs: Explained to Mr. Parker that his option allowed by the City Code of Ordinances is that he can appeal the Site Plan denial to the City Council.

Mr. Parker asked Mr. Reece and Mr. Tomlinson if they would state their reasons for denial of the Site Plan since it satisfies all the City requirements.

Mr. Reece explained that he could not vote yes, because of Mr. Tomlinson's remarks of when it got rezoned R -3 for the stipulation of getting more ground per lot... of getting more lots. That was possibly a misrepresentation. I'm voting to protect the interests of the home owners of the Subdivision.

Ms. Carol Duncan stated that there is no reason to argue. He has stated his reason for voting no.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that he needs to think about it; he feels he needs more time before making a decision otherwise to reverse. Mr. Hoelscher stated that he would have voted no, but when they meet the requirements, what are we left with. This is a quality of life issue. There is nothing but concrete pavement and building here. I don't think I can vote no under what we are legally allowed to do.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that he feels that this developed is maxed out; and the end should have been a playground. The site plan didn't sit on the plat properly. There was not open space. It was designed to the very max. Then we are talking about adding more to it. It is concrete with a few shrubs around the parking lot. It doesn't do much for the occupants or the City of Jonesboro.

Mr. Spriggs: Commented that we have had much discussion of the site plan, are there any changes that you can do in terms of scaling back the intensity. The turn around and connectivity issues were raised. Since Mr. Tomlinson has stated that he needs more time for consideration. Mr. Spriggs stated that he would rather table the matter and deal with the questions.

Mr. Scurlock: Are any of these issues subject to a home owners association? By this being a planned unit development it seems it should be covered. Mr. Spriggs corrected that this is R-3 and not a Planned District. The code allows 18 units per acre under the R-3 District.

Mr. Parker: Gave comments on the type of units to be built. They could maximize the density and have siding and change the style of units and the clientele. We are looking at that with the acquisition of the additional property, we can space the buildings out and provide more green space. Staff brought it to the Planning commission not because there are 41 units but because it would be part of a larger scaled development. Mr. Parker, stated that Mr. Tomlinson, if you need more time to study this then we will pull it to allow for that. The legal question was raised on how to proceed.

Mr. Spriggs reiterated that there seems to be a need to pull the buildings from the property lines and provide more green-space.

Ms. Duncan stated that the Commission has the option to vote to reconsider, and allow them to pull it back to refine the plan to provide Mr. Tomlinson more time.

Mr. Scurlock made the motion and stated that he is not sure how we could turn it down if they followed all of the requirements, he moved to reconsider, 2nd by Mr. Kelton. Question by Mr. Hoelscher: I would prefer to handle this without going through legal matters; are we voting on the same thing? Stated he would not want to waste the Commission's time if we would be looking at the same plan.

Mr. Parker: We are looking at the possibility to be able to spread these units out to the east. We will have nice clubhouse/pool amenities. We haven't gotten it fully planned.

Mr. Spriggs: Recommended that the Commission establishes some findings of fact to either approve the site plan or deny it.

Note: The vote was 3 (Nay) - 2 (aye) for reconsideration: (3 Nays- Mr. Hoelscher, Tomlinson, Reece) - (2 Ayes- Kelton, Scurlock) vote.

Aye: 3 - Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton and Jim Scurlock

Nay: 2 - Joe Tomlinson and Jerry Reece

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

SP-13-11 Final Development Plan- Final Review:

PD-M PLANNED MULTIUSE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4021 SOUTHWEST DRIVE AS REQUESTED BY KAGLE & SHARON HUFF.

Attachments: [KagleHuff_Final Drawings](#)
[ORDINANCE13 026](#)

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

Aye: 5 - Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

SP-13-12 Site Plan Review:

Lindel Turner, Owner is requesting MAPC approval of a final plat/plan for property recently rezoned to RM-8 LUO. The proposal is for 1 single family home to be located on the southeast portion of the acreage as a separate lot.

Location: 5308 Apt. Drive.

Attachments: [MP 13-21 Lindel Turners 2nd Apt Drive Minor Plat Rezoning Plat for Rezoning](#)
[ORD 11 048](#)

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

Aye: 5 - Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

7. Rezoning

RZ-13-14 Rezoning Case RZ 13-14:

William D. Rupard, James R. Rupard and James M. Rupard are requesting MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential to C-3 General Commercial District L.U.O. for 9.77 acres of land located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Highway 49 and Greenway Lane.

Attachments: [Rezoning Plat](#)
[RZ 13-14 Application](#)
[Staff Summary RZ 13-14 MAPC Rupard Draft](#)

Applicant:

Mr. George Hamman appeared before the Commission as agent for the applicant for the Rezoning. He stated that he had not read the staff report and has no further comments as this time.

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments noting the surrounding conditions under the existing R-1 Zoning District for 9.77 acres. The Land Use Plan recommends a combination of Planned Mixed Use Area and Single Family residence. The proposed C-3 LU-O rezoning is partially consistent with the Future Land Use Plan. Mr. Spriggs stated that about 50% of the site is proposed as a Planned Mixed Use Area (PMUA) where the rezoning to C-3 LU-O is consistent and approximately 50% of the site is planned as Single Family Low Density where the rezoning is inconsistent. PMUA includes a combination of retail commercial, office and residential uses mixed.

Mr. Spriggs gave comments on the subject property is served by East Johnson Ave., which is classified on the master street plan as a principal arterial. The recommended right of way is a minimum 120 ft. right-of-way (60 ft. to road centerline). The right-of-way dedication shown on the rezoning plat is 83.7 ft. from the road centerline.

Mr. Spriggs noted that consideration of access management needs to be addressed during the site plan approval process. Engineering: Michael Morris had no concerns other than Greenway Lane being a private drive at this point. Mr. Spriggs asked Mr. Hamman for his comments on the status of Greenway Lane.

Mr. Hamman: One of the warranty deeds has shown an ingress/egress easement granted in one area (1/2 of right of way). We are willing to dedicate at least one-half of the requirements. He noted one previous plat done in 1989

where one side of Greenway was dedicated. There is no right of way to get to that dedicated tract. The main driveway will be as far from Greenway as we can get it. They were looking at some access to include the property to the west; however, those details are still pending.

The Conditions were read:

1. The proposed listed uses that would be prohibited under the requested limited use overlay include:
 - a. Animal care, general
 - b. Animal care, limited
 - c. Cemetery
 - d. Construction sales and service
 - e. Day care, limited (family home)
 - f. Day care, general
 - g. Funeral home
 - h. Nursing home
 - i. Pawn shop
 - j. Golf course
 - k. Recreational vehicle park
2. That the proposed development shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer and all requirements of the current Stormwater Drainage Design Manual.
3. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC prior to any development of the property.
4. Coordination required of all egress/ingress with the State Highway Dept., City Engineering Dept. and the Planning Dept.
5. The setback, building height, screening, and site design standards required in "Sec. 117-328. - Residential Compatibility Standards" shall apply with the exception of an increased setback requirement of 20 ft. for surface-level parking and driveways. All adjacent property will serve as a "triggering property" without any exemptions.

Department Reviews: No comments of opposition were received from any department or agency.

Public Input:

Mr. Dennis G. Gambill: 2024 Greenway Ln.: Noted that he is in favor of this progress. He will be back to request his own property to be rezoned. He has visited the Planning Department to have his property rezoned also. He is hoping that all of his neighbors feel the same way.

Mr. Josh Brown: Stated that in terms of the other side of Greenway Ln. (East Side), he has the properties being marketed as well for commercial.

Mr. Hamman stated that his client is willing to dedicate right of way to make Greenway Lane a public road. If his client agrees he may have to amend his plan.

Commission Action:

Mr. Scurlock moved to place Case: RZ-13-14 on the floor for recommendation by MAPC to the City Council, with the noted stipulations, and that changing the zoning of this property from R-1 Single Family Medium Density to the proposed C-3 Limited Use Overlay District is compatible and suitable with the zoning, uses, and character of the surrounding area. Motion seconded by Mr. Reece.

The motion **PASSED** with the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

RZ-13-15

Rezoning Case: RZ 13-15:

Glen Bridger and Phil Bridger requests MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential to C-3 General Commercial District L.U.O. for 18.40 acres of land located at 5508 and 5512 East Johnson.

Attachments: [Rezoning Plat](#)
[Staff Summary RZ 13-15 MAPC Bridger McNeese Draft Application](#)

Applicant: Mr. Travis Fischer, TraLan Engineering appeared on behalf of the Bridger's for the rezoning of 18.4 acres from R-1 to C-3 L.U.O. This is immediately west of the previous rezoning petition (Rupard Case).

Staff:

Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments noting the surrounding conditions under the existing R-1 Zoning District for 18.4 acres. The Land Use Plan recommends a combination of Planned Mixed Use Area (PMUA). The proposed C-3 LU-O rezoning is fully consistent with the Future Land Use Plan. PMUA includes a combination of retail commercial, office and residential uses mixed.

Mr. Spriggs gave comments on the subject property which is on East Johnson Ave., classified on the master street plan as a principal arterial which requires a 120 ft. right-of-way (60 ft. to road centerline). The majority of the dedicated right-of-way is currently 60 ft. from the road centerline. However, approximately 103 ft. of the road frontage has a dedicated right-of-way of 55 ft. to the road centerline.

Mr. Spriggs added that the compatibility standards for preserving buffering between commercial and remaining residential shall be part of the final site plan.

Mr. Spriggs noted that staff will bring caution to access management during the site plan approval process. Engineering: Michael Morris had no concerns.

1. The proposed development shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer and all requirements of the current Stormwater Drainage Design Manual.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC prior to any development of the property.
3. Coordination required of all egress/ingress with the State Highway Dept., City Engineering Dept. and the Planning Dept.
4. The setback, building height, screening, and site design standards required in "Sec. 117-328. - Residential Compatibility Standards" shall apply with the exception of an increased setback requirement of 20 ft. for surface-level parking and driveways. All adjacent property will serve as a "triggering property" without any exemptions.
5. Dedication of the required 60 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of

East Johnson Ave.

6. Prohibited uses:
- a. Adult entertainment
 - b. Adult retail sales
 - c. Tobacco sales

Public Input: None present.

Department Reviews: No comments of opposition were received from any department or agency.

Commission Action:

Mr. Reece moved to place Case: RZ-13-15 on the floor for recommendation by MAPC to the City Council, with the noted stipulations, and that changing the zoning of this property from R-1 Single Family Medium Density to the proposed C-3 Limited Use Overlay District is compatible and suitable with the zoning, uses, and character of the surrounding area. Motion seconded by Mr. Scurlock.

The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 5 - Joe Tomlinson; Paul Hoelscher; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece and Jim Scurlock

Absent: 3 - Brian Dover; Beverly Nix and Kim Elmore

8. Staff Comments

COM-13:056 Presentation: Access Management

The Jonesboro MPO, Engineering & Planning Staff would like to give a brief presentation on a current Study of Access Management Policies for the City of Jonesboro

Attachments: [Access Management Presentation](#)

Marsha Guffey, PhD, Jonesboro Metropolitan Planning Organization presented a powerpoint presentation on Access Management (see attachment).

9. Adjournment