



City of Jonesboro

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

Meeting Minutes - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, December 9, 2008

5:30 PM

900 West Monroe

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 8 - Ken Beadles; Ken Collins; Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Marvin Day; Paul Hoelscher and Jerry Halsey Jr.

Absent 1 - Brian Dover

3. Approval of minutes

Present 8 - Ken Beadles; Ken Collins; Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Marvin Day; Paul Hoelscher and Jerry Halsey Jr.

Absent 1 - Brian Dover

3. MEETING MINUTES FOR THE MAPC NOVEMBER 13, 2008

A motion was made by Joe Tomlinson, seconded by Secretary Marvin Day, that these Minutes be Passed. The motion CARRIED by the following vote: All Ayes.

Aye: 6 - Ken Collins; Margaret Norris; Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Joe Tomlinson; Marvin Day and Paul Hoelscher

Absent: 2 - Brian Dover and Jerry Halsey Jr.

4. Preliminary Subdivisions

4. PP 08-05 SID PICKLE REQUESTS PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR CRAIGHILLS SUBDIVISION 7TH ADDITION.

APPLICANT REQUEST PRELIMINARY APPROVAL FOR 6 LOTS ON 2.00 ACRES LOCATED ON CRAIGHEAD FOREST ROAD.

PP 08-05- Sid Pickle-Craighills Subdivision, Craighead Road.

Mr. Bare with HKB & Associates presented. Mr. Pickle is asking that this property abutting a public road; all infrastructure is in, all the water is directed to the detention pond. It is a minor plat, and we are asking for preliminary and final approval of the minor plat. We have presented a 5 year plan and a plot plan of the 6 lots that we will combine the 3 drives.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs gave a brief staff report; stating that it is not a typical subdivision. Because they have more than 5 lots and is minor in nature. The driveways have been consolidated to 3 at the request of staff and we have

requested a cross access easement to be placed on the plats. Mr. Morris from Engineering had no comments.

Mr. Tomlinson stated concerns with the driveway entrances and there may be a problem if the lots are sold and there were a neighbor dispute. Mr. Bare stated Mr. Spriggs' request of the easement will cover that.

Mr. Spriggs stated that staff felt it was no need to come back to the Planning Commission on 2 stages; you will be provided with the same drawings.

Mr. Bare stated that nothing will change except the easement. There is no infrastructure to install, the street is installed. It is a minor plat.

Mr. Day made a motion for preliminary approval just because of a precedence, I understand where you are coming from Terry, but I don't want to split the hair. I make a motion for preliminary approval of this plat with the stipulation that the cross access agreements be provided on the legal description and found to be accepted by the City Planner.

A motion was made by Secretary Marvin Day, seconded by Jerry Halsey Jr., that this Subdivisions be Preliminary Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:all ayes

Aye: 7 - Ken Collins;Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Marvin Day;Paul Hoelscher and Jerry Halsey Jr.

Absent: 1 - Brian Dover

5. Final Subdivisions

6. Conditional Use

7. Rezonings

7. RZ 08-27 MARY HORNE 627 W. PARKER ROAD.

APPLICANT REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-1 TO C-3 LU SPECIALTY TOY AND GIFT SHOP ON .55 ACRES

RZ 08-27 Mary Horne-627 W. Parker Road, Jonesboro, AR

Ms. Mary Horne stated that she owns Jacobs Toys and Gifts on South Caraway Rd. and has signed an offer and acceptance of the 627 W. Parker Road and is requesting the C-3 Limited Use to move it into that home.

She added that Mr. Harris is representing Mrs. Francis Holt, the owner and I would like to take this home and make minor modifications, adding in appropriate parking and closing the back yard for a closed play area for kids.

Mr. Spriggs gave a brief staff report. There area will most likely remain commercial on the Land Use Map. Staff made recommendations of the buffering adjacent to the residential. Mr. Spriggs read all seven conditions:

1. Future site redevelopment of the subject property shall be subject to MAPC review and approval with a limited and maximum 50% lot coverage.

2. That prior to any occupancy of the building by the subject applicant or use, proper building code compliance shall be met by the applicant through the final occupancy permit process.

3. That permanent screening (privacy fence or evergreen trees) shall be provided at the rear of the property to screen abutting residential.

4. That any outdoor storage shall be limited to the rear yard and shall be totally screened from view from the street and all abutting residential properties.

5. If and when abutting properties are redeveloped, consolidated curb-cuts access shall be implemented where at all possible.

6. All vehicular parking shall be properly surfaced and meet code requirements for impervious surfacing.

7. No off-premise billboard signage shall be permitted on the property. All other on-premise signage shall satisfy the minimum standards of the effective sign ordinances.

8. That the addition of a drive in the rear yard be limited only as a private access in the rear for the employees only.

Mr. Halsey stated concerns of commercial drives in the rear and stated that it should be used for private use only. Mrs. Horne stated that on the side she may have to provide handicap access.

Mr. Spriggs suggested that the applicant has the structure evaluated by a licensed architect to satisfy all building code requirements. Mr. Hoelscher asked what the requirements of a non residential structure and changing it to a commercial structure. Are there clearly defined rules that have to be met. Mr. Spriggs deferred to the Building Code and stated that it should be coordinated with the Chief Building Official.

A motion was made by Jerry Halsey Jr., seconded by Lonnie Roberts Jr., that this Rezoning be Recommended to Council. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:all ayes

Aye: 7 - Ken Collins;Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Marvin Day;Paul Hoelscher and Jerry Halsey Jr.

Absent: 1 - Brian Dover

RZ 08-28 VINEYARD DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC

APPLICANT REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-1 TO PD-MU (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT MIXED USE) FOR 63.04 ACRES LOCATED ON NORTH AND EAST SIDES OF CHRISTIAN VALLEY DRIVE, SOUTH AND WEST SIDE OF CHRISTIAN VALLEY DRIVE AND ALONG MT. CARMEL ROAD.

RZ 08-28 Vineyard Development Group, LLC, North and East Sides of Christian Valley Drive, South and West Side of Christian Valley Drive and along Mt. Carmel Road.

Mike Cone, Atty. representing Vineyard Development, LLC. This is a planned

district (PD) Mixed Use on 63 acres in southwest Jonesboro. Mr. Steve Bryan, Mr. David Tyler have met with Mr. Spriggs and staff. We are all acceptable the Staff recommendations with a couple of questions and one issue that we would like to bring to your attention.

Mr. Brian Steve with the Bryan Co. and is in midsouth real estate, based in Mississippi primarily residential and since 1977. Studied the midsouth 6 to 8 states and identified Jonesboro some time ago. We like your community and it needs housing of a quality nature of the type proposed. There is a large job base coming, and the City is doing great job in attracting new business and the economy is superior to a lot of markets.

Family type is what is before you. That prototype that we search for is for a location where there are good churches, good residential growth, good schools and good access. That has been successful for us for years. That family oriented product is what I am addressing- families. We are marketing and considering families. Our product is superior and we provide a product that is good to these customers. We cater to children. We lease to multiple family types that are divorced, widowed, husband wife, seniors; etc. Our rental rates are as high as entry level homes and we are competing directly with that product.

A lot of people are not able to save a down payment. We want good access to commercial shopping. Our product is one that we take pride in. The interior is maintenance free with a concrete siding. Our interior refinishes are competitive to single family homes.

We have a structure that we have constructed 15 times across the south. It is huge in square footage; consist of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. Third level is all one bedroom units (those units go first). The 12-plex is a big home, creates a situation where we can't get the density we need. You can't put this smaller building, get the needed parking and accomplish this. We would like it to be more but we are presenting this for your review.

Our scrutiny of our residents is very thorough. We don't allow people in our development that don't have good jobs and good credit; we don't allow convicted felons. We care about crime. We have in-house programs where we work with the residents to identify problems. We have security systems, panic buttons/ systems in each bedroom to call into emergency services. Interested in locating here where crime is not a problem.

We discourage party atmosphere and we are family oriented. Our leases speak to it. We have built everything that we develop; we are the developer, contractor, and management company. We do a good job; we have personnel that have worked 20 years building these units. We have permanent employment for the management staff.

Opponent: Pam Alexander 4505 Summit ridge Max & Betty Alexander 4501 Mt. Carmel and Uncle Dale Alexander. We presented a letter that we gave the Planning Commission in 2005. Because of the family circumstances we decided to preserve our land in perpetuity. We have been pursuing this effort in tiny increments. We have been educating ourselves in conservation easements and trail systems.

Ms. Alexander also stated that our intentions are to preserve our property and allow for an easement for a greenway to connect the greenway plan that is in place that will cross the old Southern Hill Mall site and connect it to school in Valley View. The same day we sent that letter to the Valley View Church of Christ and we had conversation with them where we indicated interest to work with them to work along the property line. They agreed and we now have a berm there. The school is interested in talking to us on this. We have 13 acres on the ridge.

I serve on Land Use Advisory Committee since 2006. I have been working with Jason Wilkie to have this section added to the greenway. This is the time for us to be thinking about the next generation of what that plan will be. At the rate the city is growing we felt this one will make a great contribution. There are communities to our east and north that have children that attend the school, and this will be away to help the students and the mobility for people.

When this neighborhood came before the LU Board, I did not give input and we decided that not everyone felt the same as us. We knew that some development will be inevitable. We wanted to make sure that this was in the plan. Things work slower that you will like for them to. I am concern about the density of the multifamily; and we are not afraid of people on trails. I can bring in a boat load of documents that supports increased land values. My request is that this development incorporates some way to continue the Greenway and it can have access to the school and the school can have access to it. Mr. Halsey asked have you secured the easement across Southern Hills site? Mr. Spriggs responded that the approach may be to access through a portion of that property through the 100 ft. power line easement.

Judy Reed- 4633 Summit Reed Dr. in Griffin Park. Moved out there 7 years ago and have seen a lot of growth. We have concern with congestion. Valley View has grown recently and we have never seen growth like this in that area. We are concerned about the traffic situation and realize that there is a 3-lane road through that area that can probably handle that particular traffic. But the 278 units in shear numbers will be far more people than 278. There will be people moving in and out; it is a semi- short term arrangement and would prefer it to be condominiums.

The Valley View schools are already overcrowded. There will be more security needed; more policemen at least two more for the area will be needed. People are concerned about their property values and a new unit will be detrimental to the schools. We will hope you will do a lot of searching in to this thing as far as our infrastructure is concerned as far as additional police officers and the impact on the school

Carol Snell, live on Mt Carmel Rd. Her concern is that there will be an entrance in this area off of Mt. Carmel Rd. The traffic is phenomenal and is backed up down Lawson Rd. and down Mt. Caramel. She can't see putting in units like that to develop. Even if half these family had one child it will cause a big burden on the school, because they are bursting in the seams right now.

Mr. Spriggs presented the Staff report findings. He referred to the un-adopted land use map that is pending approval which showed a commercial node where Christian Valley Drive intersected with Highway 49.

Staff made suggestions on the access management, buffering where commercial abutted residential, vehicular and pedestrian connectivity. In the Multi-family there is a single feeder access into that portion and staff and the Fire Marshall is requesting a secondary access/egress to the development.

There are interior plans for walking trails but no detail was submitted. The request was forwarded to various agencies. Responses were received from the Fire Marshall, Randy Simpkins of CWL stated that utilities will not be compromised by the rezoning as shown on the drawings. As with any new addition, utility extensions to and inside the project will be the responsibility of the developer. There are no existing utilities on the newly constructed portion of Lawson Road.

Jonesboro Police Department has a current ratio of approximately 2 officers per 1000 people. He cannot support this project without a commitment to address this simple infrastructure need. It would require an additional two - three officers and associated equipment just to maintain our current staffing level which is already considerably below average, not to mention concerns about traffic and the impact to Valley View Public School.

There are 20 conditions by staff and the applicant listed a number of prohibited uses. Staff added an exclusion of fast food restaurant, vehicular sales, service station, etc.

There are 278 units under the RM-16 units. While Valley View is underserved in terms of a fair share of multi-family units, staff felt that an RM -12 would be better for the area in terms of a lower density.

Staff received input from the parks director and Pam Alexander, that professional consultant help be sought for the preservation of any trees. Staff suggests that a clearing limits plan be mandated to depict areas that would be preserved or what buffers will remain.

Number 8 deals with the walking trails in which staff recommended that more details be provided during the final development plan stage. A 12 ft. pathway is suggested and commitment is requested from the developer to connect to the existing bikeway and greenway?

Mr. Halsey asked if it was stated that Staff will decide on which trees will be kept? Mr. Spriggs responded that we are not deciding what trees are kept, but that a plan be decided to the Planning Commission. I think we are crossing the line when we tell a developer or someone that they have to keep certain trees; if they are willing to take something out and put it back.

Mr. Spriggs stated that the purpose of the clearing limits plan, is for showing areas of preservation. Staff doesn't think that there are not many trees on this property.

Mr. Day asked for clarification. This is a rezoning and we will have a preliminary development plan of the process and then a final development plan.

In agreeing to this PD, are we agreeing to this density?

Mr. Spriggs stated that in your recommendation tonight you need to be specific in terms of the districts, the density and the general conditions that will be forwarded to City Council.

Mr. Day commented that the land use committee has taken a position or way of thought that Multi-family does not need to be in large areas/tracts concentrated in one area. For example the Southern Hills Mall site would be a difficult situation for Jonesboro if someone wanted to do 200 acres of Multi-family.

The Land Use Committee felt our community will be better served in looking for ways to have smaller Multi-family that would be regional rather than be put sporadically placed around town. We looked at some criteria that considered access to highways, etc.

We have been very interested in the greenspace and connectivity, and I think we need to think this through and we have an opportunity of a gift to connect a school campus to a piece of property, and it will be a small nature reserve. We need to think about that to tie that together. And to the developer this should be a good draw for people to have a nature trail; that this developer doesn't have to pay for.

Dr. Beadles made comment that they wanted to meet with us on the December 2nd or 3rd and he told them he will not meet with them because of a past experience.

Mr. Cone gave rebuttal and commented on Item No. 10.... This is not a vital project under 200. Without 278 we cannot do this. We asked for RM-16. On the greenspace issue there is already a bike trail on the street going through and there are walking trails provided.

Mr. Halsey asked about the exterior materials shown on the drawings? Mr. Spriggs stated that the brick was from a previous project, this site is showing siding on the submitted drawings.

Mr. Joe Tomlinson asked if we rezone this property we are dealing with density, as far as I am concerned the density of the Multi-family is something I cannot vote for. I would be more in line with a maximum of 200 units. Mr. Cone commented that the RM-12 will result on 240 units. The 278 is the minimum.

Mr. Collins commented that we need to weigh out and consider is what it does do to southwestern Jonesboro as far as economics, school system, and traffic- the pros and cons. We know that Jonesboro is growing and it is progressing, and how do we accommodate that growth and progression in the appropriate manner. Just throwing it out the window is not the most appropriate thing to do. If we treat this development very carefully and put certain criterion and restrictions on the way they develop it -is the way to go.

Now it is a matter of discussion on what that criterion is and how we will accommodate both the citizens that live around the community, the greenways mentioned, density, traffic. Some of the pros: It will fund a lot of money into the school system.

The Valley View area in terms of taxes; the rent is high enough with the

selection of the tenants is stringent; it appears it will deter things that cause a lot of crime, disruption; you are getting into an area that will alleviate a lot of that; The cons: traffic how to deal with that; I mentioned that traffic is a issue. Has anyone to date gone out there between 7:30 and 8:15 in the morning during school hours. I recommend that some one does a traffic study. You're looking at taking 278 units with 48 resident lots and 4 to 5 commercial lots. You're looking at a lot of traffic. That's a concern of mine because I have 2 kids going there. There are 2.4 cars per family; 600 or 700 vehicles out of various location in the development. I feel like this is a good development, the traffic needs to be addressed.

There are a lot of kids in that area, and we have traffic police there that direct traffic. My preliminary thought would be to make during certain times day a right turn out only to Christian Valley Drive only out of the development towards Highway 49. I would like to highly recommend a traffic study with the type of density we are looking at. Look at your book it appears the multi-family will be sold off. Is that correct to a management company?

The question is- will the selection criteria for the tenants remain the same as what you guys initially set it up as? Mr. Bryant stated that they will have to underwrite the minimum of the numbers that I underwrite to be able to afford to pay for that property. It is 30 million dollars in value there.

Mr. Halsey stated your requirements will be like a bill of assurance. Mr. Collins asked if we can accept that bill of assurance. Mr. Spriggs stated that the bill of assurances can be modified. Mr. Phillip Crego stated that Bill of Assurances are not enforceable by the city of Jonesboro.

Mr. Cone stated that we cannot commit to certain criteria for ever. It is a substantial investment of money. Any one that would acquire the property will have to establish criteria to have return on the investment. Mr. Collins asked about the gated entrance approval through the fire department. Mr. Collins stated that on the multi-family look at the southwest corner at the clubhouse that it dump back out the Christian Valley Drive there rather than come through the single-family.

Mr. Cone we will propose an egress/ingress easement from the point in the center going south and tying back to Christian Valley Drive (north and west of the entrance). Mr. Collins stated that concerning the greenway on lots 19, 20, 21, I would like to see preservation of the greenway.

From a construction, Engineering, and a cost-effective standpoint, I don't have a problem with the 278 units, because you are providing less than 16 units per acres.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that he has seen so many big multi-family units around the city but they never turn out that way in terms of the management. It hasn't been controlled in the past.

Mr. Cone stated that they will hire professional staff and the rent will be based on monthly income (3 ½ times the income). The rent averages \$865 to \$1,375 per month.

Mr. Collins asked who will develop the commercial and single family? Mr.

Bryant stated that they are not part of that. We are interested in the multi-family.

Mr. Tomlinson asked have you built units in other university cities? Mr. Bryant stated that they have built in Memphis in Baton Rouge, Lafayette, Hattisburg, Mississippi.

We do limit the number of people that may live in a size unit. We don't hire unprofessional people to manage. Mr. Bryant stated that it will be concrete siding.

Mr. Day in my mind looking at what the land use committee had considered we may have a little too heavy of a development in the commercial, and maybe somewhat in the residential, knowing that the goal immediately is multi-family. The multi-family is border line for me. I'm not looking at their business model? From a community perspective, it is a border line issue. If you take that being border line and a large portion being commercial that is not fronting a highway. Not every commercial will be fronting a highway in Jonesboro. That is a prime piece of property in a great part of town.

Mr. Cone added that we are attempting to do is like the C4 in the Windover area.

Mr. Day, if it was no C-3, I would feel better. I am personally leaning towards us tabling it tonight. I would like to see this greenspace more tended to and planned out and a scale back of more of the Windover feel but in actuality of the zoning. Think about the multi-family a little.

Mr. Roberts, if we table it, what more are we looking for? Mr. Day stated that he would like to see little more single family homes and to have more of the Windover feel like C-5 quiet commercial. I would like to see a plan of the trail and connection.

Mr. Cone stated that on behalf of the applicant, I would like to request that you make a decision tonight.

Mr. Paul Hoelscher stated that while this may be a complete application we saw a lot of general statements in terms of the impact to the city and here I don't see how you will resolve those infrastructure issues.

Mr. Tomlinson stated that he is not anti-multi-family. We for a long time have gathered them on the north side near the university. Multi-family should be dispersed and I was happy to see some going in that direction but not at that density.

Mr. Collins asked Mr. Bryant- Can there be a compromise- (given the 278, the model and budget). Would you be willing to go to 240 units? Mr. Bryant stated that the product won't work and he is very familiar with this product.

Motion by Mr. Collins that we approve the case and send to Council the rezoning from R-1 to PD-MU for the 63 acres with the criteria of the 20 items, with the modification to number 10 and make it 278 units, and that the traffic study be done, right turn only lanes coming out the development on Christian Valley Drive, incorporate the selection criteria (P.O.A.), change the C-3 zoning request to a C-4, provide emergency access on the point at the southwest

quadrant of the PU development area.

2nd : None.

Mr. Day stated that he is like Mr. Tomlinson he is in support to have multi-family in that part of town but thinks it is a benefit to the community. He would like to see the multi-family portion resolved and the greenway connectivity addressed by the developer, I would like to make a motion to table it, to give him another opportunity to swing at it.

Mr. Cone asked if the MAPC had a problem meeting with the developer individually? No. The Commission agreed to a pre-meeting.

A motion was made by Secretary Marvin Day, seconded by Jerry Halsey Jr., that this Rezoning be Tabled. The motion CARRIED by the following vote:All ayes.

Aye: 7 - Ken Collins;Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Marvin Day;Paul Hoelscher and Jerry Halsey Jr.

Absent: 1 - Brian Dover

8. Staff Comments

8. FARIS BROOKS OF BROOKS ALTERNATOR & STARTERS 2018 W. WASHINGTON AVE.

REQUESTS MAPC WAIVER OF A PREVIOUS STIPULATION LIMITING DRIVEWAY ENTRANCE ONLY ON CONGRESS CIRCLE AND NOT WASHINGTON AVE.

COM 08-165- Faris Brooks of Brooks Alternator & Starter-2018 W. Washington, Jonesboro, Ar.

Requested to be tabled.

A motion was made by Secretary Marvin Day, seconded by Lonnie Roberts Jr., that this Other Communications be Approved. The motion CARRIED by the following vote: all ayes

Aye: 7 - Ken Collins;Margaret Norris;Lonnie Roberts Jr.;Joe Tomlinson;Marvin Day;Paul Hoelscher and Jerry Halsey Jr.

Absent: 1 - Brian Dover

9. Adjournment