



# City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center  
300 S. Church Street  
Jonesboro, AR 72401

## Meeting Minutes - Draft Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

---

Tuesday, August 13, 2019

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

---

### 1. Call to order

### 2. Roll Call

**Present** 7 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jerry Reece; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson and David Handwork

**Absent** 1 - Jim Little

### 3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-19:075](#)

MINUTES: Tuesday, July 23, 2019

**Attachments:** [Meeting Minutes from July 23, 2019](#)

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

**Aye:** 6 - Jerry Reece; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson and David Handwork

**Absent:** 1 - Jim Little

### 4. Miscellaneous Items

[PP-19-16](#)

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW: Rolling Hills Subdivision - Emerson Lane

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Mr. Tim Faisst is requesting MAPC review on Rolling Acres Subdivision which is off of Emerson Lane to establish what will be required in regard to the street improvements to further subdivide three of the existing lots into a total of seven lots to construct single family homes on all lots. The zoning is in an R-1 Single Family Residential District.

**Attachments:**

[Letter](#)

[Presentation](#)

[Rolling Acres Subdivision Filed Plat](#)

[MAPC Minutes from September 8, 2105](#)

**PP-19-16 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW: Rolling Hills Subdivision - Emerson Lane**

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Mr. Tim Faisst is requesting MAPC review on Rolling Acres Subdivision which is off of Emerson Lane to establish what will be required in regard to the street improvements to further subdivide three of the existing lots into a total of seven lots to construct single family homes on all lots. The zoning is in an R-1 Single Family Residential District.

**APPLICANT:** George Hamman stated he is seeking clarification on what needs to be done in an old subdivision that was originally platted in 1964. Most of Emerson drive did not get built, nor did the cul-de-sac, East Lane. Mr. Hamman advised his client is looking to purchase three lots and subdivide those lots. He stated they have surmised they would have to build a full street to the cul-de-sac. A variance was granted four years ago to waive curb and gutter to the lot directly across the street. Mr. Hamman stated he surmised he could just build the asphalt street with no curb or gutter. He is also asking for permission not to build East Lane.

**COMMISSION:** Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated if he owns lots on both sides of the street, he should build a full street with curb and gutter on both sides. That includes East Lane. The portion where he is on half a street should be half street improvements.

**STAFF:** Michael Morris stated the owner could check with the adjacent owner to see if they would be willing to abandon that section, but it would be unlikely they would. It is going to be expensive, but we are getting streets complete so I agree with Derrel there. City, Water, and Light does want them to run utilities through that section. They will have to run utilities across their lots.

**COMMISSION:** Lonnie Smith Jr. asked if they are planning on doing the entire cul-de-sac, or stopping where his property line ends.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated based on the ordinance, he can stop where the property line ends. Given the amount, it would be best to complete it now. It should have been required when the subdivision was developed.

**STAFF:** Michael Morris advised the subdivision was in the county when it was developed and was part of the annexation.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson asked about the flood zone for this area.

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated it is not in the flood zone.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated you will be impacting storm water by developing these lots. We need to have curb and gutter to deal with that. I support Derrel and the Planning Department in this decision because it is not our job to save an individual money. It is our job to help the public. It is our job to help the people already living on the street. They will be impacted by storm water in this area. We need to have these complete streets developed and not wait for people to someday buy those lots.

COMMISSION: Dennis Zolper stated on the cul-de-sac issue, it does not make sense to pave it to the boundary line. There is not that much cost differential for the developer to go ahead and pave the entire cul-de-sac. He has frontage on two lots almost three quarters of the way.

COMMISSION: Jimmy Cooper asked if they did not pave the cul-de-sac, would the lots become landlocked.

APPLICANT: George Hamman stated not by the recorded documents. By the practicality of getting to it, maybe. The person who owns the lots owns a lot behind it and it has frontage on Maple Valley Drive. Because he owns them, he is not landlocked.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for additional comments. There were none. As this was just a conceptual review, no vote was taken.

[COM-19:053](#)

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW: Elizabeth Lane

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Jackson Innovations, Inc. is requesting MAPC to do a conceptual review on the southern 300 ft of land on the west side of Elizabeth Lane south of Prospect Road where they want to create 5 60 ft. lots with only constructing a street with typical 26 ft. of pavement, but does not want to install curb and gutter and after the east side of the road is developed, the owner can complete the curb and gutter on both sides. This will include sidewalk on the west side of Elizabeth Lane.

Attachments:      [Elizabeth Lane Preliminary Subdivision Plans](#)

**COM-19:053 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW: Elizabeth Lane**

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Jackson Innovations, Inc. is requesting MAPC to do a conceptual review on the southern 300 ft of land on the west side of Elizabeth Lane south of Prospect Road where they want to create 5 60 ft. lots with only constructing a street with typical 26 ft. of pavement, but does not want to install curb and gutter and after the east side of the road is developed, the owner can complete the curb and gutter on both sides. This will include sidewalk on the west side of Elizabeth Lane.

**APPLICANT:** George Hamman stated this also deals with an old plat. A client is buying 300 feet of a property. It already has sanitary sewer running through it and has water almost to it. East Lane is a paved road from Prospect to where you see. It is only about 16' wide. There is no curb or gutter. The question is, does our developer have to do both sides of the road and do curb and gutter on both sides, or can we be consistent with what is there and put in the sidewalks on the west side.

**COMMISSION:** Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated this is a little different. If they put in the full 26' of asphalt, they are actually improving the other side of the property. If they were not offering that, we would recommend they install curb and gutter and do half street improvements. They are putting in sidewalks. We are not as opposed on this one of doing the full width asphalt. Cost wise, it about evens out. The problem is when the developer on the east side develops and he puts in curb and gutter, we will not be able to make him put it on the west side. If we miss this opportunity, it may be the only opportunity to get these five lots curb and gutter.

**STAFF:** Michael Morris stated he has been in conversations with engineers on the other side of the street. They are looking at the project, but have no specifics at this time.

**COMMISSION:** David Handwork asked normally, the developer would add curb and gutter on their side of the street.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated they would add curb and gutter. If it is a 26' street, they would put in 13' of asphalt. It would not do anything to the other side. This way you do get a full 26' wide asphalt street through there. You then lose your ability for curb and gutter in the future.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked that if we require curb and gutter, could he then say he was only going to do 13'.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated yes, that is all he is required to do.

COMMISSION: David Handwork stated he would be more inclined to go with what is typical. He develops his side of the street and future development would handle the rest. We have seen a lot of development in this area. It is likely that we will see continued development there.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for additional comments. There were none. As this was just a conceptual review, no vote was taken.

## **5. Preliminary Subdivisions**

[PP-19-15](#)

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION: Sierra Hollow

Michael Boggs of Tralan Engineering, LLC on behalf of owner Sierra Development, LLC request MAPC Approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Approval for Sierra Hollow located just South of Kellers Chapel Road on Southwest Drive with 22 proposed lots on 6.72 acres +/- acres within the PD-M Mixed Use Planned Development.

**Attachments:**     [Sierra Hollow Plan Set-A](#)  
                              [Sierra Hollow Plan Set-B](#)  
                              [Staff Report](#)  
                              [Plat](#)

PP-19-15 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION: Sierra Hollow

Michael Boggs of Tralan Engineering, LLC on behalf of owner Sierra Development, LLC request MAPC Approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Approval for Sierra Hollow located just South of Kellers Chapel Road on Southwest Drive with 22 proposed lots on 6.72 acres +/- acres within the PD-M Mixed Use Planned Development.

**APPLICANT:** Michael Boggs stated the piece of property was rezoned and approved back in 2013 for a PD-M, which is a PUD mixed use. He stated they are keeping with the same standards that are already present. The first two lots are commercial lots. They will be separated with public right-of-way on the first two. Once you go back to a residential, it goes to a private drive with ingress/egress and a private gate. He is seeking approval for the subdivision.

**COMMISSION:** Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated what they have done is shifted the road alignment. The lots are the same. The sizes still meet all requirements. It meets all of the requirements that were originally in the planned development. The city would recommend approval of this project.

**APPLICANT:** Michael Boggs stated the area was overburdened. We wanted to shift the road because of the grading plan.

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

**Aye:**    6 -    Jerry Reece;Kevin Bailey;Jimmy Cooper;Dennis Zolper;Mary Margaret Jackson and David Handwork

**Absent:**   1 -    Jim Little

**6. Final Subdivisions**

[PP-19-17](#)

PLAT APPROVAL: 516 W. Jefferson

Gary Harpole of Halsey Thrasher Harpole is requesting MAPC Plat Approval for Jefferson Replat of Bicentennial Subdivision lots 2-3 block 12 for splitting one lot into three lots located at 516 W. Jefferson. This is in an C-2 Downtown Fringe Commercial District.

Attachments:     [Jefferson Replat of Bicentennial Subdivision](#)

**PP-19-17 PLAT APPROVAL: 516 W. Jefferson**

Gary Harpole of Halsey Thrasher Harpole is requesting MAPC Plat Approval for Jefferson Replat of Bicentennial Subdivision lots 2-3 block 12 for splitting one lot into three lots located at 516 W. Jefferson. This is in an C-2 Downtown Fringe Commercial District.

**APPLICANT:** Gary Harpole stated this is currently an asphalt parking lot. His desire is to replat that from one C-2 lot, into three.

**COMMISSION:** Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated it meets all the requirements of the zoning district. We would recommend approval.

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

**Aye:** 6 - Jerry Reece;Kevin Bailey;Jimmy Cooper;Dennis Zolper;Mary Margaret Jackson and David Handwork

**Absent:** 1 - Jim Little

**7. Conditional Use**

**8. Rezoning**

[RZ-19-10](#)

**REZONING: 3714 Harrisburg Road**

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Evone Roberts is requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to C-3 General Commercial District Limited Use Overlay for 3.64 acres +/- of land located at 3714 Harrisburg Road.

**Attachments:**     [Application](#)  
                              [Staff Summary](#)  
                              [Rezoning Replat](#)  
                              [Nettleton School Signature](#)  
                              [Email](#)

**RZ-19-10 REZONING: 3714 Harrisburg Road**

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Evone Roberts is requesting MAPC Approval for a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to C-3 General Commercial District Limited Use Overlay for 3.64 acres +/- of land located at 3714 Harrisburg Road.

A motion was made to untable this property by jimmy Cooper, seconded by Dennis Zolper. A verbal vote in the affirmative was taken with no opposition.

**APPLICANT:** George Hamman stated the reason for the rezoning request is that this is likely not a place that people are going to develop as R-1 single family homes and be able to sell them at a later date. That is why he is requesting a C-3. It is a limited use overlay by taking out many of the permitted uses that would create noise or vibration. Also, this is roughly a three and a half acre site. It is not large enough to house a big box development. We envision a strip center that would house businesses that would support the existing residential. We do not believe traffic will be a problem because people are going to stop at these businesses while going to and coming from work. Property values should not be affected because we are planning on screening these on the north and east sides and part of the Southside where there is existing residential uses. Drainage will meet the current drainage manual. These are the reasons why we are looking to rezone.

**COMMISSION:** Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated it meets three of the six approval criteria. We do not feel it meets D., E. or F. D. is suitability of the subject property for the uses to which it has been restricted without the proposed zoning map amendment. You can have commercial there now, but you can still do residential there. The land use plan shows that area to be commercial in the future, but we are not sure now is the time. We do not know the effects of the Harrisburg Road improvement. We also did not think it met E., the extent to which approval of the proposed rezoning will detrimentally affect nearby property including, but not limited to, any impact on property value, traffic, drainage, visual, odor, noise, light. We do not know what will be out there. It could be offices, it could be small commercial and that would probably blend. It could also be a restaurant. It could be any other use that is not specifically listed out in the limited use overlay. The Harrisburg Road improvements will not continue past



the property. We are unable to determine the impact since we are speculating. We would make the recommendation that the staff cannot support the rezoning at this time.

PUBLIC: Richard Ishmael stated they do not want this lot rezoned commercially. They have enough north of the ditch to take café of them.

PUBLIC: Patti Lack stated she wanted to address the traffic problem. There are a lot of people in the room that has spent a lot of time trying to keep that area as residential. Where the road comes back to a two lane road is right where this property is. We do not even know how the traffic will flow in the area. If you head south and try to access this property, you are going to hit a two lane road and stop traffic. The point of having the five lane road is to make sure traffic flows. There are no plans to expand the five lanes any farther in the future. We do not need a little strip mall in that area. It is R-1 and someone told me that if they won the lottery, they would but that lot and put a really nice house on top of that hill and have a beautiful lot. We do not need commercial property on that and I hope you vote no on this.

PUBLIC: Sandra Esman stated her property adjoins 3710. The neighborhood has had opposition in the past regarding this property. The property is surrounded with residential on three sides and Central Baptist across the street. Everything north of Dollar General is commercial. Everything south is 99% residential. We do not want commercial in the middle of residential. We feel it is profit motivated. It is a large single family area and we would like it to stay that way. We feel as property owners like we are the ones suffering the consequences since we do not know what is going to go there once it is sold. There are five houses between the property up for rezoning and Mr. Ishmael's house. You also have Medallion Acres. We do not feel it is consistent with neighboring properties. We feel the land is contusive to single family development. We have collected 209 signatures against the rezoning and received an email today against it bringing the total up to 210 people against it. Ms. Esman asked people to stand who opposed the rezoning. Several people stood. We respectfully ask you grant our request to not rezone the property to C-3, general commercial.

PUBLIC: Gary Clairiday stated based on their proposal, there are two ways into this property. All the water that comes off Central Baptist drains straight through that property into a drainage ditch. It is already a drainage problem now. The traffic and drainage are what he has a problem with.

PUBLIC: Anna Williams stated this is a residential area on a scenic byway and we would like it to stay that way.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. opened for commissioner comment.

COMMISSION: Mary Margaret Jackson stated she agreed that this is not the right time for this rezoning. Flooding is a problem. There is a substantial flood mitigation system there that has been taxed to its limits the last few weeks. We need to wait to see how the highway system revisions affects this area before we move forward. This is an opportunity for us to protect an asset. We could really make something special here. It is a scenic byway and there is a plan to build a trail system not even a mile down the road. I have heard that the

mayor wants to extend the five lane to the fire station and I hope that will not happen. We need to look at developing our neighborhoods. I am not against multifamily development. I am for village nodes, but the proper things. Increasing the attractiveness of the neighborhood. Making it functional. We are looking at the public and thinking how this is going to affect this part of our city. It is important that we do not do it too fast.

A motion was made by Jimmy Cooper, seconded by Dennis Zolper, that this matter be Approved. The motion FAILED with the following vote.

**Nay:** 6 - Jerry Reece;Kevin Bailey;Jimmy Cooper;Dennis Zolper;Mary Margaret Jackson and David Handwork

**Absent:** 1 - Jim Little

[RZ-19-11](#)

REZONING: 1702 - 1710 Aggie Road, 103 State Street, 1800, 1806-1814 Aggie Road, 105 Melrose, 1918 Aggie Road

Gary Harpole is requesting MAPC Approval for a rezoning from R-2 Multi Family Low Density District to PD-M Mixed Use Planned Development for 3.79 acres +/- of land located at 1702 - 1710 Aggie Road, 103 State Street, 1800, 1806 - 1814 Aggie Road, 105 Melrose, and 1918 Aggie Road.

**Attachments:**     [Application](#)  
                              [Staff Summary](#)  
                              [Conceptual Rendering](#)  
                              [Layout of Property](#)  
                              [Rezoning Plats](#)

RZ-19-11 REZONING: 1702 - 1710 Aggie Road, 103 State Street, 1800, 1806-1814 Aggie Road, 105 Melrose, 1918 Aggie Road

Gary Harpole is requesting MAPC Approval for a rezoning from R-2 Multi Family LowDensity District to PD-M Mixed Use Planned Development for 3.79 acres +/- of land located at 1702 - 1710 Aggie Road, 103 State Street, 1800, 1806 - 1814 Aggie Road, 105 Melrose, and 1918 Aggie Road.

APPLICANT: Gary Harpole stated they are looking to kick start the redevelopment effort to connect Arkansas State to downtown via Aggie Road. He is looking to develop this area as a PD-M. The only tear down and new construction would be in Phase I at 1918 Aggie. That is an abandoned multifamily structure. The fire marshal closed it down some time ago. That will come down and we are working on a conceptual drawing that will go back with an enclosed pavilion. It is currently drawn with shipping containers with glass garage doors to the north and west. This building would contain five to six food uses that would be pedestrian in nature to serve the campus. We are looking at PD-M because we think this all does not need to be commercial. There is a large grove of trees behind those houses that look underutilized. As we redevelop those houses into commercial uses, we want to open that area up to a public grove type space that would service that area. It is an idea in process, but we think a PD-M is the best way to be able to mix these uses. The 1700 block, we are waiting to see what happens with University Loop.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for staff comments.

STAFF: Derrel Smith stated they have reviewed it and would recommend approval of the mixed use planned development with the following requirements:

1. That the proposed site shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Storm water Drainage Design Manual and Flood Plain Regulations regarding any new construction.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Planning Department, prior to any

redevelopment of the property.

3. Any change of use shall be subject to Planning Commission approval in the future.

4. A final site plan illustrating compliance with site requirements for parking, signage, landscaping, fencing, buffering, outdoor storage, dumpster enclosure, sidewalks etc. shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to any redevelopment of the property that pertains to the Zoning and compliance with the Ordinances and Development.

5. Setbacks and Parking Requirements will Mirror that of C-1 Downtown Core Commercial District.

COMMISSION: Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for any public comment.

PUBLIC: David Handwork stated on behalf of ASU, he voices his support of this redevelopment along Aggie corridor. He believes this will be a great amenity to the university and a great amenity to the city.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper, seconded by Jimmy Cooper, that this matter be Recommended to Council. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

**Aye:** 6 - Jerry Reece; Kevin Bailey; Jimmy Cooper; Dennis Zolper; Mary Margaret Jackson and David Handwork

**Absent:** 1 - Jim Little

[RZ-19-12](#)

REZONING: 516 W Jefferson Avenue

Gary Harpole is requesting MAPC Approval for a rezoning from C-2 Downtown Fringe Commercial District to RI-U Residential Intermediate - Urban District for .62 acres +/- of land located at 516 W Jefferson Avenue.

**Attachments:**     [Application](#)  
                              [Rezoning Replat](#)  
                              [Staff Summary](#)  
                              [Focus Letter](#)  
                              [School Email](#)

Withdrawn

**9. Staff Comments**

**TEXAS ROADHOUSE FEE-IN-LIEU**

**COMMISSION:** Lonnie Roberts Jr. asked for any staff comments to conclude the meeting.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated last week we did a final site inspection for Texas Roadhouse. During the inspection we found the sidewalks were not installed. There was a miscommunication between the engineer and contractor. We told them that was conditional upon their certificate of occupancy. They have offered to pay the fee-in-lieu for the sidewalks. You have in front of you a plan from the highway department showing the widening and showing sidewalks that are going to be installed along the front of the building. We would ask you approve a fee-in-lieu for them to pay for their share and then we can use that in another location. With the highway department plan, we know there will be sidewalks in that area.

**COMMISSION:** Mary Margaret Jackson asked how long until the highway improvement.

**STAFF:** Derrel Smith stated they are at 90% planned. They already have the right-of-way purchased. They are in the process of working utilities now. It is expected to bid this year. It could start this year depending on how quickly they mobilize. It will be installed within a year.

A motion was made by Dennis Zolper to approve the fee-in-lieu of construction, seconded by David Handwork, that this matter be Approved. The motion PASSED with the following vote.

**Aye:** 6 – Jim Scurlock; Mary Margaret Jackson; Kevin Bailey; Jerry Reece; Jimmy Cooper and Dennis Zolper

**Nay:** 0

**10. Adjournment**