



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, March 28, 2023

5:30 PM

Municipal Center, 300 S. Church

1. Call to order

2. Roll Call

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Absent 1 - Dennis Zolper

3. Approval of minutes

[MIN-23:030](#)

MINUTES: March 14, 2023 MAPC Minutes

Attachments: [March 14, 2023 MAPC Minutes](#)

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

Aye: 7 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

4. Miscellaneous Items

[COM-23:014](#)

SIDEWALK IN LIEU FEE: 3311 Stadium Blvd.

Cavanaugh Auto Group is requesting MAPC approval to pay the sidewalk in lieu payment of \$11,475.73 for 229.27 l.f. along Stadium Blvd. The current rate is \$75.08 per square yard.

Attachments: [Letter](#)
[Site Plan](#)

John Easley – Associated Engineering: On behalf of Cavanaugh Motors. This is the second part of a two part development. Cavanaugh auto group is redoing the Honda and Kia dealerships. We've come before the commission about 2 months ago with a sidewalk waiver one Hyundai and the lot south of it. This is the Kia portion. We are asking again for a sidewalk waiver for the new Kia development. ARDot is going to make improvements to Stadium Blvd in the next couple of years. The sidewalks, curbs, and gutters, and things.

Lonnie Roberts - Chairman: Monica, do you have staff comments on this one?

Monica Percy – Staff: Yes, we’ve reviewed it. As John stated, ARDot has assigned a job number to this project, so they will be installing sidewalks when the time comes. We would recommend approving.

A motion was made by Paul Ford, seconded by Jeff Steiling, that this matter be Approved . The motion PASSED with the following vote.

Aye: 6 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Monroe Pointer; Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

Recused: 1 - Kevin Bailey

5. Preliminary Subdivisions

[PP-23-04](#)

SUBDIVISION: Parker Hollow

Todd Buttler is requesting MAPC subdivision approval for 4 lots on 31.34 acres located south of Paula and Parker Drive. This property is located within the R-1, single family medium density district and the C-3, general commercial district.

Attachments: [Subdivision Plat](#)
[Application](#)

Todd Buttler – Ozarks Civil Engineering: I’m here representing Jerry Halsey with Halsey Land Company regarding the Parker Hollow Subdivision which has about 31.34 acres with 4 lots. Lot 1 is a residential lot. It’s approximately 1.6 acres. Lot 2 is 6.7 acres, Lot 4 is 15.83 acres. Lots 2 and 4 is zoned C-3 general Commercial. Lot 3 is kind of a drainage. There’s a creek in there and storage that will be non-buildable at that time. Separate that out as a separate lot. As part of the due diligence to do the subdivision we were required to look at multiple different things. The traffic, utilities, drainage. The drainage is a phase 2 phase 1 part of it was widening Christian creek out and doing storage over on lot 2. That was part of phase 1. Phase 2 of this is we are looking at the utilities. Getting the utilities to lot 1 we’ll be running some sewer up Paula Dr to get to lot 1. Over on lot 4 there will be rerouting of the sanitary sewer along with the piping of storm sewer. The utilities and traffic, as part of that we visited with the city. We had a local traffic consultant Mark Nichols with TDS. We were anticipating on doing a traffic stud. We had to come up with some uses that were highest intensity so we could look at how it would impact the road systems. Some of the items that were consid4ered were a school, mini storages, mixed uses condominiums, banks, he used different scenarios to figure out what the traffic analysis would look like. At this time there is nobody know to be on the site. It was one of those things where we had to figure out what the uses were that would be high enough to analyze the road systems.

Jim Cooper – Commission: You’re only dividing into lots, you’re not rezoning anything?

Buttler: I am not rezoning anything.

Cooper: The R-1 lot will stay R-1?

Buttler: Yes, sir.

Cooper: So this is strictly a replat of the property itself?

Buttler: That is correct.

Lonnie Roberts: Monica, do you have any staff comments?

Monica Pearcy – Staff: Yes, we’ve reviewed it and it does meet all of our subdivision guidelines.

Roberts: I had a request that someone had one question. Would someone like to come up and ask a question?

Oz Garcia – 2611 Covey Dr: I just have a couple of questions. I recently found out – I found out yesterday about this – I was kind of wondering what was going on in the last couple of years on that development. I kind of thought Mr. Halsey would be here to represent himself, but I guess you’re Mr. Todd Buttler. I just don’t – I feel like there hasn’t been much transparency between the developer and the residents of this subdivision. I know several years ago they were trying to put in an apartment complex and that was turned down and I don’t know if they said nothing of this kind would be put in those lots or in that part of –

Roberts: Let me interject real quick. So when that got turned down, everything reverted back to what it’s originally zoned at. At this point, there’s no application in process, no consideration for rezoning, no consideration for development other than to subdivide the property. That’s all we are here to consider tonight. The breaking up of the lots.

Garcia: With subdividing the property into 4 lots, does the potential – I don’t know if you guys have it, but page 6 of the traffic analysis – what they’re proposing is going to be put in is just a proposal of what they are wanting to put in?

Roberts: That’s not actually in our packet.

Kevin Bailey - Commission: the traffic study is irrelevant to what we’re looking at.

Roberts: The traffic study won’t come until we’re actually proposed a development.

Garcia: Okay, so my question is that it’s getting split up into 4 lots, correct?

Roberts: Yes, 3 commercial and 1 residential at this point.

Garcia: So, the traffic study shows the 4 lots being split up and what could possibly be there. The school and the storage units. So, my question is is there any family housing in that – on our side?

Roberts: We haven’t seen any application. Like I said, we don’t have anything except for they’ve come and said we want to configure these lots in these shapes which is on the board and we want to put a road in so at this point there’s been no mention of development as far as what the specifics would be of the development.

Garcia: So I guess I’m here to voice my opinion just to let everybody know that I’m against the splitting of the lots just because I’ve gotten ahold of the site plan and the traffic analysis of what they could probably propose that would be on those lots and I’m against it. I’ve got all my neighbors here, people who are from the subdivision. Could you raise your hand if you’re against the –

Roberts: Against the splitting?

Garcia: Just the splitting of the lots because we already know what’s going to be going in there and I can speak for myself and they’ll probably vouch that we do not want any condos or any multi-family housing. I know you guys don’t know this but it says there’s 8 units on an existing baseball field in our subdivision. I don’t know if there’s 4 duplexes going in. It does not fit in with our residence. Our neighborhood.

Roberts: At this point, that would require further action as far as a rezoning goes. So that would be heard multiple times. In other words, I’m letting you know that wouldn’t be slipped in through the development. That would have to be applied for, we’d have to take action and it would require a city council

reading.

Garcia: I think we're all aware and we know if this got split up into 4 lots, then it's going to be a domino effect of all this coming in and the rezoning and all of that. That will probably be for I guess in the future if it comes up again. If it gets split up and gets rezoned we can talk about it. I am just saying I'm opposed to it and I know they are I think we just want to keep it the way it is or if the developer would actually meet with us and propose something that's brand new instead of throwing possibly –like Mr. Buttler said – mini storages. I'm not against the school if they put the school there. I think I'd rather see a school than mini storages and condos.

Roberts: We appreciate you speaking about it. City Planner, do you have any comments?

Jeff Steiling – Commission: Is it true that the items they seem to be the most concerned about which is mini storages and condos are not allowed on the way it's zoned? Those can't be put in the way it's being zoned right now. They would have to come back and ask for a rezoning and get all of that approved. That would really be the time for your fight if that happens.

Garcia: But Mr. Halsey had a traffic analysis done on that piece of property for – as Mr. Todd Buttler said about the school.

Steiling: So they may have considered it at one time, but it is not zoned for that. They cannot build that at this time with the way it's zoned.

Garcia: Okay we are as a neighborhood are very aware that this may possibly be going in. I know it's not going to but he said there's going to be a school put in and rezoned and all that.

Roberts: So they could go put in a school tomorrow without coming back before us. Even with the way it lays right now. And that's just – I'm just saying that is a possibility. Because of the way it's zoned commercial.

Garcia: But what's – to me it's what's stopping Mr. Halsey from not selling that property to the school or having a school put on there and him going the other way and putting storage units?

Roberts: The way it's zoned right now, that would not be allowed by law.

Garcia: But he could get it rezoned, correct?

Roberts: He would make an application for rezoning. I think 3 rezoning's or at least 2 have been declined on this property already in the years passed.

Garcia: So that property – there is no multi-housing of any sort? They'd have to get it rezoned?

Kevin Bailey – Commission: That's been attempted before and been denied.

Garcia: Just to let everyone know, we do not want that there. It's like if you put this in thre one of these things is not like the other and it's not a subdivision and we'll wind up dealing with anything that gets put in there. He's not here but Mr. Buttler will you relay the message to Mr. Halsey that in the near future whenever he's trying to develop there if he could include the residents of (unintelligible) and the backside because ultimately we have to live there and we have to deal with the backlash or whatever after the developer moves on –

Roberts: Could it just be read into record that we don't actually like conjecture between –

Garcia: Sorry – the developer just comes in and builds and then moves on. He doesn't and he's not worried about what - afterwards. He just jumps from one project to another and we're concerned about that. We are concerned about what happens after it's developed. We –

Roberts: We're going to have to address that once we have a subdivision plan or once we see an actual development plan.

Garcia: Thank you for your time.

Roberts: Commissions, any questions or comments after that?

(Unable to transcribe)

Roberts: It's not actually a public hearing but I'll go ahead and let you ask one more question. Come up to the mic and introduce yourself.

(Unable to transcribe)

Carol Duncan – City Attorney: It's just for the people watching on TV.

Fred Harget – 1811 Carolyn: I'm assuming, and tell me if I'm wrong in my assumption, that if y'all approve this plot plan then you are approving an extension of Carolyn Dr to Parker Rd?

Roberts: Yes, sir.

Harget: For that reason, I would be strongly against approving this plot plan just like it is right now. Especially not knowing what's going to go in there. I can envision all kinds of traffic cutting through there on a very quiet street right now. The parent line picking up kids and backing up in front of our houses and obstructing traffic. Also do we know what's going to happen with Parker Rd anytime soon? Because where Paula Dr runs into Paula Dr it backs up from Southwest Dr to Wood St early in the morning on a lot of mornings and a lot of afternoons.

Roberts: I think that would be the subject of a traffic study if they ever apply for a development plan. Again, we won't be considering any of that tonight because we do not have a development plan.

Harget: Thank you very much, again my big objection is that street connecting. It looks like it could serve the whole 15 acres without connecting to the neighborhood. Thank you.

Roberts: Thank you for your comments. Commissioners, do you have any questions or comments?

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

Aye: 5 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Nay: 1 - Stephanie Nelson

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

Recused: 1 - Monroe Pointer

6. Final Subdivisions

7. Conditional Use

[CU-23-03](#)

CONDITIONAL USE: Woodsprings Road

Chad Fisher is requesting conditional use approval for a proposed storage complex within a C-3, general commercial district. The property is located east of Big Lots on Woodsprings Road.

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Site Plan](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Certified Mail Receipts](#)

John Easley – Associated Engineering: On behalf of Focal Point Investments. Chad Fisher, the owner is here tonight. We are requesting a Conditional Use permit on this property on Woodsprings between big lots for a proposed mini storage complex. We've met with the City Planning Department, Engineering Department and the plan you see is the proposed layout. The property butts up against Parker Rd, or I guess Alexander. The main entrance would be on Woodsprings Rd. It would be a one way in one way out. It would be a gated development. As the right of way frontage on the Interstate. Set in the overlay district which requires additional landscaping, building materials, signage, and drainage. We propose to make improvements to Christian Creek. To lay the slope back, landscape and stabilize it. As I said, Mr. Fisher is here to answer any questions. We've made some renderings of the development that we'd like to pass out to you.

Chad Fisher – 8888 Midsouth Dr, Olive Branch, MS: The elevations you have in front of you, the first page is the original rendering. The actual building is page 2 and page 3. That's just going to show you guys that what we design is very close to what we're actually building. The 4th page is a facility we just got approved in West Tennessee and it shows the kind of gate system we are going to have beside the building. Our intentions are to build a, take the first page building and put that on Woodsprings. This is a gated facility so as you pull in there will be a main office. It will be staffed and managed 7 days a week. The hours will be 9-6 Monday through Friday and 10-4 Saturday and Sunday.

Roberts: Did you say 9-6?

Fisher: 9-6. It is not a 24 hour access center. So the access is from 6 in the morning to 9 at night. There are exceptions to that rule. If they have a unit, they can pay extra to visit after hours. We have security systems, we have gates, and it's fully enclosed. You can see the ingress and egress gates up by the building on Woodsprings but we also have a fire exit on the Southside towards the interstate. On this site plan there are 3 climate controlled buildings, the remainder are non-climates. I believe we have about 60,000 sq. ft. of climate on this project and about 20 or so thousand of non-climate. Are there any questions I could answer from you guys?

Roberts: City Planner, do you have staff comments on this one?

Derrel Smith – City Planner: We've reviewed it and we could recommend approval of a Conditional Use permit with the following conditions:

1. That upon issuance of the Conditional Use Approval, all other permits, licenses, and inspections required locally and statewide be applied for and obtained by the applicant.
2. That the proposed site shall satisfy all requirements of the City Engineer, all requirements of the current Stormwater Drainage Design Manual and Flood Plain Regulations regarding any new construction.
3. 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.
4. The site shall comply with all overlay district guidelines.

Roberts: Now this is actually a Conditional Use within the C-3 so I do open it up for public comments. Is there anyone here to give public comments on this development?

Richard Owens: 1604 Whitehaven Ct: I'm here to talk about this and for my neighbors who are going to be backed up to a large collection of probably metal buildings that are going to be sitting up there. My concern is when you're going to bring all of this all the way up to Christian Creek and

essentially knock out everything that exists back there, we're going to have then a fairly nice kind of space. Now we'll have a big section of land with probably indiscriminate lighting shining out because you need to be safe with your storage building. So you'll have these big screaming lights just shining out everywhere and there's not going to be anything between the residences he's backing up to and all this lighting. We also have to worry about vehicles and the extra traffic coming in and out. I know it's a big incentive to pay extra so they can get in there after 11 at night or 6 in the morning when they actually do stuff. You can say they charge extra, but I don't know that the extra charge is going to make a difference for most people. I have to get to my stuff when I need my stuff. I'm going to pay an extra \$10-\$15 a month. I'm sure they're probably looking at some kind of how this is going to effect the ditch or try to do something with the ditch because presently how it is with the fields and the houses that are there now you already have to worry about the wash area and the trees falling in. Is the answer just to clear out all the trees and everything down through there to make that space for them? Also, on the weirdo hippie side, not too keen on losing kind of that habitat through there. So that to me has an effect on things. And the other thing is down around the road around the corner we've got some more apartments coming up there. Jonesboro needs housing. We need apartments, we need condos, we need single family residences. Do we need – I can about anywhere and just about point out a pile of storage buildings some place going up and down the road you're going to see from the highway and Woodsprings road? This isn't something that visually anybody appreciates. I would much rather see somebody put in someplace where someone can live rather than a bunch of buildings out there done by someone who, again, is not going to be living here and doesn't have to incur the cost of well my house was pretty nice now people who are looking at it will look out the back door and go that sure is ugly back there ain't it? I'm not so sure I want to live next to that. Most of these people living in this circle are longtime residents of Jonesboro. So those are all the options and things I wanted to make sure to voice to you all for our point and for hopefully for my neighbors.

Roberts: Thank you for your comments. Anyone else have any comments at this time? Anyone want to speak?

Paul Ford – Commission: I have a question for Derrel. What is it about the use that is desired vs the current zoning that requires the conditional use permits? Where is it, if you will, are they coloring outside the lines that require them to have our permission to do so?

Smith: Just allowing the storage buildings in a C-3 zone requires a conditional use permit.

Ford: So a storage complex typically is not a permitted use in this zoning?

Smith: It's allowed with a conditional use permit.

Jim Little – Commission: If I can, Paul, most of the storage units you see in Jonesboro are in C-3. They have all had to get conditional use for all of them. But they're mostly in C-3.

Ford: So like the ones that are under construction on Washington between the Elk's Club and the bypass, those are C-3 zoning?

Little: We saw those here, yes.

Monroe Pointer – Commission: Yesterday we talked about one of the questions one of the gentlemen just asked about the buffering between Christian Creek and the back of those storage units. Is it possible you can kind of reiterate that there will be some green area back there to be able to buffer?

Easley: Yes, I'm not sure what's on the other side of Christian Creek besides

trees and brush. I know there are some parts of Christian Creek where the banks are vertical and I think Michael can attest to that. Part of the drainage design, one option is to lay the slope back. Make it safe and stable where it won't wash out anything. In some spots Christian Creek 14-15ft tall. At a 3-1 that's 45ft. back to the top of the bank plus between what would be the proposed top of bank and the buildings is a 20ft sewer easement. When you have that plus the bank itself, plus the requirements of the overlay district, the middle of Christian Creek or the edge of Christian Creek you could be 60-70ft away with the building. Also part of the overlay district is there is landscaping. There's trees, evergreens, big, thick, lush evergreens all along the bank or behind the buildings. There's ways to shield all those buildings on the outside with landscaping. In addition to that the finishes on the buildings. I understand the concern, but there's ways of buffering most anything really.

Roberts: I guess just to kind of get the technique you're going to use, there's no way to leave the trees considering you've got to improve the drainage at this point?

Easley: Not to leave the trees when we're doing kind of bank improvements. We worked together on several projects where we laid the banks back or tried to stabilize it to keep it from falling in.

Roberts: Any other questions at this point?

Pointer: Just one to follow up with that one. So, Christian Creek kind of divides up here North and South, would you be removing any trees on the South side of Christian Creek?

Easley: No, we would be doing work on our side of the ditch or the property side of the ditch. You can tell there's spots on that property that goes all the way across Christian Creek for a good size. That won't be touched. It's only on the west side or the north side, however you look at it. On the development side of the creek is where the improvements are. The south side won't be touched.

Bailey: John, can you address the lighting concern? I know that you can't floodlight off the property, but can you address?

Easley: Well there won't be any lighting on the back of the building. We're not going to put sconces outside or on the edge of the building. All lighting in the development will be focused into the development. We can't control all of it, but we can control some of it as far as the bleed over. We make use of building sconce on the building to sign through opposed to 30-40ft light poles.

Roberts: There's also an additional architectural code on this development due to where it's located. So what can you speak to or do you have plans far enough out yet for what's on the back of the buildings?

Fisher: So we have not gotten to designing that yet but it's to my understanding that it's going to be brick stone.

Roberts: Brick and stone?

Fisher: A mix of brick and stone, yes. I'm not sure on colors. I'm not sure what the color pallet is here that has to be met, but we will meet those requirements.

Easley: Other developments I've seen that he's done he's had like brick, stone, brick mix. Not just a solid brick wall.

Roberts: Not just a metal building?

Fisher: That's right. And I'm not real sure, we were talking about it earlier the brick requirements for the project, but we try to do on all of our projects is at the very minimum, anything that's visible from the outside, because it is a gated facility, you can't see into the facility from the outside. But everything on the outside we 100% brick. So if you're driving around, if it's visible from the

street, it's bricked. Inside of those, if you can still see, on the main building especially, my ultimate intention if it's possible to meet everything that's required would be 3 sides of that larger building are 100% brick and then everything on the perimeter of the facility is brick. My preference is to do metal buildings inside the facility, but again that will be met through different designer boards and things like that. But that's our intentions. And to the lighting like you said, we're not doing 30ft poles and we do lighting studies with our MEPs and it shows the –

(unable to transcribe)

Fisher: Yes, sir.

Bailey: Being in the overlay district, I'm pretty sure everything will have to be brick and mortar.

Fisher: That's 100% fine.

Bailey: So there won't be any metal panels unless you go to BZA and get a variance.

Fisher: No, that's completely fine.

Roberts: Any other questions?

Little: I have another question. This looks pretty maxed out. Has this been – is there like an impervious, pervious part of this site. Has that all been designed into this?

Easley: We haven't gotten into the technical parts of the design. Part of that is the ditch work.

Little: Because there is a lot of land over there. I see what you're saying.

Bailey: Does that bring into play, does 65-70% coverage in a C-3, you can only develop, correct me I'm wrong, can only develop 65-70%? Not 90%.

Roberts: Is this the conceptual layout at this point, or is this the layout?

Easley: It's the preliminary layout.

Ford: Does the current preliminary layout exceed perimeters authorized in this overlay district.

Smith: We don't have any calculations on here, but there appears to be a lot of asphalt right now.

Michael Morris – Engineer: You also have to remember this is going to come back if it's over 75,000 sq. ft. as a large scale development. So we'll see the site plan again.

Bailey: So by voting on this Conditional Use tonight, just to be clear, we are not approving this site plan in any shape, form, or fashion.

Ford: So we would be approving the usage of a storage unit project, but not the size of scope of it as it's laid out before us tonight?

Roberts: So, at this point if there are additional barriers so to speak of trees, we would consider that at the development layout.

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

Aye: 4 - Jimmy Cooper; Jim Little; Kevin Bailey and Monroe Pointer

Nay: 3 - Stephanie Nelson; Jeff Steiling and Paul Ford

Absent: 1 - Dennis Zolper

8. Rezonings

9. Staff Comments

10. Adjournment