



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

[play video](#)

2. Roll Call

[play video](#)

3. Approval of minutes

[play video](#)

Approval of the MAPC April 28, 2015 Minutes

[play video](#)

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

4. Preliminary Subdivisions

[play video](#)

5. Final Subdivisions

[play video](#)

Final Subdivision: Prospect Farms Phase III

Associated Engineering request MAPC approval for Prospect Farms Phase III located off of Aggie Road and Old Paragould Hwy within a R-1 Single Family Residential District. Applicant is proposing 22 lots on 6.73 acres.

[play video](#)

John Easley, Associated Engineering, representing the owner, P & J Development, stated he is asking for approval of Phase III. The question was raised last time on the 20 ft. all weather access road for fire safety, we are providing for connection access road to the east to Wildwood Subdivision to the north.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs noted compliance as mentioned in the Staff Report for R-1 Single Family and with the preliminary plan approved. This was discussed in the pre-meeting.

Engineering: Mr. Morris had no additional comments.

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

Final Subdivision: Greensborough Village Commercial Subdivision Phase I

John Easley on behalf of Associated Engineering request MAPC approval for Greensborough Village Commercial Subdivision Phase I located at Johnson Avenue and HWY 49 within a (TC-O) Town Center Overlay District.

[play video](#)

Mr. Easley, Associated Engineering, representing the developers Greensboro Investments, asking for approval by the Planning Commission.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs gave staff comments regarding the previously approved Town Center Concept/Overlay District, T.C.O. 200 acres were rezoned for a mixed use development. The associated lots in this Phase were approved for this Phase I. The noted right-of-ways and public streets are noted in the report (3 local streets were described). There are detailed sections provided showing the sidewalk connectivity. There will be street improvement issues to be addressed by Engineering on the streets having maintenance coordinated. There were 12 pads proposed on the 7 lots as approved in the preliminary layout. The layout is in compliance with the original ordinance and concept layout.

Engineering: Mr. Michael Morris stated that there will be a detention pond platted within drainage easements a little north of this. There is a right-turn lane noted on the eastern drive off E. Johnson Ave., will this be installed.

Mr. Easley noted- yes, as far as he is aware. **Mr. Morris also noted that right-of-way for Johnson is already a 5-lane section; there is no need for additional right-of-way dedication.**

Mr. Spriggs noted that this case was discussed in the pre-meeting and there were Commissioners present that had concerns about the joint/cross access between lots and the restriction of additional driveways on and off of E. Johnson Ave.

Mr. Kevin Bailey: A question was raised on the lots that are bordering Johnson which were limited to the two main streets coming in. When you all sell an individual lot will they come in and be allowed to gain additional access off Johnson? **Mr. Easley,** the will be held to the 2 curb-cuts for any lot that is sold. Our intent is not to create additional driveways off of Johnson for this Phase. Any lot to be developed will come back to the Planning Commission for individual Site Plan approval.

Mr. Spriggs: In the pre-meeting a concern was raised by Commissioners that what type of assurance can be made to prevent this. He added that it could be

done one of two ways: By either conditioning it as part of the Final Subdivision approval, and maintaining the condition in the record; or, Mr. Easley could you possibly note such a restriction on a recorded plat. Mr. Easley: We tried the limited-access approach before, and it did not work. You may want to condition the individual site plans. Mr. Spriggs concurred.

Mr. Scurlock: It seems like this is the cart before the cart. How can we approve a subdivision plan if we do not know what the footprints will be.

Mr. Spriggs: You have a valid concern. In terms of the commercial uses going here, you have that pattern with the concept plan. The plans are on the layout sheet for phase 1. This give you the parameters of the pad. You have the parking layouts onsite and on street. There is no deviation from this. Mr. Easley: This is the ownership's vision of the lots for sale per the guide book.

Mr. Scurlock: Are they buying the pad or the acreage? Mr. Easley: They are buying a lot that we will have constructed, but it may deviate some from that pad perhaps with a loading dock or other changes. Mr. Scurlock: Referred to a development across from Panera Bread which changed back and forth on the access and that was 3 buildings.

Mr. Spriggs reiterated that with this approach the MAPC does have the pattern book to guide the look and feel of the proposed project of TC-O, unlike other rezoning.

Motion to was made accepted the proposal as specified with the noted conditions of cross access along Johnson Ave. and limitation on drives to be accessed off local streets.

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

Final Subdivisions: Lake Pointe Estates Phase 1

Wood Engineering request MAPC approval for Lake Pointe Estates Phase 1 located Southside of Woodsprings Road, East of Friendly Hope Rd. within a R-1 Single Family Residential District. Applicant is proposing 28 lots.

[play video](#)

Mark Morris: Presented the case noting the modifications. He changed the name it was Buckhead South to Lake Point Estate; we are changing lot widths from 150' to 100', keeping the lot depths the same; and, we are increasing the number of lots from 19 to 28 lots. We have also included a proposed grading plan; to make a few adjustments because CWL does not like the sewers more than 20 ft. deep, there is a hill that we will be hauling out materials.

Mr. Michael Morris noted that we had the same issue with Meadowood Subdivision where they took materials out, where there was a hillside in order to build the subdivision.

Staff: Mr. Spriggs noted that the plan complies with the R-1 District. He commented on the coordination with the Woodsprings Rd. entrance area: Dustin Dr. terminus and the new entrance proposed here (Lot 1 owned by the

Macon's family). It will not connect there. There is a cul-de-sac. You are willing to modify your plan to show the dedicated right-of-way which would allow for the completion of that turn-around.

Christy Wright, 3511 Cedar Creek Lane, appeared before the Commission stating that the street name was renamed to Cedar Creek Lane and she has no problem with the proposed subdivision. She and her brother-in-law own adjacent land, Lots 1 & 2 off of Cedar Creek Lane which extends from the formerly known Dustin Dr. right-of-way.

Mr. Bailey made the motion to approved with the conditions; 2nd by Mr. Scurlock

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

6. Conditional Use

[play video](#)

7. Rezoning

[play video](#)

Rezoning: 2814 Wood Street

RZ 15-08: Christopher L. Baugh is requesting MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Medium Density District to C-3 General Commercial District Limited Use Overlay for 1.52 acres of land located at 2814 Wood Street.

[play video](#)

Applicant: Mr. Michael Boggs, TraLan Engineering, representing the owner stated that his client is looking to rezone the property from R-1 to C-3 L.U.O., with the stipulations and limitations noted in the Staff Report. We are looking to redevelop this property. We have met with several surrounding owners, some were neutral and others were opposed with certain concerns. We addressed as many as we could. We feel that this rezoning will be beneficial to the City of Jonesboro and the surrounding area, and ask that you approve this and move it forward to City Council.

Staff:

Mr. Otis Spriggs gave summary comments from the Staff Report which lists the surrounding conditions. To the immediate west and north are single family homes; Arberwood Cove Subdivision to the immediate north. C-5 church use lies to the immediate east, and highway/access road to the south. The Master Street and Land Use Plans would be complied with. The Land Use Map recommends high intense growth sector uses, which would provide for some form of overlay district that would allow for concerns of residentially abutting properties. Consistency is achieved with the Land Use Plan. Any type of negatives could be dealt with if property screening and buffering is provided, and those are addressed in the conditions proposed. Surrounding zoning conditions were shown on the provide maps, which also shows other property

recently zoned to the far west (1/2 mile west) and developed as Commercial. To the far-east is the Outback Commercial Shopping Center.

Mr. Spriggs: Development requests for review were sent to the various departments and reviewing agencies. Comments were received from M.P.O., Engineering, Fire Department and City Water Light, who were all present in the pre-meeting, all noting concurrence and no issues with the request.

Mr. Spriggs: Parameters and requirements for the C-3 General Commercial District were noted in the report. Less desirable uses next to residential properties were highlighted. The applicant has agreed to an exclusion list and the Conditions are listed to address staff concerns. Staff feels that if this property is zoned to what lies to the west, that the site could be developed in a responsible way to fit-in next to the residential with certain controls. The conditions were read.

Public Comment: (5 Stood in Opposition)

Mr. Eric Kriner, 819 Amberwood Cove: Stated that his property is adjoining that which is under consideration for rezoning, and seeing that none of us have been informed of the type of use proposed, nor of any buffer zone, we urge you to deny application and recommend that it remains residential.

Robin Criss, 821 Amberwood Cove: Adjourning the subject property and we are asking that it be denied.

Gary W. Rodgers, 2815 Wood St. Neighbor and he is for nor opposed to this. I am not able to say it's a good thing or bad thing.

Referring to the report it was mentioned that the proposed zoning would not be detrimental to nearby property. I do not see anything in the report that supports this. It is based on an opinion and I do not see what it is based on.

Mr. Rodgers: The address of this property is 2814 Wood St. There are lots of pictures shown how ever none shown standing from 2814 looking towards the houses to the west. You would see that there are nothing but houses there.

Mr. Rodgers: I feel that the properties would be affected negatively or positively. Folks that live there will be affected. Give proper consideration to the people that live there and not just a map. He added that he has lived there since 1986 and want to make sure that is still a great place to live after you make your decision.

Janet Harden: 2810 Wood St., She supports what has been already said. She lives next to the property and with what you are considering making commercial. I do think that it will affect the residential area, whether positively or negatively. I ask that you would consider or reconsider that. 5 in opposition stood. .

Sheryl Rodgers: 2815 Wood St., Stated that she has a couple of considerations on the layout of that area. The part that opens on to Wood Street access is a concern; it's a very narrow access point. It would not be a good thing to have an opening there. Speaking with the Engineer, it's my understanding that they haven't decided on a use or site plan layout. Nothing has been committed to

writing, and that could change. We are concerned about use, access and we live directly across the street and are concerned about any buffers that will go there. Where is the evidence to base that on?

Mr. Spriggs addressed questions raised to staff, regarding the “detrimental” question, noting that there are some things that are allowed to occur in a C-3 District that we listed that could be detriment or undesirable next to residential uses. We provided that menu list and we worked backward from there. All of the concerns noted in the report can be addressed by conditions approved by the MAPC. The type of use would drive the impacts such as traffic volume, access. Some commercial office uses do not have high traffic demand nor customers visiting other than by appointment only. The size of the lot would dictate the amount of lot coverage, this being a smaller lot. The Planning Commission can use controls under the site plan to assure that the use fits within the area and control any detriments as listed in the criteria for considering rezoning such as: drainage problems, odor, noise, traffic problem impacts, light pollution as noted in the staff report.

Mr. Scurlock: Can we control the access on to the site, and deny access off Wood Street and provide for substantial boundary buffers?

Mr. Spriggs stated that we could; however, we would not want to prevent a use that could perhaps only demand 5 or so cars visiting per day to be developed on the lot, only because we have placed restrictions that will not ever allow certain allowances. Once you go over a certain traffic volume or threshold, the Planning Commission has that authority to control those uses during the Site Plan Review process. However, the Highway Department has complete control over the access on and off Alexander Dr. and will dictate what happens on that frontage. There are other possibilities for cross access that could happen.

Mr. Scurlock: Stated that his problem is that he does not want the developer to go through a lot of work, effort, and costs. If I turned this down because of some substantial entrance/access off of Wood Street, because we are meeting residential and commercial really close together. I think there is a place it could work out, but I like to be fair to everybody, and I do not think a major entrance off of Wood St. would work.

Mr. Boggs: We would like to wait until the actual Site Plan Review, and we do not want to place a lot of restraints on a piece of property. We could wait until that point to limit the access and lay the site plan out the best way it could be accommodated.

Chairman Lonnie Roberts: I guess what Mr. Scurlock is saying that you do not want to tie-up a lot of development fees at the time of the Site Plan review, and should we condition it now during the rezoning? I request what the pleasure of the Commission is?

Mr. Kelton: Can that be part of the original approval. Mr. Spriggs: Are you meaning the ordinance? Mr. Spriggs stated that the MAPC can approve the case based on any conditions. Mr. Kelton stated that he does not agree with any entrance off of Wood Street.

Mr. Reece: Is there any provision provided for fencing? The same issue came

up on Stallings lane and Hwy. 63. Can we approve this with limitations that we would see at the site plan approval?

Attorney Carol Duncan clarified stating that she is not sure that everyone understands that we are not allowed to ask what type of development or use is going there legally. We are not to ask are you placing a fast food restaurant there for example.

Mr. Hoelscher: My concern is the property mentioned on Stallings Lane, where even though the City has an ordinance preventing certain light fixtures, depending on what goes there. Fencing and landscaping will not prevent high lighting and the affect on residential.

Mr. Spriggs stated that the lighting can be controlled with the codes where as lighting cannot be allowed to spill off on the residential and the photometric readings have to read "0" foot candles at the property lines. Mr. Hoelscher: Hours of operation on uses such as Carwashes could be a problem.

Mr. Spriggs offered Staff's assistance to help craft any conditions on any areas that you feel we need to address in terms of impacts.

Commission Action:

Mr. Kelton added a condition No. 6 to stated that Egress/Ingress should be limited to Alexander Dr. and not provided on Wood Street. Travis Fischer, TraLan Engineering approached the Commission asking if that could be modified to state that unless it is cumbersome by the Highway Department (if it is an impossibility). Mr. Kelton agreed to modify that if it is an impossibility created by the highway department, to not land lock the property from access.

Motion was made by Mr. Kelton to place Rezoning Case RZ15-06 on the floor for consideration, a rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential to "C-3" L.U.O., General Commercial, Limited Use Overlay as presented; and we, the MAPC recommend approval to Council and find that the rezoning is consistent with the Planning Area and Land Use Plan recommendations. This approval is contingent upon the satisfaction of the noted 6 conditions. Motion was seconded by Mr. Scurlock.

Action/Vote- 6-1 Approval: Mr. Kelton- Aye; Mr. Cooper- Aye; Mr. Perkins- Aye; Mr. Bailey- Aye; Mr. Hoelscher- Aye; Mr. Scurlock- Aye; Mr. Reece- Nay; Absent was Mrs. Schrantz; Mr. Lonnie Roberts, Jr. was Chair.

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

8. Staff Comments

[play video](#)

9. Adjournment

[play video](#)

