



City of Jonesboro

Municipal Center
300 S. Church Street
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Meeting Minutes - Final Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Tuesday, April 11, 2017

5:30 PM

Municipal Center

1. Call to order

[play video](#)

2. Roll Call

[play video](#)

Present 8 - Lonnie Roberts Jr.; Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent 1 - Paul Hoelscher

3. Approval of minutes

[play video](#)

MIN-17:038

Meeting Minutes from March 28, 2017 MAPC Meeting.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Minutes from March 28, 2017 MAPC Meeting](#)

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

Aye: 7 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

4. Preliminary Subdivisions

[play video](#)

PP-17-14

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION: Bridger Park Phase 2 - 4.9 Acres - 18 Lots - West of Oriole Cove

Wood Engineering on behalf of Mark Morris of Morris-Kidd, LLC requests MAPC approval of a Preliminary Subdivision - Bridger Park Phase 2 for 18 lots on 4.9 acres for property Zoned R-1 Single Family, located west of Bridger Place and Oriole Cove.

[play video](#)

Attachments:

[Application](#)

[Staff Report](#)

[Bridger Park Plat](#)

[Bridger Park Phase 2 Plans](#)

[Location of Bridger Park Phase 2](#)

APPLICANT: Wood Engineering requested MAPC approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Bridger Park Phase 2 for 18 lots on 4.9 acres for property zoned R-1 Single Family Residential. This development is located west of Bridger Place and Oriole Cove.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said he recommended approval of this subdivision.

No public comments.

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

Aye: 7 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

5. Final Subdivisions

[play video](#)

PP-17-15

FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL: Prospect Farms Phase IV - 9.80 Acres - 27 Lots

John Easley of Associated Engineering on behalf of P & J Development requests MAPC Preliminary Subdivision Approval for 27 proposed lots on 9.80 acres located south of Prospect Farm Lane (Prospect Farms Phase II) and Goldrush Lane (Prospect Farms Phase II). This property is zoned R-1 Single Family Residential.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Staff Report](#)
 [Prospect Farms Phase 4](#)
 [Aerial View of Location](#)

APPLICANT: Mr. John Easley of Associated Engineering requested MAPC Preliminary Subdivision Approval for 27 proposed lots on 9.8 acres. This developed is located south of Prospect Farms Lane and Goldrush Lane. The land is zoned R-1 Single Family Residential. Mr. Easley pointed out they are providing access to the West and Airport Road.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith recommended approval of this subdivision.

No public comment.

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

Aye: 7 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

6. Conditional Use

[play video](#)

[CU-17-01](#)

CONDITIONAL USE: CU 17-01: 3000 E Matthews - Billboard

Danny Rainwater of Lamar Advertising is requesting MAPC approval for property located at 3000 East Matthews off Herb Street for a Conditional Use for off-premise signage going from Static Panel to LED Digital Face on one side and Static Panel still on other side located within an I-1 Limited Industrial District.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Application](#)
[Letter](#)
[Staff Summary](#)
[Plat of Survey](#)
[Plat of Survey with sign location](#)
[Adjoining Property Owners Notifications with Signature](#)
[USPS Receipts](#)
[Sign Pictures](#)

APPLICANT: Mr. Danny Rainwater requested MAPC approval for property located at 3000 East Matthews off Herb Street for a Conditional Use for off-premise signage going from Static Panel to LED Digital Face on one side and Static Panel still on the other side. This property is located within an I-1 Limited Industrial District.

Mr. Tom Gibbons explained they are proposing to keep on side of their billboard static and changing on side of the billboard to a Digital LED display. The proposed changes will actually make the face of the billboard smaller.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith recommended approval with the following conditions:

1. That upon issuance of the Zoning Permit Approval, all other building permit and other permits and licenses required locally and statewide be applied for and obtained by the applicant.

COMMISSION: Mr. Reece asked where this billboard was located.

APPLICANT: Mr. Gibbons said it was located at the Red Wolf overpass by Arkansas State University. This is the sign that ASU Athletics has one side advertising their athletics program.

APPLICANT: Mr. Gibbons said this billboard does comply with all of the state requirements for billboards. He asked if they could build their boards about 10 feet higher. He said they would stay within the required 50 or 55 feet above the grade of the road requirement in the Jonesboro Sign Code. They want to raise it to around 35 feet so the board is not hidden by parts of the overpass.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said that would be ok as long as it complied with the ordinances.

No public comment.

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

Aye: 7 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

7. Rezonings

[play video](#)

RZ-17-06

REZONING: RZ 17-06: 4210 Southwest Drive - 8.60 Acres from R-1 to C-3 LUO

George Hamman of Civilogic on behalf of Terrel D. Watkins are requesting MAPC approval of a Rezoning from R-1 Single Family Residential District to C-3 General Commercial District Limited Use Overlay for 8.60 acres of land located at 4210 Southwest Drive.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Application](#)
 [Staff Summary](#)
 [Minor Plat](#)
 [Ownership Information within 200 ft](#)
 [Returned Property Notification Letter - Signed](#)
 [Rezoning Plat](#)
 [USPS Returned Cards](#)
 [Email about Rezoning](#)

APPLICANT: Mr. George Hamman of Civilogic requested MAPC approval of a rezoning at 4210 Southwest Drive on behalf of his client Mr. Terrel D. Watkins. The applicant would like to rezone the property from R-1 Single Family Residential to C-3 General Commercial District with a Limited Use Overlay. Mr. Hamman pointed out there were no objections to this rezoning in the staff report. He did get a letter from one of the adjoining property owners. In the letter, they pointed out a few concerns they had with this request. Ms. Pam Alexander's first concern was the application did not specifically mention her property. Mr. Hamman pointed out that was not part of the application requirements. She also talked about erosion on the two properties surrounding this proposed rezoning. There were also concerns about chemicals and how those chemicals would affect the surrounding area. Mr. Hamman said that he contacted Mr. Watkins and the basic chemical is baking soda for the fire extinguishers. This is conducted inside of the building when they work on the Extinguishers in an environment with systems that take care of the cleaning and fumes.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith presented staff comments. He recommended this request be approved since the application is requesting the LUO.

The planning department recommended approval with the following conditions:

1. 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.
2. A final site plan subject to all ordinance requirements shall be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the MAPC, 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 etc. shall be submitted to the MAPC prior to any redevelopment. New screening outdoor storage and dumpster enclosure requirements shall be implemented if stipulated by the MAPC.

5. The proposed site will have a twenty-five foot wide vegetative buffer on the north and east sides of the property.

6. The property shall be limited to the following uses:

- A) Bank or Financial Institution
- B) Bed and Breakfast
- C) Church
- D) College or University
- E) Funeral Home
- F) Government Service
- G) Library
- H) Medical Service/Office
- I) Museum
- J) Office, General
- K) Parking Lot, Commercial
- L) Parks and Recreation
- M) Retail/Service
- N) Safety Service
- O) Sign, Off-Premises
- P) Utility, Minor
- Q) Vocational School
- R) Agricultural, Farmers Market

PUBLIC: Ms. Pam Alexander spoke at the meeting to voice her concerns about this rezoning request. First, she was concerned about erosion and drainage. Second, she was concerned about how chemicals from the proposed development would affect her bees that she houses close to the build site. Third, she was concerned about the proposed 25-foot vegetative buffer. Finally, she wanted the new owner to be aware that Phase 5 of a multiuse trail would be going through their property.

Ms. Alexander did agree this land was not suitable for single-family housing. She also said they were not against this rezoning request.

PUBLIC: Mr. Howard French was also at the meeting to voice his opinion about this rezoning request. He wanted to know what the owner would like to do with the back half of the proposed property.

STAFF: Ms. Tracy McGaha showed him the list of allowed uses on the property.

PUBLIC: Mr. French had no problems with the proposed uses.

PUBLIC: Ms. Ellen Laurence also voiced her concerns about the rezoning. She wanted to know what the owner was going to do with the 60 feet of street frontage along Winterhaven Street.

APPLICANT: Mr. Hamman said he was not had a chance to discuss this with the applicant. He thinks they will probably make this a cul-de-sack.

PUBLIC: Ms. Ellen Laurence also asked about the retention ponds.

APPLICANT: Mr. Hamman said they would stay on the development and they will probably be dry ponds unless it rains.

PUBLIC: Ms. Ellen Laurence also asked Mr. Hamman about the vegetative buffer.

APPLICANT: Mr. Hamman said they were going to leave the current vegetation. They would not be touching what is currently there.

COMMISSION: Mr. Kelton did want to point out that Ms. Alexander was given appropriate notice about this rezoning request.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said that was correct that she was given appropriate notice about this rezoning.

PUBLIC: Mr. Howard French was also at the meeting to voice his opinion about this rezoning request. He wanted to know what the owner would like to do with the back half of the proposed property.

STAFF: Ms. Tracy McGaha showed him the list of allowed uses on the property.

PUBLIC: Mr. Howard French had no problems with the proposed uses.

PUBLIC: Ms. Ellen Laurence also voiced her concerns about the rezoning. She wanted to know what the owner was going to do with the 60 feet of street frontage along Winterhaven Street.

APPLICANT: Mr. Hamman said he was not had a chance to discuss this with the applicant. He thinks they will probably make this a cul-de-sac.

PUBLIC: Ms. Ellen Laurence also asked about the retention ponds.

APPLICANT: Mr. Hamman said they would stay on the development and they will probably be dry ponds unless it rains.

PUBLIC: Ms. Ellen Laurence also asked Mr. Hamman about the vegetative buffer.

APPLICANT: Mr. Hamman said they were going to leave the current vegetation. They would not be touching what is currently there.

COMMISSION: Mr. Kelton did want to point out that Ms. Alexander was given appropriate notice about this rezoning request.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said that was correct. Stated she was given appropriate notice about this rezoning.

No more public comments.

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

Aye: 6 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece; Jim Scurlock; Brant Perkins; Jimmy Cooper and Rick Stripling

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

Abstain: 1 - Kevin Bailey

8. Miscellaneous Items

[play video](#)

COM-17:024

ORDINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS: Sidewalk Ordinance

Derrel Smith, Director of Planning, is presenting changes from the Sidewalk Committee pertaining to the Sidewalk Ordinance. Feedback and recommendations are welcomed from the MAPC Committee to finalize the Sidewalk Ordinance for Recommendation to City Council.

[play video](#)

Attachments: [Sidewalk Ordinance](#)
 [Sidewalks - A Livability Fact Sheet](#)
 [Making the Case for New Sidewalks](#)
 [Sidewalks](#)

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith started the discussion by providing a brief summary about why he drafted the proposed sidewalk ordinance and the formation and meetings with the Sidewalk Committee. He read a list of individuals on the committee. There were 13 members on the Committee. Mr. Smith said in the meetings that covered the history of sidewalks in Jonesboro and covered the purpose of the Committee. The Committee went over the proposed ordinance section by section. There was discussion about requiring sidewalks on one side of the street and in cul-de-sacs. In the end, the committee voted to keep the proposed ordinance the way it was written. Section B was reviewed and there was no changes to the proposed ordinance. Section C had some wording changes. The changes were made and then voted on and approved. Section D was reviewed and the Committee changed the bonding period from 3 years to 5 years. The Sidewalk Committee approved the proposed sidewalk ordinance 9 – 2 with two individuals not voting.

COMMISSION: Mr. Jim Scurlock had questions about the proposed ordinance. He wanted to know if this ordinance would impact existing houses. He also wanted to know if it would impact existing houses that decided to build on an addition to their house that was larger than 20%.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said it would not impact existing houses. This ordinance would only impact subdivisions platted after the adoptions of this proposed ordinance. Houses that are already built will not be affected.

COMMISSION: Mr. Jimmy Cooper asked if they would have to pay fees on the lots that are not finished or would they have to pay a fee for the entire subdivision.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said the developer would have to put up a bond at the beginning of development. As the lots are built and sidewalks are installed the developer can ask for a reduction on the bond.

COMMISSION: Mr. Jimmy Cooper asked about the last sentence in Section C.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said they would accept the fee at the time when they are ready for the Certificate of Occupancy to be issued. That is when the money will be paid in lieu of the developer installing the sidewalks. They will pay the fee at the end right before they get their CO.

COMMISSION: Mr. Brant Perkins said there will not be a time when that is determined by lot – it will be determined by subdivision.

STAFF: Mr. Smith said that was correct.

COMMISSION: Mr. Brant Perkins asked if the developers bond would still be in place even if the developer no longer owns any of the lots in that subdivision.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said that was correct.

COMMISSION: Mr. Brant Perkins pointed out the developer would be relying on the contractor to make sure the sidewalks are installed. The developers bond will still be at stake if there is a problem with the homebuilder installing the sidewalk.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith pointed out the sidewalk would have to be installed by the time the CO is issued. If the sidewalk is not installed whoever built the home will not get their CO.

COMMISSION: Mr. Brant Perkins asked about lots that are bought as investment property. The owner has no intention of building a house. They were bought as investment lots.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said the bond is good for five years.

COMMISSION: Mr. Brant Perkins asked if there was going to be a sidewalk bond posted for every subdivision.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said that was correct.

COMMISSION: Mr. Ron Kelton asked if anyone knew how much the bonds would cost.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said there are several factors that play into the cost of a bond. It will be a percentage of the total price of the bond. Usually it is around 2% of the total bond.

COMMISSION: Mr. Jimmy Cooper wanted to point out the proposed ordinance would not put a new sidewalk in front of anyone's house. This was only for new development.

COMMISSION: Mr. Kevin Bailey had questions about subdivisions that have already been platted.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said the ordinance would only apply to subdivisions that are platted after the adoption of the proposed ordinance.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said you could have a subdivision that has sidewalks in one phase and no sidewalks in two other phases.

COMMISSION : Mr. Brant Perkins asked if there was things that would motivate a developer to post the bond or pay the fee.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said the sidewalks could be accounted for when they are doing the grading for the streets. There will be very few situations where the developer cannot develop a road that will allow for sidewalks.

COMMISSION: Mr. Lonnie Roberts asked if the developer could pick 10 lots in the subdivision and pay the in lieu of fee just for those 10 lots.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said as long as the developer pays the in lieu of fee the developer would not have to install sidewalks on those 10 lots.

COMMISSION : Mr. Brant Perkins said he was wondering if payment of the fee was really an option for the developer. Either way the developer is still going to have to pay money for sidewalks. He asked if a waiver could be granted in some cases if this ordinance was approved.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said they could waive the location of the sidewalks but they could not waive it to where the developer would not have to pay money for sidewalks. This ordinance is set up to where anything can be appealed to either the City Planner or the City Engineer.

COMMISSION : Mr. Brant Perkins asked about ADA requirements for sidewalks.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said sidewalks can run along the grade of the road and will have to meet ADA requirements at intersections.

COMMISSION: Mr. Ron Kelton asked about sidewalks on private property.

STAFF: Mr. Derrel Smith said the city would not be responsible for those sidewalks. The city would be responsible for sidewalks that are in their easements.

There were several individuals at the meeting in support and opposition of the proposed sidewalk ordinance.

PUBLIC: Ms. Katy Stipman felt like sidewalks help build a culture within a city. She supported the sidewalk ordinance. She said young people are ready for sidewalks.

PUBLIC: Mr. Bill Hall read a section about sidewalks regarding ADA compliance. What he read stated the sidewalks could run along the same grade as the road. He supported the proposed sidewalk ordinance.

PUBLIC: Ms. Haley Knight voiced her support of the proposed sidewalk ordinance. She was on the sidewalk committee. She explained how the proposed ordinance was drafted and eventually ended up being forwarded to the MAPC. She said each committee member had plenty of opportunities to get their questions answered before the committee voted.

PUBLIC: Mr. TJ Thompson also spoke in support of the proposed sidewalk ordinance. He felt like the housing market could handle the additional cost of building sidewalks in front of houses in new subdivisions. He also pointed out, cities such as Fort Smith and Fayetteville have figured out a way to build sidewalks. If they can figure out a way to require sidewalks Jonesboro should

be able to figure out a way to require sidewalks.

PUBLIC: Ms. Mary Margret Jackson spoke in support of the proposed sidewalk ordinance. She feels like Jonesboro is behind the times when it comes to sidewalk development. She presented several articles from different sources that show sidewalks are positive additions to developments.

PUBLIC: Mr. Carol Caldwell spoke in opposition to the proposed sidewalk ordinance. In his opinion, the homebuyer will be the one to pay for the installation of sidewalks in new subdivisions. The developer will pass the additional cost on to the builder who will then pass those costs on to the homebuyer. He presented the MAPC with information that supported his opposition to the proposed sidewalk ordinance. He showed several examples of houses with steep driveways, areas where sidewalks would require retaining walls and retaining walls with handrails.

PUBLIC: Ms. Debbie Finley spoke in opposition to the proposed sidewalk ordinance. She said both sides want sidewalks. She loves sidewalks but she feels like the proposed ordinance will hurt the real estate community and take money from developers.

PUBLIC: Mr. Todd Wilcox spoke in opposition of the proposed sidewalk ordinance. He said the mayor said at a meeting he attended that he did not support the proposed sidewalk ordinance. The mayor said there was a need for sidewalks but the proposed ordinance was not the solution. He also said the mayor had a study done that found miles of sidewalks that were under grass because the city could not maintain them. He also said the City Planner had only one person call his office asking for new subdivisions with sidewalks. He felt like the only solution to the sidewalk problem would be to pass a sales tax. He also did not like having to pay money into a fee for the city to put sidewalks somewhere outside of the subdivision that he is building.

PUBLIC: Mr. Caldwell spoke again and said he is against having sidewalks in all new residential subdivisions. He did propose a compromise. According to him, developers would support a sidewalk tax. He also said developers would be willing to install sidewalks in residential subdivisions on both sides of arterial streets, within a quarter mile of any schools and within a quarter mile of any public transportation.

COMMISSION: Mr. Jim Scurlock said everyone on the MAPC want sidewalks. He spoke about the cost. He felt like the city could get in a situation where they have to decide between sidewalks or give raises to city employees. He was also disappointed the committee come back with requiring sidewalks on both sides of the street in residential subdivisions.

A motion was made by Rick Stripling, seconded by Ron Kelton, that this matter be Approved. The motion **FAILED** with the following vote.

During the vote, Mr. Bailey voted against the proposed ordinance because he felt like the residential portion of this ordinance needs more work.

Mr. Perkins also voted against the proposed ordinance but said he supported sidewalks. He would like to see a Jonesboro solution.

Aye: 3 - Ron Kelton; Jerry Reece and Rick Stripling

Nay: 4 - Jim Scurlock; Kevin Bailey; Brant Perkins and Jimmy Cooper

Absent: 1 - Paul Hoelscher

9. Staff Comments

[play video](#)

10. Adjournment

[play video](#)