Russellville Planning Commission Minutes

October 24, 2016 @ 5:30 p.m.

The Russellville Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Monday, October 24, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in the Russellville City Hall Council Chambers.

Members Present

Chairman Dennis Boyd
Vice-Chair Doug Skelton
Secretary Wendell Miller
Peggy Stratton
Shirley Hatley
Nathan Barber
Karen Yarbrough
Mike Wilkins
John Whiteside
Council Liaison Freddie Harris

Members Absent

None

Also present: Mayor Randy Horton, City Planner James Walden, City Engineer Kurt Jones, City Attorney Trey Smith, Planning Assistant Lequitta Jones, Jim Lynch/City Corp, Zane Bryson/City Corp, Building Official Brian Holstein, Fire Marshal Richard Setian, Dave Garza/Barrett & Associates, John Sledge/Arbors, Nick Landers/Arbors, Gregg Long/Crafton Tull, Leslie Merritt/Arbors, Ron Knost, Russell Roberson, Chris Dale, Allen Williams/AW Engineering, Bucky Croom, Janine Fleck, LeeAnn Langley, Carol Ford/Coldwell Banker, Harold Barr, Sara Lou & Cliff Goodin, Terri & Jim Knight, Johnny Story, Gaye Croom, Dr. & Mrs. Stan Gately, Randy Campbell, Rena Taylor, Kevin Beavers, Cheryl Monfee, and Mike & Sue McCoy.

Welcome

The First Order of Business was a request to review and approve the September 26, 2016 minutes.

Commissioner Skelton made the motion to accept the minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Miller and passed unanimously.

The Second Order of Business was a request to table by petitioners: A request to vacate all of West 4th Street running between South Quanah Avenue and South Phoenix Avenue described as a 50 ft. right-of-way for West 4th Street lying between Blocks "K" and "N" of the Barger-White Addition to the City of Russellville, Pope County, Arkansas. Submitted by James Campbell, Kevin Fugate, Nathan & Jennifer Barber, and Joan Rickett. (ST.16.10.81)

Commissioner Wilkins made the motion to approve the request to table until next month. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Skelton and passed unanimously.

The Third Order of Business was a public hearing requesting review and a recommendation of approval to rezone property currently R-1 (Single-Family Residential) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) for a proposed upscale assisted living and independent living facilities for property located on Marina Road. Submitted by Gregg Long of Crafton Tull on behalf of Nick Landers of Landers Holding LLC, d/b/a The Arbors of Russellville (Z0.16.10. 201)

Chairman Boyd recused himself from any action or comment on this agenda item because he said he lived near the property in question. He stated that he had not discussed his position on the issue with any of the other commissioners. Vice-Chairman Skelton moderated this item.

City Planner Walden said this property is located on Marina Way. The request is to rezone approximately 20 acres currently R-1 to PUD to construct an assisted living/senior living facility. The adjacent zoning is R-1, Single-Family Residential. On the Comprehensive Plan this property is indicated as being single-family residential. The nature of PUD zoning is that the applicant states the use that will be conducted on the property. That is the only use that the property can be used for and the property has to be developed exactly in the manner indicated on the documents submitted as part of the PUD. What's on the site plan is locked in and it cannot change without another public hearing and going through the same process that we are going through tonight. There were several planning comments that we had related to this application that dealt with some technical issues:

1) There was a need to include easements and existing/proposed ROW for Marina Way. The minimum ROW dedication would be 30 feet from the centerline.
2) The applicant would need to coordinate with AHTD on exploring half-street improvements on the corridor.
3) Indicate a sidewalk along Marina Way.
4) PUD development regulations allow for preservation of open space. The commission should discuss the possibility of such measures being upheld for this development.
5) Indicate a lighting plan for the site.
6) Indicate the building façade elevations that will be used for the proposed structures.
7) Include a landscaping plan.
8) The lift station on the northern edge of the property needs to have indication for vehicular access shown on the site.
9) The parking for the cottages needs to be shown on the site plan in reference and in terms of the parking requirements.
10) Recommend pedestrian connectivity between the main lodge, cottage, and memory center within the site and sidewalks similar to what is shown for the main lodge area.
11) Add trails around the pond.

Planner Walden further stated that the proposed zoning is mostly consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as the site is indicated for residential use. The density for the area is slightly above what the Comprehensive Plan calls for, but it is not unreasonable for the area considering the size of the property and the nature of the use. The proposed use is not going to be generating as much traffic as you normally would if you were going to develop this with 20 acres of homes. Because of the nature of assisted living facilities you don't have as many people coming and

going which results in a less intense use. It is what I consider consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to a certain degree.

The recommendation for action on this application is approval with conditions:

1) The approval of the PUD must be followed with a large scale development application. That application would address the eleven comments listed in the staff report (see above list).
2) Any increase in the number of units, change in setbacks, or change in use shall require reappoval of the PUD by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Planner Walden said a couple of things have changed within the last week. There were changes to the PUD regulations in the zoning code. This application was submitted before the PUD regulations were revised. This application is largely consistent with the revised regulations. The main change that happened with the PUD regulations was procedural. In an effort to figure out how we can deal with this, we essentially made the procedure for this similar to the way you would do it in the new two-step process that has just been enacted into law. In terms of providing a zoning plan followed by a full scale development proposal, the information tonight to be voted on by the Planning Commission would be a zoning plan that locks in where the building footprints are. That would be followed by an engineering site plan that goes through a large scale development process that would come back to the Planning Commission for review and approval that would address the planning comments that we have identified (see the attachment for additional information provided by the staff regarding adherence to the zoning code).

Commissioner Wilkins asked Planner Walden about the staff's comment regarding the density for the area being slightly above what the Comprehensive Plan calls for. Mr. Wilkins asked that as the commission sees more and more applications for PUDs, by their nature, wouldn't a residential PUD perhaps in many instances vary, or not quite fit, the Comprehensive Plan that was done in the past as far as the density in that development area just given the fact that a residential PUD is so different in nature from a typical R-1 or R-2 development? So when a PUD is involved, by the very nature of a PUD, the density issue becomes less of a consideration because we are looking at the overall development, the number of units in the development, the way they are situated in the development, and once we approve that large scale plan, not one single thing in that development can be changed without them coming back to us for permission to change that. Planner Walden agreed.

Mr. Gregg Long of Crafton Tull said in addressing items that the staff pointed out we have no problems with the conditions. We intend to comply with that. We will work with the City working through all of those items. There are still a lot of things that have to be worked out. So conditional approval is what we are asking for. We did ask for a PUD rather than a commercial rezoning because it does protect the City. In the current zoning we could easily go in there and build 75 to 80 smaller homes which would generate a lot more traffic and more impact in that area than this facility will. We have a model that we have prepared for you to look at. We also have some color renderings of what the project will look like.

The project team includes Frank Barksdale with AMR Architects, Inc.; John Sledge with Landers Development, LLC out of Bryant and Arbors of Russellville; Nick Landers the developer; and Leslie and Tom Meredith, associates of Mr. Landers.

Mr. Long pointed out that there is a need for 117 additional beds in Pope County. This number is supported by the number of beds the Arkansas Health Services Permit Agency has available in the county. We applied for 75 beds which is the maximum you can get at one time. The availability to the hospitals and medical clinics are really close. As far as the traffic, these types of facilities don't create a lot of traffic. Many of the residents don't drive. They go to bed early so there isn't a lot of noise. There will be some traffic in and out with the employees. There will be 40 to 60 people hired locally to run this facility. The facility is 64,000 square feet in the main facility, which will include 60 beds that are assisted and a 15-bed memory care that will be a walk down situation. We have a gated entry system which will be locked at all times. The amenities include a beauty salon, a gourmet chef so the residents can order from a menu, a chapel, conference room, exercise rooms, walking trails, a lot of courtyards, landscaping, and waterfalls going into a pond. The development will set back off the road. There is also an entrance on the back side. We have it hidden behind the tree lines.

Mr. Barksdale said when the team saw the site at the proposed location on Marina Way, they all agreed that they had an opportunity to build something special. We designed it to look like Big Cedar Lodge Resort in Branson. We plan on keeping a lot of the trees on Marina Way. When you drive by the property you will only get a glimpse of the facility at the gate. If you didn't know it was there you wouldn't notice it. It's a lot different place than nursing homes of yester years.

Mr. Sledge emphasized that what they were proposing is not a nursing home. This is an assisted living facility. It is all independent pay. It is not Medicaid or Medicare. He said the proposed development will be a 14-15 million dollar project. There will be some approximately 1200-1400 square foot, two bedroom two bath independent cottages down by the memory care. They are garden-style homes. It is a stepping stone type of living arrangement. We take them from independent living all the way up to the memory care.

Vice Chairman Skelton opened the meeting for public comments.

Chris Dale said he lives in the neighborhood that this is being built in. He said he didn't want to see delivery trucks up there on Skyline Drive. A place like this is going to have to have deliveries in and out. It is residential R-1, which is the most restricted zone that there is. He read an e-mail message that he received from Morgan Barrett:

> This seems like a terrible idea to me placing this development in the middle of the largest R-1 most restricted residential zone in Russellville. It is not typical and not beneficial to the City. Typically, these would be located in transitional areas between residential and commercial, not in the middle of the most restrictive residential zone. I think the reason is simple, even though the property seems expensive it is economical, and even cheap, for this type of development. I believe this property is listed for $20,000 an acre. To locate this in the area I described would be around the $80,000 an acre range and up. There are alternatives to the proposed site with available land; Parkway and Fairway comes to mind at comparable pricing. This is a good project for the City. It is just the wrong location.

Mr. Dale said what Mr. Barrett is saying is that we need those trees going over Skyline Drive. We need quietness. We need the neighborhood. I built two houses in that area. I don't understand it. I think Mr. Boyd owes us the right to vote his conscience on this. He lives across the street.

Jim Knight said I live almost across the street from this development. We have collected several hundred signatures of neighbors that live in the area. I have been in the development business for 38 years. I am not against development at all. He said this is what I would tell you; there are several pieces of property for sale that are already zoned for this type of development. They are good pieces of property in excellent locations for this type of development. I am amazed that we are not talking about one of those pieces of property. What about us? What about our property? It is my opinion that values will go down when this goes in. They didn't address the other 20 acres. What will happen to that when they come back and want to expand? Will we be on a fast track for that as well? I stand before you today and say that if you rezone this piece of property our property values as single-family at the very best will go down.

Commissioner Wilkins asked Mr. Knight if he had studies to that effect. Mr. Knight asked Commissioner Wilkins if he was an investor in this project. Mr. Wilkins said, "no sir." Mr. Knight told Commissioner Wilkins he believes his (Knight) opinion counts. So you don't have the need for any reason to question me. Commissioner Miller said what Mr. Wilkins was referring to was that Mr. Wilkins has done some study on that. It was not a personal thing. Commissioner Wilkins said one thing he wanted to make very clear was that absolutely in no way would I ever be an investor in a facility like this, Jim. I haven't spent my career in investing in the healthcare industry like you have. However, I did take the time to go and do some research. Mr. Knight said what I actually came up here to say to you guys tonight is that yes, it is an emotional thing when you live right across the street. What I do say to you people in a responsible position that are going to make this decision is to think about us when we made our investments. We went in there under an R-1 zoning. The people up there whose property touches this property and all the way around it are saying they want it to remain that way. Mr. Knight asked the commission to please consider that.

Dr. Stan Gately said he lives about 200 feet from the corner of this property. I built a house about 15 years ago in the middle of a large R-1 residential zoned area. There is no one on this commission that is going to convince me that my property is going to be anywhere near desirable, much less worth as much money, or will appreciate as much as it should over the next 10 years with that facility within a stones throw of my yard as it would have without it. I don't know what assurance anyone in this community is going to have when they take the time and money to invest and build a house. The brochure I received showed 50 employees which will be coming in and going, 3 shift changes, delivery trucks, and transportation vans running right by my house and shining their lights in my house. I am strongly opposed to it. Someone should not have the right to come into our town, into our neighborhood and put something in like that. What is going to happen in to 20 acres next to it? Dr. Gately said he opposes this development. He also had concerns with the sewer system.

Russell Roberson said he was a business owner here. I've been here 16 years. This is a very nice facility. We welcome you into this community, but we just don't want you to build it where you are trying to build it. We want this to stay R-1. Mr. Roberson said he was opposed to where they are building it.

Bucky Croom said this was a bigger picture issue to him. I do have a conflict here. My wife has the property listed. If this property didn't sell somebody else is going to buy it. This is a picture of Russellville trying to move forward similar to the same story that we heard with the Walmart Neighborhood Market. We want it, but not in our neighborhood. It is the same story; no one wants it next to them. I do live in that area. I don't have the nearness that a lot of these people do but I really think Russellville needs to look at moving this town forward. I think this is a great project for the City of Russellville from a developer's standpoint. Russellville needs this type of project. Mr. Croom asked the commission to approve this project.

Mike McCoy said he lives just around the corner from the proposed development. He said he built in 1989 to get away from the commercial businesses and, as far as I'm concerned, this is a commercial business. These people are not going to own their own property up there. They are going to be taking funds in from these people so it is a commercial business. When I moved up there was no sewer in that area. We paid 25 years for the Hilltop Sewer District Improvement. Mr. McCoy was concerned that the sewer lines weren't big enough for a commercial development.

Todd Brown said he had six acres next to this land. He said he was opposed to the commercial project. He said he was paying city taxes and we have no sewer. Now a PUD comes in and they get sewer.

Mr. Knight said he wanted to make sure that he understood the process correctly. The Planning Commission takes a vision of the City and lays it out and if you see a need for a particular possible development, you are to press on with that. When opening those types of developments up to the market place, I guess the question that I have for each and every one of you Planning Commission members is that there are multiple properties in very good locations that are for sale that meet the requirements for this type of development and already have utilities available. I went to the trouble of going out before I came up here tonight. I have no interest in trying to sell anybody anything, but I went and met with people who own those properties to make sure they were for sale and that they want to sell them. And if they were priced at a fair market price and that they had all utilities and the engineering was in place; and that the zoning was in place. I just ask you commissioners why you would consider opening up a situation when we have existing properties available that people want to sell and invade an R-1 neighborhood that the neighborhood and people in those areas obviously don't want that type of issue for us in that area. And that is the question I ask you. I have those properties in my car and will bring them to you. Again, I'm not trying to market anybody. I just wanted to make sure they're available and if we had an option.

Mr. Sledge said the property had been on the market for a long time. Basically, we could go in there and develop R-1 and put 120 homes on it. The square footage of an R-1 lot is 9500 square foot lots. I could do starter homes which would create 200 to 300 parcels. We are residential developers and these types of facilities are built in residential neighborhoods. This is not commercial. This development is not going to hurt your property values. It does not create a lot of traffic.

Mr. Nick Landers said he was proud of the facilities he has built. I want to apologize to you, I really do. I'm proud to own one of these. I'm proud of what they do. I didn't know I was going to get hit with all of this. I came to Russellville because I loved that location. It really hurts my

heart. I didn't come here to make people mad. All the property values have gone up around the one we built in Hot Springs Village. They love us over there. I'm proud of it. If you don't want it I'll go somewhere else.

City Engineer Jones said I am a property owner and I understand how emotional this issue can be. I'm keeping my comments strictly to engineering facts on this. There has been a lot of talk about infrastructure requirements and availability out there at that property including some comments about sewer availability. The developers are proposing a lift station. Any development that took place on that property would involve a lift station. So that is not going to be a limiting factor in developing that property. I heard several different numbers about how many residential units that can be put on that property. Those 20 acres would probably support about 75 units and would max the density. So what you are looking at is potentially 75 single-family residential lots on that particular piece of property. If it was developed as a residential subdivision the City wouldn't have any say over the actual target dollar figure whatsoever of the homes themselves. All the City would have control over at that point is the lot size in making sure that the minimum lot size of 9600 square feet in an R-1 zone is utilized. If these lots sold, you are dealing with potentially 75 individual property owners that are going to build 75 individual homes that could be built in pretty much anyway that they want as long as they met our building code. It is a little bit unrealistic to think that property is going to sit out there and be developed as one to two acre lots because that is not going to happen. The value of that property is too high. The assisted living facilities in town are in residential areas. From a traffic standpoint this facility will generate significantly less traffic than a 75-lot subdivision. The traffic it would generate would be a little bit different I would agree; however, considering the total traffic trips per day, a single-family 75 lot residential subdivision is going to generate more traffic than this proposed development.

Dr. Kevin Beavers said I live in the neighborhood. When we put in city water from River Oaks down to our neighborhood in Pleasant Hills, the city wouldn't contribute any money. It was about a $72,000 project. We were told we would be reimbursed from people who hook on. We never got a nickel. It is a 6-inch line. What size line would go to this facility? Would the sewer pumping station pump up to the top of Hilltop?

Mr. Long said the sewer will be collected all on site with gravity sewer. We will put in a lift station and then we will pump from the lift station close to where the Sewer Improvement District #6 lift station is. There is a gravity line from the Sewer Improvement District #6 station. There is a gravity line that goes about 300 feet south. We would pump up to that gravity line and it would all go to Sewer Improvement District #6.

Dr. Beavers said his concern was downhill from a water supply standpoint. Where I live (Pleasant Hills Subdivision) we were told at the time that we were going to have to put in an 8-inch line instead of a 6-inch line if there were going to be 10 more houses down there. What protection are the residents going to have downstream?

Mr. Long replied that they would be working with City Corporation. There are a couple of PRVs (pressure reducing valves) in that line that we may have to make some adjustments on. The line right in front of our property is an 8-inch line. It is fed from the other direction and comes up through the property.

Mr. Jim Lynch of City Corp said we do have a loop system. We have one line that comes down Marina Way and we have a line that comes around Marina Road past the state park on past Pleasant Hills and they are tied together. Unfortunately, it is two different pressure zones and that is where some problems must be addressed that Mr. Long was alluding to. We are going to have to work on that issue so we don't harm anybody's water pressure should this project be approved. This will be at the developer's cost.

Mr. Long said all the infrastructure on this will be paid for by the developer. The City will not contribute a dime. It will all be approved by City Corporation and also approved by the Arkansas Department of Health. Everything will have to be built to code. The hydraulics will have to work. We will do the hydraulic modeling. We will have all that information.

Commissioner Wilkins stated he was not an investor in the project. I would support this if it would be built in my neighborhood. I would never sit on this commission and vote on an investment I would be involved in now or in the future. I believe our City and our seniors deserve a great place to grow old in.

Mr. Knight said he wanted to apologize to Mr. Wilkins first of all. Sometime we get a little emotional. Mr. Wilkins said he considered Mr. Knight his friend. Mr. Knight said sometimes we do disagree and respectfully so. All I want to say to the commissioners again is if there were no other choices then I would certainly... my mother had alzheimer's so please don't play that card with me. Commissioner Wilkins said that card is not being played with you. Mr. Knight said that if this gentleman decides to pull out of Russellville, please remember that I have been doing this a long time and I see markets all over. We will have other investors move right in here and put these facilities up. If he chooses not to come in here, do not be intimidated by that. I ask you not to be intimidated by that. I ask you to consider this on the basis of this right here. You are a commission that is gathered to look at this from a standpoint of this is our community. Offer good available alternatives. That's all I'm asking you to do.

Vice Chairman Skelton told the applicant that he believes everybody in this room would embrace your facility in our community. It's just the location that has caused some of the people's concern.

Commissioner Stratton said she had a number of calls and have visited with a number of people about this and the one thing that keeps coming up is, yes we really need this but just don't put it by my house. I live a half mile from Brookdale and I live less than half a mile from Walmart and all that came in after I moved into my house. All I have to say is the people that have talked to me have suggested those people need to be out by the post office or the high school or can't you just put them someplace in the middle of town. In ten years from now, I don't want to be down by the old or new post office. I want to be someplace where it is pretty and I have a good view and nice facilities. You want to live up there so why wouldn't I want to live there when I am 75 and can't mow my two acres. Commissioner Stratton said we have to think of the whole community and not just the surrounding residents. That is what I am here for.

Sue McCoy expressed concern about who will be able to afford to live there if they can't afford to live in these other places.

Commissioner Barber said he wanted to thank Mr. Landers in coming into this town and doing the research. I think you have a right to come in and do that and make a proposal on buying a piece of property and putting $15 million dollars to work in this community. I think I am a good judge of people and I think what you said is, if we don't like it you'll go somewhere else. I believe you so I'm going to thank you for going through the trouble of doing that.

Commissioner Wilkins made the motion to approve. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Yarbrough and passed unanimously.

The Fourth Order of Business was a public hearing requesting review and a recommendation of approval to rezone property currently C-4 (Neighborhood & Quiet Business) to C-3 (Large Scale & Shopping Center Commercial) to construct a climate controlled and mini-storage facility for property located at 306 North Phoenix Avenue. Submitted by Dave Garza of Barrett & Associates on behalf of J & M Warehouse & Storage. (ZO.16.10.200)

Planner Walden said this property is located just south of the railroad and just east of the new overpass. The adjacent uses are various (office, commercial, and industrial). The adjacent zoning is C-4 to the south and east, R-2, C-4, and M-2 to the west, and C-2, R-3, and M-2 to the north. On the Comprehensive Plan it is indicated for multi-family residential. This property is located in an area with intense industrial zoning to the northwest, but because of market conditions I would tend to call it legacy industrial. I don't think with market conditions that there is likely to be a lot of industrial use in the future in those areas. This would not have any negative impact on industrial development even though that is not likely to happen. The C-3 zoning is really intended for higher traffic areas. This would actually help protect the property better and adjacent property because of the nature of it being intended for those types of areas. There are certain uses that are limited. It would preclude uses such as a sexually oriented business, sheet metal shop or small tool equipment rental which might not be appropriate in this area. A truck stop would be inappropriate in this area. The development of the site for self-storage would not pose a greater aesthetic detriment to the site than existing conditions. This request is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, but the area has not developed in any way that the plan has directed. *The recommendation for this application is approval.*

Dave Gaza of Barrett & Associates said he agreed with Planner Walden about the residential use of it. It's adjacent to the railroad that gets about18 traffic trips a day and that is very detrimental when you are talking about residential uses. There are two small warehouses and one large warehouse that were on the property to begin with. The larger warehouse has been removed and it is that slab they are looking at putting some small mini-storage units. The two larger existing warehouses are planned to be converted to climate control storage. Mini-storages are generally very low traffic volume. You have the overpass and the railroad which is kind of sandwiched in there.

Commissioner Stratton said her concern was the access because of the overpass. Planner Walden pointed out that it is already currently zoned for commercial use so we are trying to zone it for a different commercial use that generates a lesser amount of traffic. That access will be something that has to be worked through with the applicant through the process of site design. I think from a traffic standpoint there wouldn't be one that would be more ideal than a mini-storage facility.

Engineer Jones said the access itself is what is going to limit the use of this property long term. One thing you are not rezoning this to mini-storages you are rezoning this to C-3, which is the request. Right now the developer is proposing mini-storage on there but technically you are opening this up to anything that is allowed in C-3. I don't think there are uses in C-3 that are necessarily going to create more of a traffic issue at that ingress and egress point in a C-4, the existing zoning. What is going to limit the use of this property is that the access to this property is so limited. I don't think it is an unsafe access, but it is definitely a set-up that will not lend itself to a lot of traffic coming in and out of it. Engineer Jones said mini-storages are a great use for this property.

Commissioner Skelton said this access issue concerns me a little bit. You are going to have someone at the foot of the bridge making a left hand turn or right hand turn. Engineer Jones said the issue is going to be sight distance and the bridge does limit sight distance to some extent, but the bridge was designed in such a way that it provides adequate sight distance for the design speed of the roadway there. That was one thing that was taken into consideration with the vertical curvature of the bridge and the vertical alignment of the roadway and that was maintaining an adequate sight distance. Are you going to be able to see a car turning in or out from 700 yards? "No." Think of it as a vertical curve that is the first point that you actually have an opportunity to tie into it simply because of the elevation change. We have vertical curves on highways all through the state and they are designed in such a way that they have adequate stopping sight distance.

Commissioner Stratton made the motion to approve the request. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Miller and passed unanimously.

The Fifth Order of Business tabled from the September 26, 2016 meeting. A request to review and approve *The Landing of Russellville Preliminary Plat* property located north of I-40 and west of Hwy 7 North/North Arkansas Avenue to construct a hotel and convention center. Submitted by Dave Garza of Barrett & Associates on behalf of David Hunt. (SD.16.09.132)

Planner Walden said this preliminary plat approval of that property it is designed to divide the property into six separate lots. The current use is vacant. With this preliminary plat when you are reviewing plats as a commissioner you are reviewing this in sort of an administrative role. So what we are looking at in an application like this is does it meet the check boxes. The staff went though and looked at all the check boxes and it met all the check boxes. *Our recommendation is approval.*

City Engineer Jones said he had one very minor comment. This is a very unusual situation in that that you have a preliminary plat and you have another development that you are reviewing right after this that is going to occupy two lots out of this. There is a lot of intermingling of design elements between the large scale development and the roadway design that is going to actually serve the lots on this plat. I would just ask that you make any approval contingent on final approval of the engineering design plans for the infrastructure on the preliminary plat.

Chairman Boyd asked Mr. Jones if he was satisfied with the preliminary plat and whether he thought that it satisfied all the requirements. Mr. Jones replied that he was satisfied.

Commissioner Skelton made the motion to approve the plat contingent on the final approval of the construction plans and street and drainage plans by the city engineer. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stratton and passed unanimously.

The Sixth Order of Business tabled from the September 26, 2016 meeting. A request to review and approve the large scale development plan for the proposed *The Hilton Garden Inn and Convention Center* located north of I-40 and west of Hwy 7 North/North Arkansas Avenue. Submitted by Allen Williams of AW Engineering on behalf of David B. Hunt. (DV.16.09.145)

Planner Walden said this application involves development on Lots 3 and 4 regarding the hotel and convention center and development on Lot 6 involving trail improvements that are attached to Lots 3 and 4. The applicant is requesting large scale development approval. We went through a lot of interactions involving a lot of review on this particular application. All of the comments that we had have been addressed in terms of removing any portions that are not being actively constructed. There was confusion regarding what is actually being construction in the current phase. What is being constructed is what is reflected on the plan. We had some questions about detail of signage on the trail. A 10-foot trail is not wide enough to accommodate both biking and pedestrian use at the same time. Signage that indicates "walk your bike" while you are on that portion will improve safety. We also had some questions concerning the boating access. We have worked though all those issues providing access easements for the trails since this is going to be divided up into separate lots where the trail is going to be on five of the six lots in the development that needed access easements for all of that. The present portion of the trail that is being constructed will be on Lots 6, 4, and 3. So there is going to be a perimeter trail with future development that will be extended to Lots 2 and 1, which is reflected on easements on the preliminary plat that you all just approved. Additionally, we had questions related to maintenance agreements. Anytime you have a situation where you have cross use of different kinds of improvements, there are questions regarding who is going to maintain what. They provided us with documentation of the maintenance agreements that pertain to the shared improvements that are on Lots 3, 4 and 6. We had parking calculations. Lot 4 has listed parking dimensions in the table at 9'x18' although the regulation is 9'x20' which has all been worked out. *The staff recommendation for this application is approval with contingencies,* i.e., prior to commencing construction obtain satisfactory approval of the construction plans for streets and drainage from the city engineer.

Mr. Allen Williams with AW Engineering representing Hunt Properties said they are about 90% complete with the building plans for both the convention center and the Hilton Garden Inn. We are about that same progress with public improvements such as the new street that we are proposing and about that same level with the onsite utilities, both sewer and water. This is about a 20 million dollar project for us. Hunt Properties has already invested a million dollars in design work in a preliminary site preparation plan that involves leveling the lot out to grades that are about two feet higher than the existing interstate in order to create visibility on the site. There are a portion of these buildings that are in the floodplain. We have submitted our application to FEMA for the removal of those two buildings. Tonight we are presenting the two lots to be developed; both the hotel and convention center. We have a master plan that includes developing two additional restaurants along with a retail center but those plans have not been finalized. We wanted to reserve the right not to present those at this point to keep the process going for the hotel and convention center and the agreement with the City and Hunt Properties. That allows us more time to refine our plans for the two restaurant sites and retail center. We didn't want to extend the

trail through Lots 1 and 2 because of that same reason. We don't know the final layout of those properties and we wanted to make sure that it was incorporated according to their layout and still give us the walking trail. This project is sort of like a mini Branson Landing. This hotel is planned to work along with the convention center.

Mr. Ron Knost, member of the Dardanelle Aquatics Resource Team, asked who the owner of the boat ramp would be. Mr. Knost said I noticed you are changing the ramp. Mr. Williams said our plan with the ramp is to leave as is. Our walking trail will actually go around the ramp. Mr. Knost asked about the public use. Mr. Williams said that phase has not been finalized.

Commissioner Miller made the motion to approve contingent upon the developer obtaining satisfactory approval of the construction plans for street and drainage from the city engineer prior to commencing construction. Commissioner Hatley seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Meeting Adjourned

_____

Chairman Dennis Boyd

Attachment - Russellville Zoning Code Compliance

Russellville Zoning Code Section 2.16.1, General Description

The Planning Commission shall consider a PUD proposal only if it meets one of the following threshold criteria.

1) The PUD will allow the development of an infill parcel in the developed portion of the city that could not be made productive under normal zoning regulations.
2) The PUD would further the city's goal of providing housing for all economic segments of the city and its Planning Area Boundary.
3) The PUD involves a large parcel in which flexibility would allow high quality or innovative urban design.
4) The PUD would aid in the elimination of slums and blight within the city and its Planning Area Boundary.
5) The PUD design results in a minimum of 30 percent of the total development's being reserved as permanent open space.

The PUD meets criterion #2 and #3 for consideration. The project will provide greater housing choice for elders within the Russellville community on a large parcel being developed in a high quality manner.

Russellville Zoning Code Section 2.16.5, Review Criteria

The following criteria will govern the approval or disapproval of the PUD application by the Planning Commission.

1) The PUD shall provide public benefits that would not be achievable through the normal zoning regulations.
2) The PUD shall not create undue or unmitigated negative traffic impacts.
3) The PUD shall be compatible with surrounding developments.
4) The PUD shall be compatible with the city's comprehensive plan.
5) The PUD shall not endanger the public health, welfare or safety, nor shall it substantially diminish or impair property values in the neighborhood in which it is located.
6) The PUD must be of a character and contain such uses that are needed in the area of the proposed project.

The following findings are provided in response to each criterion:

1) The PUD would allow the proposed development while providing assurance to the adjacent properties that the site would not transition to other uses that are typically allowed within districts where assisted living facilities locate.

2) The PUD will likely produce less traffic than full build-out of the property under current property rights vested by R-1 zoning.

3) The PUD will provide and maintain buffers to protect adjacent property.

4) The PUD has been determined to be largely compatible with the comprehensive plan.

5) No data has been presented that would indicate an impairment of adjacent property values.

6) With aging population and shifting demographics, there is a need and demand for a facility of this type. It would allow residents to age and live their later years in life with dignity.