



**Benton County Planning Board
Public Hearing
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting**

September 16th, 2015

6:00 PM

Benton County Administration Building
215 East Central Avenue, Bentonville AR

Planning
Board
Approval:

G. Kimbrough
10-7-15

Meeting Minutes

PUBLIC HEARING:

Call to Order: The meeting was convened at 6:00 PM by Planning Board Chair, Mark Curtis.

Roll Call: Jim Cole, Rick Williams, Mark Curtis, Sean Collyge, Starr Leyva and Ron Homeyer were present. Ashley Tucker was absent.

Staff present: John Sudduth – Administrator of General Services, Building Official – Glenn Tracy, Planning Director – Kevin Gambrill, Planning Manager – Taylor Reamer, and County Planner – Caitlynn Kimbrough were present.

Public Present: There were 4 members of the public present.

Disposition of Minutes: 09-02-2015.

Mr. Williams moved to approve the September 2nd, 2015 Planning Board Meeting Minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Collyge. The motion carried 6-0.

General Public Comment: None

Old Business: None

New Business:

- I. **Carroll Electric Service Station Site Plan Review, #15-139, 10720 N AR Hwy 59, Gravette Represented by Blake Jorgensen, 124 W Sunbridge #5, Fayetteville and Ken Shireman, 1689 E Mission Blvd., Fayetteville**

Mr. Curtis asked Staff for the report of Carroll Electric Service Station SPR #15-139. Staff gave a presentation on Carroll Electric Service Station SPR #15-139, outlining the information in the Public Hearing Report.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Jorgensen stated the landscaping was modified on the plan and provided planting examples.

Board Comment:

Mrs. Leyva asked about the Silverberry planting staying in bloom all season. Mr. Shireman stated the Silverberry proposed is evergreen. He also stated that the shrub was extremely dense with dark glossy leaves.

Mrs. Leyva asked if the Silverberry in the picture provided was planted on a berm.
Mr. Shireman confirmed they were planted on a small berm.

Mr. Curtis asked if the applicant had any concerns with the Fire Marshal comments.
Mr. Jorgensen stated there were no issues with the Fire Comments.

Public Comment:

Robert Smith, 18812 N. Mt. Olive Rd., Gravette

Mr. Smith asked if he could see where the access would be off of the highway. Mr. Smith expressed concern with the traffic on Mt. Olive since the road is narrow. Mr. Smith expressed concern because of previous fatality accidents at the intersection of Mt. Olive and Highway 59. Mr. Smith was concerned for the increase in traffic.

Mr. Curtis asked Mr. Smith if there was a stop sign at Mt. Olive and Highway 59.
Mr. Smith confirmed there is a stop sign but it has not helped with the accidents.
Mr. Curtis suggested that could be a location for rumble strips.

Mr. Williams moved to approve the Carroll Electric Service Station SPR, #15-139 with stipulations as written.
The motion was seconded by Mr. Homeyer.
The motion carried 6-0.

Carroll Electric Service Station Site Plan Review was approved.

Public Hearing adjourned at 6:17 pm.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Call to Order: 6:17 pm

Old Business: None

New Business:

- I. **Silica Valley Storage LSD – Major Amendment, #15-136, 15206 Silica St., Rogers
Represented by John and Julie Gall, 8197 Forest Hills Dr., Rogers**

Mr. Curtis asked Staff for the report of Silica Valley Storage, #15-136.
Staff gave a presentation on Silica Valley Storage, #15-136, outlining the information in the TAC Report.

Applicant Comment:

Mrs. Gall confirmed that there are lights on each building currently and would probably put a light on the new building(s).

Board Comment:

Staff asked the applicants to further explain the “proposed three 36 inch CMPs” for the stream crossing on page 2 of plans.
Mrs. Gall stated that the proposed graded inlet by the existing storage is already there and is not proposed. She also stated that the three culverts were recommended by the engineer.
Staff asked if the culverts are existing and being updated or if they are proposed.

Mrs. Gall stated there were culverts there but they were pulled out when they put in the proposed graded inlet.

Staff confirmed that there were culverts, they then pulled them and will be replaced.

Mrs. Gall stated it was to be discussed with the engineer because when the proposed graded inlet was installed it solved the drainage problem in front of the existing storage building, but the three culverts were pulled because they were backing up.

Staff asked if it could currently be crossed at grade.

Mrs. Gall stated it was not at grade and there would be a bridge.

Staff stated that they may ask for a grading plan to show the existing and finished grades.

Mrs. Gall asked staff if they had already had shown grading.

Staff stated that they were told the culverts were already in.

Mrs. Gall stated there was one currently installed with the proposed graded inlet.

Staff confirmed that there were not culverts installed in the middle of the property.

Mrs. Gall stated they were not in because they previously removed them.

Staff asked if the culverts going in were going to be formatted to fix the drainage problem.

Mrs. Gall stated she would talk to him as well as staff.

Staff stated they would want to see it in plan view and not just in the drainage report.

Mr. Collyge asked if the mobile home park and storage unit were owned by the entity.

Mrs. Gall stated her father in law and brother in law developed it and they bought the storage facility from her brother in law and her father in law sold the mobile home park.

Mrs. Leyva asked if there was a proposed bridge that is not shown on the plans.

Mrs. Gall stated first they will put up the proposed building and that there will be a bridge to cross.

Mrs. Leyva asked the material of the bridge and how to access the proposed building.

Mrs. Gall stated she would have the engineer update the plans to show the bridge.

Mr. Cole asked if any construction was started.

Mrs. Gall stated there was no construction started.

Mr. Homeyer commented that because of the past history of the culverts not working then the engineer would need to certify by documentation that what they're proposing will work and also support the 75,000lb fire code.

Mr. Gall stated the original plan showed the 75,000lb support.

Mr. Homeyer clarified that the proposed bridge would need this 75,000lb support capability.

Mr. Curtis asked about the variance for the existing building.

Mrs. Gall stated she would fill out the variance, but that the building is already there.

Mr. Curtis stated we would need a variance for the existing buildings.

II. Barnett Warehouse SPR – Major Amendment, #15-142, 21153 Hwy. 16, Siloam Springs Represented by Amy Brooker, 1006 S Lyndale, Siloam Springs (representing Ozark Management) and Ron Homeyer.

Mr. Curtis asked Staff for the report of Barnett Warehouse, #15-142.

Staff gave a presentation on Barnett Warehouse, #15-142, outlining the information in the TAC Report.

Applicant Comment:

Ms. Brooker stated she with the help from Professional Landscapes, Jeff Hunter and Hank Thomas with HHT investigated the property to proceed with plantings in October and there were concerns about the original

design. A new design for the planting plan is being proposed. Ms. Brooker stated that the southern berm is actually much bigger than the original plans had stated. The new proposed trees will not require as much water and will last longer. The originally proposed pines are on the edge of the planting zone and therefore many of them would be a guaranteed loss. Ms. Brooker stated the property across the street has spent a fortune trying to keep their pines alive. They're proposing a new shrub that will provide a large dense barrier.

Mr. Curtis asked the origin of the proposed Glen St. Mary shrub.

Ms. Brooker stated she was unsure of the origin and that it was recommended from the landscapers suggested because it's evergreen and low maintenance.

Mr. Curtis stated the reason he asked was because they would like to see the use of native plants and pines are native to this area. He stated that was the reason they were originally proposed for the project.

Ms. Brooker said she would discuss the origin of the Glen St. Mary with the landscapers.

Mr. Curtis stated the importance of planting plants that do not cause problems for the area and thus the native plants are ideal.

Ms. Brooker stated that was another reason of replacing the proposed red cedar. The landscapers suggested it was not a good fit since it retained a lot of water from the other plants around it even though it is a native species.

Board Comment:

Mrs. Leyva asked about the space on the proposed plan where there are no proposed plantings.

Ms. Brooker stated there are no residents or neighbors that would need to be screened in that area. Ms. Brooker also expressed concern about the amount of trees planted on the berms and wants to keep it as minimum as necessary because of the extreme maintenance to mow and weed eat around them.

Mr. Curtis stated the full screen of trees planted on the berms were necessary due to the strong opposition of the neighbors when the project was originally proposed.

Ms. Brooker stated there was not a property to be developed in that area where the proposed trees were removed from the berm. There is only a road existing.

Mr. Curtis stated regardless of if there is an existing home near the open space it is still a neighborhood and needs to be treated as such.

It was determined that there is a house with a view into the proposed open space on the berm but it is not visible due to existing vegetation.

Staff noted that the natural vegetation list could be found in the regulations in Appendix C and suggested the landscape architects see the Appendix.

Mr. Curtis stated his concern with leaving the berm open without tree plantings.

Ms. Brooker provided photos for the Board.

Mr. Curtis asked about the east berm being removed.

Mr. Homeyer stated the east berm was not required according to the regulations because of the property across the street being the same use.

Staff stated that upon discussion, regardless of what is required, the plan shown the night of the public hearing did show the east berm existing. The proposed plan should be updated with this berm removed as well.

Mr. Homeyer stated that part of the berm was built and then was deemed impossible due to the utilities.

Staff stated the new plan needed to be an updated, scaled drawing similar to the originally submitted document.

Mr. Curtis stated he did not see a reason for the berm but would like to see nice landscaping there.

Other Business: None

STAFF UPDATES:

- I. Administrative Approvals
 - A. Ayers Minor Subdivision, #15-138, 11543 High Sky Inn Rd., Hindsville
 - B. Luedecke Minor Subdivision, #15-143, 17753 Luedecke Rd., Gentry
 - C. Lor-Thao Minor Subdivision, #15-144, 24653 Lamphear Rd., Gentry

DISCUSSION ITEMS: None

Meeting Adjourned at 7:09 pm.