



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

October 7th, 2015

6:00 PM

Benton County Administration Building
215 East Central Avenue, Bentonville AR

**Planning
Board
Approval:**

10/21/15
C. Kimbrough

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, Ron Homeyer, and Ashley Tucker were present.

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

Public Present: There were 3 members of the public present.

Disposition of Minutes: 09-16-2015.

Mrs. Leyva moved to approve the September 16th, 2015 Planning Board Meeting Minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Williams. The motion carried 7-0.

General Public Comment: None

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 Public Hearing Report.

Applicant Comment:

Mrs. Gall stated there was a problem with outstanding items F-G. Mrs. Gall stated they previously had two engineers do a hydraulic analysis report for the current culvert configuration and stated it was fine and that the culvert system is superior to what is existing on Pollock road. Mrs. Gall stated the culvert is 6 inches of gravel and 4 inches of concrete with a 6 x 6 wire mesh.

Mr. Curtis stated that he was aware of what Mrs. Gall was talking about on Pollock Rd.

Mrs. Gall stated it would be very expensive to get another drainage report done after they have already had one done for the entire site.

Mr. Curtis asked Staff why the drainage report that was submitted does not suffice.

Staff stated the drainage report that was submitted was for the overall site drainage and not for the culvert specifically and because of the history of the culverts failing there would be a need for a specific report. Mrs. Gall stated that the engineer stated the culverts will fail in the case of a monsoon type rainfall, and they're proposing concrete instead of dirt.

Staff requested comment from Mr. Homeyer.

Mr. Homeyer stated that the applicant mentioned at the previous TAC meeting that the culverts had been removed. He stated the engineer is not showing the type of storm these culverts would be rated to carry. Mr. Homeyer wanted to know what size storm the culverts are constructed to hold. Mr. Homeyer stated a 10 year storm would suffice but a 25 year storm would be preferred.

Mr. Gall stated that the issues with the culvert previously failing was due to the culvert being full of dirt and no maintenance had been done at that time and therefore the culverts were removed.

Mr. Homeyer asked if the previous culverts were the same size as the proposed 36" culverts.

Mr. Gall stated he believed they were the same size.

Mr. Homeyer stated there was no information provided proving the culvert could handle a ten year storm. He stated there were no calculations to support the sizing. Mr. Homeyer stated that was the necessity for the culvert analysis.

Mrs. Gall stated it is expensive to change the plan and that she had just found out the analysis was requested.

Mr. Homeyer stated he did ask for a culvert analysis three weeks prior at the TAC meeting.

Mr. Curtis stated it could be left as a condition upon voting.

Board Comment:

Mrs. Leyva stated that upon discussion of the bridge and the drainage area there was discussion of the culverts not failing because there is a proposed building in the area.

Mrs. Gall referred to the previous statement that the culverts were superior to the existing culverts on Pollock Road.

Mrs. Leyva asked the location of the 2 ft. and 7 ft. variance.

Staff stated it is for the existing offset northern building.

Public Comment: None

Mr. Homeyer moved to approve the Silica Valley Storage LSD – Major Amendment parking and setback variances.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Leyva.

The motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Homeyer moved to approve the Silica Valley Storage LSD – Major Amendment with stipulations as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Collyge.

The motion carried 7-0.

Silica Valley Storage LSD – Major Amendment was approved.

- 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 Public Hearing

Report.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Homeyer stated the trees that were proposed (white oaks and red cedar) was out of the blue book manual as screening plants. The landscape architects suggested not using the selected trees due to water usage and the location on the berm. The landscape architect suggested more sustainable plants to use.

Board Comment:

Mrs. Leyva asked if the proposed plants were native species.

Ms. Brooker stated they were not native but does very well in this climate. She also stated the St. Mary is considered invasive in other states but not Arkansas.

Mrs. Leyva asked about the screening gap on the southern berm.

Mr. Homeyer asked if Staff had made a site visit to view from the southern properties.

Staff stated they had not.

Mr. Homeyer stated the homes to the south are all in higher elevation than the warehouse ground elevation and therefore the berm plantings were necessary. The heights of the berm allow no views to the trucks at the dock of the warehouse. Without any plantings the top of a tall pickup truck may be seen in the parking lot due to the height of the berm.

Ms. Brooker stated there were smaller gaps on the berm in the original plan for mowers to move through.

Ms. Brooker stated the main reason for the berm was for easier maintenance of mowing and weed eating because the person doing the maintenance was overwhelmed with the plantings.

Mr. Homeyer stated the gap was adjacent to existing vegetation and the gap could be filled if that vegetation were ever to be removed.

Mrs. Leyva stated from previous discussion the existing vegetation was not on the subject property.

Mr. Homeyer confirmed.

Mr. Tucker stated the intent of the screening was the idea of a jungle, so the warehouse would be completely buffered from the residences to the south.

Ms. Brooker stated the landscape architect assured her the proposed plantings would grow together for full coverage.

Mr. Tucker asked for the proposed plantings maturity.

Ms. Brooker stated she was unsure but the landscape architect stated it would happen much quicker than the original plantings.

Mr. Tucker stated he was still concerned with the large gap on the southern berm.

Mr. Barnett stated it was not feasible to install the original plantings knowing they would not survive.

Public Comment:

Valari Mukha, 21711 Carousel Dr., Siloam Springs

Ms. Mukha stated she lived in the house just south of the berm. Ms. Mukha stated the berm is tall and does serve its height purpose but wants to make sure that their home will be protected. She stated she could see the top of the warehouse and tops of the trucks as well as hear when they open the doors. Ms. Mukha stated the berm would continue to protect from any future construction as well as existing. Ms. Mukha stated she would like to see the south berm maintained like the north berm was. She also stated she would like to see a berm to the east because of the scale of the warehouse the berm would soften the view.

Mr. Curtis asked Ms. Mukha to locate where her home was located.

Ms. Mukha stated she was the house on the back of the southern berm furthest away.

Mr. Cole asked if Ms. Mukha was concerned with the gap on the southern berm.

Ms. Mukha said she was concerned with the gap because it is not hidden in the winter months when the vegetation loses its leaves.

Board Comment:

Mrs. Leyva stated she was concerned with the gap on the southern berm as well as approving landscaping that was not native.

Mr. Curtis also stated his concern with the gap. He suggested a single row of the lower shrubs on top of the berm to help fill the gap.

Mr. Tucker stated if the plantings are too uniform it can be just as unappealing.

Mr. Cole stated he was unsure of the justification of the gap considering it was not on the original plans.

Mr. Curtis stated he agreed that there needed to be something planted to fill the gap.

Mr. Barnett stated he did not have a problem doing a single tier on the berm in the location of the gap.

Mrs. Leyva confirmed that once the plantings had grown together there would be no need to mow between them.

Mr. Homeyer stated that was correct.

Mr. Curtis stated a single row of the St. Mary on top of the berm on any side 15 ft. on center spacing.

Mrs. Leyva moved to approve the Barnett Warehouse SPR – Major Amendment, #15-142, amended during the hearing (St. Mary's to go across the gap on the berm with the continuous spacing as shown on the plans) and with standard conditions as written.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Cole.

The motion carried 6-0.

Barnett Warehouse SPR – Major Amendment was approved.

Public Hearing adjourned at 6:51 pm.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Call to Order: 6:51 pm

Old Business: None

New Business:

- III. **Berens Variance, #15-149, 8280 Ozark Ridge Dr., Rogers
Represented by Steve Berens, 8280 Ozark Ridge Dr., Rogers**

Mr. Curtis asked Staff for the report of Berens Variance, #15-149.

Staff gave a presentation on Berens Variance, #15-149, outlining the information in the TAC Report.

Applicant Comment:

Mr. Berens stated he built his house ten years ago and were a family of four at the time. Mr. Berens stated he now has a family of six. He stated they love their neighborhood and home and do not wish to move but have outgrown their house. The proposed addition would be for an extra bedroom and bathroom. The house is set roughly 145 ft. off of the road and the area selected for the addition works well with the layout of the home. The location for the addition is also cost effective for their family. Mr. Berens stated the neighboring lot has been vacant for the ten years he had lived there. He stated he does not think the addition would affect the quality of life, if someone were to move onto that lot, due to the topography not being buildable in the area of the proposed addition.

Board Comment:

Mr. Cole asked Staff if it was the topography that demands the location of the proposed addition. Staff stated that was correct.

Mrs. Leyva asked for the location of the driveway.

Mr. Berens stated it was off of Ozark Ridge drive, just north of the southern property line. He also stated the septic system was located to the east of the home. The west of the house is not buildable due to utility lines and a steep slope. Mr. Berens stated the other locations were not buildable or cost effective to the family.

Mr. Curtis asked if the 2.5 ft. variance was due to the roof overhang.

Mr. Berens stated he would like to run a split rail fence along that property line.

Mr. Curtis asked how far the roof would go toward the easement.

Mr. Berens stated to keep the current style of the house the overhang is 14 inches.

Mr. Curtis stated that would be another foot, and therefore would need a 2.5 ft. to 2 ft. variance.

Mr. Berens stated he was asking for 2 ft. did not mean it would be built to 2 ft. It would be insurance for a worst case scenario. If he could go 4 ft. from the property line he would do that.

Mr. Tucker asked how a fire truck would get to the back side of the house.

Mr. Berens stated there is a path on the adjacent lot.

Mr. Tucker rephrased to ask how a fire truck would get in close proximity, if there was a fence.

Mr. Berens stated using the existing blacktop path he would leave a section of fence that is open. He also stated that if there were a fire the house is still accessible from all other sides.

Mrs. Leyva stated she would like to see more detailed information of the site plan showing the proposed addition.

Mr. Berens stated before he got architectural drawings done he would like to make sure he had an approval to do the addition.

Mr. Berens stated he did have concerned neighbors that he had met with and explained the reasoning.

Mr. Cole asked if they understood to variance request.

Mr. Berens stated the neighbors would be at the Public Hearing to speak against the project.

Other Business: None

STAFF UPDATES:

- I. Administrative Approvals
 - A. Quam/Fairchild Minor Subdivision, #15-150
 - B. Swenson Minor Subdivision, #15-152
 - C. Larson Minor Subdivision, #15-153
 - D. Fancher Minor Subdivision, #15-155
 - E. Thrailkill Minor Subdivision, #15-156

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Mr. Sudduth notified the Board that Trulove Construction was appealing the Board's decision and he would update the Board on the date of the appeal.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:08 pm.