

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:05

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR



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

March 2, 2022  
6:00 p.m.

Benton County Administration Building  
215 East Central Avenue  
Bentonville, AR 72712

**Meeting Minutes**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Call to Order:** The meeting was convened at 6:00 p.m. by the Planning Board Chair, Mr. Bracy.

**Roll Call:** Bob Bracy, Theresa Neal, Terry Maienschein, Stephen Torrez, Bethany Rosenbaum and Rick Williams were present.

**Staff present:** Taylor Reamer – Director of Planning, Madison Kienzle – Senior Planner, Sandra Garza – County Planner

**Public Present:** See sign in sheet

**Disposition of Minutes:** February 16, 2022

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the February 16, 2022, Planning Board Meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Maienschein.

Motion approved: 6 – 0

**General Public Comment:** None

**Old Business:** None

**New Business:**

- I. **Smith Variance, case no. 22-062, Lakeside Rd, Lowell; 15-10154-002**  
Representative: Jim Smith, 10657 Sycamore Rd, Lowell

Staff gave presentation.

Mr. Smith states that there will not be anyone residing in the building on the 0.16-acre lot, that is just a shop. The people who are buying the 0.36-acre lot will have first right of refusal to buy the shop back and put it all back together in the future. The septic system did perk but not by the county, we had a field designer come out and pass it on site. There are multiple buildings like this one out in the area and there are people living in them on this size lot.

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Dr. Rosenbaum comments that if the board that we are in a bind from the subdivision and their covenants and by permitting this lot split you are by in affect out of compliance with the covenants. In the last two weeks were you able to visit with the person who runs the POA or find out more.

Mr. Smith states they do not have a designated POA, at one time about 18 people met and signed a document which wasn't legal because there wasn't a notary there, we all agreed with what we had out there and leave it alone that it grandfathered in, to change that it would take 100% of the people to participate and that is hard to do. Really not too many people are complaining about it but 2-3 people that live right by it, all it's going to be is a house.

Dr. Rosenbaum comments that she understands his plan, selling the house portion and keep the storage structure on the 0.16-acre lot and the plan is for the people buying the other portion to buy the shop back, if that doesn't work out, we still have two parcels under different ownership and that is out of compliance with the covenants. Has there been any other creative way of still getting what you want, perhaps could you sell the entire lot and lease the building from the new owners?

Mr. Smith states they thought about that but then there are insurance problems, we really don't want to do that if there is no other choice, we rather just own it straight out.

Mr. Bracy comments that Mr. Smith mentioned other buildings similar to his on small acre tracts; in 2014 the regulations changed and everything in the past would be grandfathered in. Taylor would you please state the requirements for lot splits.

Mr. Reamer states that any lot splits in Benton County require a one-acre minimum for a split, in situations like this where the lots are under the acre and are under compliance in subdivision lots, the aim of the ordinance is to create situations where there is no net change. In this situation this lot split would not comply with our ordinance.

Mr. Bracy asks and it would require the board to change that with a variance

Mr. Reamer states that is correct.

Mr. Bracy states that the property owner got county approval for septic but not from state.

Mr. Reamer states that the property owners had a septic design representative, come out and test the site after that is done, the designer then needs to submit it to the Arkansas Department of Health for approval. The county does have a health unit but it is still ran by the state.

Dr. Neal would like to know the reason for the variance other than selling the lot for someone to build a house, is there any kind of hardship involved?

Mr. Smith states there is not.

Public Comment: None

2022 MAR 22 AM 8: 06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mr. Williams motions to deny because there is no hardship, Dr. Neal seconded the motion.

Mr. Bracy states that the board needs to give a reason for denial when voting.

Roll Call for Votes

Mr. Bracy approves the denial because it violates Benton County's current land use requirements, I also see no hardship.

Dr. Neal agrees with the denial because there is no hardship.

Mr. Maienschein agrees with the denial, it is out of compliance.

Mr. Torrez agrees to deny, due to no hardship

Dr. Rosenbaum agrees with the denial, if we approve this lot split it would make you more out of compliance with our ordinance and the covenants in your community.

Mr. Williams agrees to deny, it is not compliant and does not have a hardship.

Motion to approve the denial: 6-0

**II. Lost Bridge Storage Site Plan Review - Major Amendment, case no. 22-083, 20054 AR 127 Hwy; 15-16329-000**

Representative: Todd Butler, 3214 NW Avignon Way, Suite 4

Staff gave presentation.

Mr. Butler mentions he was not at the last meeting but did get informed with everything that had to get updated and in place.

Mr. Torrez asks if the buildings to the south are also part of the project.

Mr. Reamer clarifies that those buildings are part of the storage facilities but not included in the site plan because they will not be disturbed.

Mr. Williams asks if the alternations from the previous approval and the landscaping, change the drainage.

Mr. Butler clarifies that it will not, the original detention study incorporated the expansion, so he reviewed the analysis. He wrote a letter from the previous findings and didn't have to change anything.

Mr. Williams asks if it is the same culvert design.

Mr. Butler states it is. He states he created a berm and has directed the water into

2022 MAR 22 AM 8: 06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

a culvert that will run into the ditch.

Mr. Reamer states that what is being reviewed for this project, would be the construction for the new buildings, the rest has been completed.

Public Comment: None

Mr. Williams motions to approve, Mr. Torrez seconded the motion.

Motion to approve: 6-0

**III. Pitts Variance, case no. 22-091, 13775 Pitts Rd, Garfield; 18-01257-001**

Representative: James Pitts, 13775 Pitts Rd, Garfield

Staff gave presentation.

Mr. Pitts clarifies the hardship for his Variance, being he would have to re-do the septic system if not approved.

Public Comment: None

Mr. Maienschein motions to approve, Mr. Williams seconded the motion

Motion to approve: 6-0

**IV. Dav-Chu Site Plan Review, case no. 22-094, E Hwy 94 & Panorama Rd; 18-03723-005**

Representative: Jason Ingalls, 9200 Suits US Drive, Bella Vista

Staff gave presentation.

Mr. Bracy asks if any of the 10 outstanding items have been completed.

Mr. Ingalls states, they have added the parking spaces and dimensions, the loading spaces have not been added

Mr. Reamer clarifies that some of the outstanding items are very minor

Dr. Rosenbaum asks for clarity on if the tiny homes/cottages will be brought in by every individual or the applicant will construct the tiny homes and rent them out.

Mr. Ingalls states they would be renting a space.

Dr. Rosenbaum comments, they rent their space and bring their own cottage in.

Mr. Ingalls states that is correct.

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
DENVER COUNTY

Dr. Rosenbaum asks if the pictures of the example of tiny homes will be something they hope for individuals to bring in, there is no control over how they will actually look because they are just renting their space and bringing their home there.

Mr. Ingalls states that is correct.

Dr. Rosenbaum asks what is the difference between a tiny home and a cottage, is that on purpose, is there a reason for this language.

Mr. Ingalls states it had something to do with the septic system, the way that the usage is classified to get the septic system to work properly. When they classify an item as a cottage, its usage is a little less than a tiny home so we could only do 10 tiny homes and the rest as cottages, they are essentially the same.

Dr. Rosenbaum asks how would you control leasing to somebody and determining what they are bringing in.

Mr. Ingalls comments he does not have an answer.

Dr. Rosenbaum asks for clarity, the people will bring in their home and they will have a skirt put around them and they will not be on a permanent foundation. Asks Mr. Reamer how will the board have to review this project, do we review it as mobile home park because of that, we don't have a Tiny Home ordinance.

Mr. Reamer states due to some of the information that was just discussed may change that in fact tonight, I don't want to give a definitive answer one way or the other. If these units are to remain mobile that may change the classification to high density residential, which we are reviewing tonight to some sort of RV Park due to the fact that they are staying mobile and they are transportable, even in mobile home parks you see them put on foundations with skirting and other elements to make it more residential, the viewing of it. This particular proposal what has been stated tonight somewhat changes the review criteria to more of a commercially RV type use; RV camp ground type use, which changes the requirements of the board.

Mr. Bracy states that looking at the architect drawings, it appears that this is represented as a mobile home park, looking at the pictures, this is a representation of what has been really defined as tiny homes and we do not have an ordinance for them. There are different requirements for mobile homes and tiny homes.

Mr. Ingalls states the pictures presented to the board are from the Olive Street in Rogers, tiny home park and they show skirting and some of them still have the frames and axels on them so those can be moved.

Mr. Torrez asks about trash service; will each lot have their own trash cans or will there be a dumpster.

Mr. Ingalls states each will have their own trashcans, carts that we all have at home.

Mr. Torrez asks where they will be stored

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
ROGERS, AR

Mr. Ingalls states there is green space between every lot and they should be able to put it next to the home.

Mr. Williams asks if there is a designation for fire lanes.

Mr. Ingalls states there is.

Public Comment:

Bill Watkins; attorney of rogers representing a group  
Comments that the tiny homes on olive were put in before they adopted their code, whatever is there has been grandfathered in, the ones out on Monte Ne Rd are meeting the codes. Tiny homes are not regulated by same federal building code regulations as mobile homes. This proposed development is so out of character for this area, the homes in this area are 5-acres or larger, please consider the type of residential area this is (presents a slide to the board showing how far apart houses are, how this property has been scraped and cleared already, the developer tried putting in a self-storage facility in there and the board denied it. The ordinance states to try and keep the residential and rural character of the county, how is this proposal in any way going to keep that look? This proposal, proposes to install an in-ground sewage disposal system that will serve 28 different residences, most of the properties surrounding this area get their water from wells, how is this water going to be safe for other property owners in the area? Remember Bethel Heights and the fail of the drip system, everyone had to pay more in taxes to clean that mess up, is that what we want in the county? 28 homes on 5.59-acres are overcrowding for this area. If you look at it this way these are 5 units on an acre, which is high for single family residential development. How are we going to protect the value of land, what is the traffic going to look like? If the drip system fails there is no room for a back up to be installed, that's a requirement of the Arkansas Department of Health. State code requires 100-foot distance in wells and septic systems, one of my clients has been under contract to drill for a well since November, if this gets approved, he will have to completely redesign the system. I encourage you to deny this application, please consider other property owners and the value of their properties as well as your own code and deny this application.

Katherine Theleman; 9546 Bayside Dr, Rogers  
(Reads the letter sent to all Planning Board Members) Comments how will 28 homes on 5 acres look like? This would be a village. Questions to consider, what will this look like in months years and decades? What are the set of guidelines you're going to use? What does the maintenance to this place look like?

Joe Mills; 16168 Blackhawk Trail, Rogers  
Thanks the board, comments that he is about quality and not quantity, this project is not quality to me. This project will decrease the value of our homes. I have traffic concerns off of 94, Panorama Rd doesn't have any shoulders. This is the wrong project in the wrong place.

Alfie Mahmoud; 15050 Natural Habitat Way, Rogers  
Is representing the Preserve POA, we have 32 names on our petition and 7 of them are present, I request 10 minutes. Why can't we get a right definition of what this project is? This is obviously an RV Park. This is a high safety concern for us

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO. & PROBATE CLERK  
BEAVER COUNTY, AR

because we don't know how this is going to look, the speed people drive on 94 that is a blind curve and the way Panorama Rd is. How is this place really going to be operated and managed? We oppose this project.

Scott Strauch; 9731 Palomino Dr, Rogers

Comments he is understanding that the septic system will have a total of four-thousand gallons, that's for 28 homes, if you put four people times a home, that's a lot. I have a three-bedroom home that utilizes a thousand gallons, that fluid has got to float somewhere. Pollution is a big deal and if it flows into Beaver Lake, it will ruin everything, we all get a drinking source from there. Please consider voting this thing down.

Jim Troupis; 9571 Preservation Dr, Rogers

Comments that he moved from Wisconsin to the Horseshoe Bend area because of the view and the way living is around the area. All of this aspect brought us to purchasing this property and now things will change, this is so ridiculously incompatible to the area. Back in Wisconsin the only reason why tiny homes are put out in the area are really for the housing of homeless. I ask you kindly to please deny this request.

Alline Pendley; 14420 E Hwy 94, Rogers

In the past there have been two mobile home parks closed down because of septic issues, they were overflowing.

Burton Freeman; 9725 Buckskin Cir, Rogers

Safety is his main concern, the entrance off of Hwy 94 is very dangerous, the speed limit is 55, that is not a good entrance. Trash trucks like Mr. Torrez mentioned, that is going to be another concern, knowing how big they have gotten, it will be hard to back that out. Another concern is the septic system, who is going to monitor that in the future?

Megean Dumas; 14301 E Hwy 94, Rogers

We are just south of this proposal, which is where all of the stormwater goes, it goes under the highway and into our property. What happens when the stormwater management fails? All of this movement on that property is going to bring more water into our property, damaging our house and washing it away, which has already started.

Bill Dark; 9881 Bobwhite Circle, Rogers

(Provided a slide) Mentions he is representing a group. This property served as a natural habitat for a lot of animals, it was beautiful with just trees on it. The property owner had purchased the property with the intent to open up an RV & Boat storage, three days after closing on the property and before any permits were approved, the property owner contracted people to remove every one of the hundreds of trees that were on the property. When they burned the debris, the fire got out of control and had to get the fire department to put it out. I went out to the property and there was water that had accumulated from the last rain, the water just ponds specially in the drip area, the ground definitely saturates for about a couple weeks.

Mr. Ingalls comments that at this point he is going to table the project out four weeks to try to get things in order. He states he didn't know there was a well that

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO. & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

was being proposed on the property to the north. He would like some input from the board if they have any.

Mr. Williams comments that All building codes will be changing in the beginning of next year and will be from 2021. In 2012, tiny homes are not addressed, they were addressed in 2018, which was a draft code and was not adopted. All building codes will be changing in the beginning of next year and will be from 2021. The code references at 600 feet and greater on a foundation, it has nothing to do with mobile. There is a clear definition between the two.

Dr. Rosenbaum asks Mr. Reamer for clarity on if these homes weren't mobile and are on permanent foundation, would we be reviewing it as high density residential?

Mr. Reamer states that is correct.

Dr. Rosenbaum asks, if so, would they be required to have sewage approval prior to our approval?

Mr. Reamer comments they wouldn't, it would be similar to other projects, the board may elect to condition any decision upon the health department's approval.

Dr. Rosenbaum states that her concern are all the comments made from the neighbors on local areas with sewage problems.

Mr. Reamer states that is an option for the board to require ADH approval before rendering a decision on this project. That would be to confirm that the system would be able to handle this proposal, and second, to confirm the capacity for the 28 units.

Dr. Rosenbaum states that, this would be something she would like to see before making a decision on this proposal.

Mr. Ingalls states that he is going to look into the water ponding, that is outside of his expertise but will look into it.

Mr. Bracy suggests a traffic study

Mr. Ingalls comments that they probably need at least four weeks to try to complete everything.

Mr. Reamer states one of the most important things to distinguish would be the foundation type, will these be structures that are going to be permanently fixed via a residential foundation or will these be units that will remain on wheels, because that distinction changes the land use category that this board will review. Also, trying to identify this waste water system before the next meeting.

Dr. Neal states her concern of the different names of the type of buildings, we've got tiny homes and cottages. Can we get the property owner to pick one or the other and size everything appropriately?

Dr. Neal motions to table the project for four weeks



2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mr. Reamer comments that the meeting date will be April, 6, 2022.

Dr. Rosenbaum asks if there will be public comment that date, so the public can know.

Mr. Reamer states that's up to the board; we have a motion from Dr. Rosenbaum.

Dr. Neal seconded the motion.

Motion to table to April 6, 2022: 6-0

**V. CKJ Site Plan Review, case no. 22-095, 14012 Monica Dr, Gravette; 15-15991-000**

Representative: Jason Ingalls, 9200 Suits US Drive, Bella Vista

Staff gave presentation

Mr. Ingalls states some of the outstanding items have been revised on today's plats that are in front of you. Comments that ADEQ does not require notice under 5 acres, it is an automatic coverage, they just require to fill their form out and post it out on site.

Public Comment:

Sawyer Cantrell; 14197 Monica Dr, Gravette

Comments that he is representing a group. This property was advertised as a 3200 sq ft, single-family home, with one bedroom upstairs with a walk-in closet and an in-suite nursery room or an additional closet/ office space, there is a downstairs bedroom with access to the shop. This is the first home on Monica Dr. and recorded by the county as part of the Stonegate Subdivision with the intent use of a private home and shop not a commercial business located in an industrial area. All of the parking spaces being projected make it seem to us that this is going to be a heavy commercial business, no where in the application does it state that there will be multiple ingress/egress. With this many employees, it will double the traffic on our roads, the roads were designed to support rural use of single-family homes not 36 plus commuter cars. The roads are only wide enough for one car to pass at a time, this is important because the corner of this property serves as a school bus stop, it is a valid and huge concern for the safety of the children walking across the roads or waiting at the bus stop, there is a high chance of one of them getting seriously hurt because this property was not designed or intended to be a commercial property. Dirt roads are the last to melt, Fishback Rd is plowed, Monica Dr is not plowed due to it being a dirt road, this drastically increases the chances of a kid getting hurt or killed due to one of the employees not being able to stop in a safely matter. There has already been water damage due to the way the parking lot was constructed. There is no way that the current septic system can hold all of these employees, when it was designed for a single-family residence. We are not against growth in our area but this is not the place for it. These reasons should be more than enough to deny this project in our subdivision. Our land values are going to drop with this proposal, loading docks are stated to be on the proposal, we do not

2022 MAR 22 AM 8: 06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO. & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

have the room for trucks and trailers. Please consider our comments and deny this application.

Jason Peters; 14024 Trinity Way, Gravette

Comments he wasn't too much opposed to the project when it was a granite shop. He has a 19-year-old and a 16-year-old that drive up and down that road. States he cuts roads for utilities for work, this dirt road is very small and they would have to implement the road in order for it to use it the way they want to with all the extra traffic. I also know that you're suppose to have a grading permit when putting in a parking lot as well as erosion control, I'm not sure they had one. I also know that he has ran fiber, that he has the rights to, that none of us can tap into his business. Our road has no material on it, this road is about to blow out, when a bus has to drive by, I have to get up on the very edge of someone's property for it to be able to pass by. I would request for this project to get denied.

Trey Carter; 14124 Monica Dr, Gravette

Comments that he is against this proposal, I am a father of two, we moved away from Centerton to move away from the noise, to move away from the city and leave that behind. I like to be able to let my kids play and be out freely and wildly and know that they're going to be safe, this is a huge increase safety risk, with that many people driving up and down our roads. This also takes a toll on my property value, not only my house but my vehicle with the roads and the current conditions they are in. Please consider all of our statements and deny this application.

Tanya Charlton; 13946 Noah Rd, Gravette

There are over 20 children in this neighborhood, across the road from this property there is a farm and chickens cross the road, we have to stop for them. I spoke to everyone on my road and no one wants this proposal to go in.

Mr. Ingalls states the property owner came to him because he didn't know he needed so many permits and wants to make everything right. My client didn't know it was a structure that had been built and never permitted before the board. Before he applied for that permit, I know he spent over one hundred seventy-five thousand dollars to extend the fiber optic to this facility because he is handling truck brokerage, taking care of scheduling loads, no loads or trucks would be coming or going to this property. About traffic, this would just be people getting to work and going home after work, that being 8 am and leaving at 5 pm, occasionally some that leave during lunch time.

Mr. Milligan (owner of the property), 591 Keller Rd, Centerton

Comments he didn't know it was a requirement to have lights in the parking lot, I wasn't planning to put any lights in the parking lot because we don't do any evening work there. There is already a light post that the electric company put out, in the front of the building but it doesn't shine out through out the neighborhood. When I bought the property, it was listed as, can be used as commercial or residential and when I asked her about it, she stated there had been three other businesses before.

Mr. Torrez asks if this property part of the subdivision or is it not.

Mr. Milligan states that he wasn't told that it was, there aren't any covenants that were provided to him.

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mr. Bracy states that real estate is a profession and sometimes it is misconstrued a times, because we see many times people coming with their projects and not knowing certain things about their property.

Mr. Reamer states that based on the information he has at his disposal at the moment, it does appear to be a portion of that subdivision.

Mr. Torrez comments that the board doesn't get into covenants.

Mr. Ingalls states he doesn't think the traffic should impact at all like the neighbors think it will.

Dr. Rosenbaum asks if there is a difference, whether or not this property is in a subdivision, make a difference in their decision. Do we need to have more information?

Mr. Reamer states that if the board supports, Benton County Planning staff can investigate the existence of any existing covenants for this property or property in this subdivision, and with that, we can provide it at a future meeting.

Mr. Bracy states if we can also get clarity on if this proposal is commercial or heavy commercial.

Mr. Reamer states this would be classified as a professional office, that is the land use category.

Mr. Bracy asks if there is an amount of population or vehicle activity is not in that regulation.

Mr. Reamer states there is not, but the board can request a traffic study.

Mr. Milligan states that the work they do is a freight brokerage company, we have customers that send us available loads and we put them on a broker board, we find and hire trucking companies to pick up the loads and deliver. None of the loads would ever come or go from my facility, I didn't ask for a loading area, I think that your planning commission guidelines require there to be one, but that is not necessary in this case. I am not adding any truck traffic to any of the roads in my area, at all.

Mr. Torrez motions to table to the March 16, 2022 meeting to try to get information about the covenants and the traffic study.

Mr. Ingalls states that he doubts they can get a traffic study within two weeks.

Mr. Torrez comments that maybe April 6, 2022 is a better date.

Mr. Reamer states we have a motion by Mr. Torrez to table to April 6, 2022 Public Hearing.

Mr. Maienschein seconds the motion.

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:06

BETSY HARRELL  
CG & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Motion to table to April 6, 2022: 6-0

**VI. Sossamon Major Subdivision and Waiver, case no. 22-100, 8068 S Tillys Hill Rd, Decatur; 18-11443-007**

Representative: James Sossamon, 12982 AR 279 Hwy, Gravette

Staff gave presentation.

Public Comment: None

Mr. Torrez motions to approve, Mr. Williams seconded the motion.

Mr. Bracy comments that he does not see where this easement leads.

Mr. Reamer clarifies that there has been an easement established in the past and this one would connect to it, leading to S Tillys Hill Rd.

Motion to approve: 6-0

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Call to Order**

**Old Business / Ongoing Applications: None**

**New Business:**

**I. Hayes Variance, case no. 22-101, 16283 Kostner Dr, Rogers; 15-15369-000**

Representative: Kelly D. Hayes & Billie Hayes, 1530 PB Ln #H3517, Wichita Falls TX

Staff gave presentation.

Mr. Hayes comments he is wanting to build his home, they currently live in an RV out in Texas. States that the neighbors drive is right in front of their property which still allows for his neighbor to pass by, the reason for the variance is to be able to build without being in the drastic area of slope that is a ravine. States the builder already has a building permit, they didn't realize they were in the setback until the house was going to get started.

Mr. Torrez asks if Kostner Dr is a county road or a private road?

Mr. Hayes explains that the county road does not go down on the westside of the property, the maps show it ending right at their property.

Mr. Torrez asks if there are any plans for Mr. Kostner to create new tracts on his property.

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:07

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
PULASKI COUNTY, AR

Mr. Hayes states that the person who sold these lots were from someone else and not Mr. Kostner, he doesn't know if Mr. Kostner has any plans to divide his property in the future.

Mrs. Hayes states that Mr. Kostner just uses their lot to drive by to get onto his driveway and back to get onto Kostner Dr.

Mr. Torrez asks Mr. Reamer if Kostner Dr is a county road or a private road.

Mr. Reamer states that based off the information he has, this is technically a public road, granted there is not enough evidence to support why.

Mrs. Hayes states that this portion of the road has never got maintained by the county, but the actual road and on does. We are not asking to block anyone to be able to pass, we just want to build our house with out it being in the ravine.

Mr. Reamer clarifies to the board that the survey pulled up as it being a road that was platted and that is why they are coming to the board for a variance.

Mr. Bracy asks for clarity on to where this road in front of the property leads.

Mr. Reamer states it operates as a driveway for the property east of the proposal.

Mr. Hayes comments that Mr. Kostner has concreted the driveway to the edge of their lot.

Dr. Rosenbaum states that as far as the variance goes, they have met the hardship due to the topography

Mr. Bracy asks where the driveway is going to be placed.

Mr. Hayes states the way they would go in, would be parallel to the house, that way they are not in anyone's way.

Dr. Neal asks if they are going to have a well.

Mr. Hayes states they are, it will be on the other side of the house.

**II. Jelinek Waiver, case no. 22-116, 10709 Bluewater Passage, Rogers; 15-16415-000**

Representative: Lisa Jelinek, 10709 Bluewater Passage, Rogers

Staff gave presentation.

Board has no questions

**III. Tisdale Site Plan Review-Major Amendment, case no. 21-422, 2713 S Old Wire Rd, Rogers; 18-03582-000**

Representative: Olan Asbury, 412 Zion Church St, Lowell

2022 MAR 22 AM 8: 07

BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Staff gave presentation.

Mr. Asbury states that he didn't know they had anything else to add.

Mrs. Kienzle states that they consulted about the site plan and there is a thorough analysis made and that is where we find outstanding items on projects, we will have a new submission for the public hearing and will let you know what is needed.

Mr. Asbury states this is Old Wire Storage, an existing self-storage facility, we are wanting to add three buildings, which will build out the site. We are wanting to add, two heating and cooling buildings and a 25-foot building along the south property line. Our request is to obtain a variance for the 25-foot building from the 40-foot setback, for a few reasons, one being more rental space, two would be that this building would be the only one with a slanted roof to be able to put solar panels on it to convert this facility into a greener facility, another reason is to block the view of the open view. There is a double wide on the property that is currently used for the on-site manager but that will be removed, there is a well and a septic there as well and those will be removed too. This property will be operated as a sister property to Russell Storage, which is a mile down on New Hope Rd and will be managed out of there as well, that is why we don't need the mobile home or septic and well. For screening they will have 6-foot wooden privacy fence between the neighbor to the south and to the north. We are going to get rid of the northern driveway and just going to keep one entrance and exit.

Mr. Bracy asks if there will be a gate since this facility is going to be unattended?

Mr. Asbury states there will be, there will be an electronic gate that will be tied to Russell Storage and we have made provisions for turn arounds, the gate is probably over 100-feet off of Old Wire Rd.

**Other Business: None**

**Staff Updates - Administrative Approvals:**

- I. Downing Minor Subdivision, case no. 21-431, 15286 E. Hwy 264, Lowell; 18-02637-000
- II. Williamson Property Line Adjustment, case no. 21-455, 8269 Magnolia Ln, Rogers; 15-00448-000
- III. Andrade Minor Subdivision, case no. 22-078, 23622 Van Fleet Rd, Siloam Springs; 15-06961-000
- IV. Jasan Minor Subdivision, case no. 22-085, 16402 Sugar Creek Rd, Garfield; 18-04481-000
- V. Detweiler Property Line Adjustment, case no. 22-092, 18264 Luedecke Rd, Gentry; 18-14746-000
- VI. Bowling Minor Subdivision, case no. 22-103, 20945 AR 16 Hwy, Siloam Springs; 18-12890-000

**Discussion Item: None**

FILED

2022 MAR 22 AM 8:07


BETSY HARRELL  
CO & PROBATE CLERK  
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Meeting Adjourned: 9:38 p.m.

Next Meeting: April 6, 2022

APPROVED THIS 16 DAY OF MARCH, 2022.

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PLANNING DIRECTOR

APPROVED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PLANNING BOARD CHAIR or  
VICE CHAIR

\*Digital voice recording may be made available upon written request to the Planning Department. \*