

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2:35



Benton County Planning Board
Public Hearing
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

BETSY HARRELL
CO & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

May 15, 2019

6:00 p.m.

Quorum Court Room
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, Ron Homeyer.

Roll Call: Bob Bracy, Sean Collyge, Ron Homeyer, Terry Maienschein, Stephen Torrez, Ashley Tucker and Rick Williams were present.

Staff present: Taylor Reamer – Director of Planning and Tracy Backs – County Planner were present.

Public Present: 23 people signed the Sign In sheet

Disposition of Minutes: May 1, 2019

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the May 1, 2019, Planning Board Meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Maienschein

Motion approved: 7 – 0

General Public Comment: None

Old Business:

- I. ~~CMI Acquisitions/Capps Telecommunications Tower Roadway Setback Variance, #19-064, 22078 UTL Highway 62, Garfield; 18-00305-000~~
- II. CMI Acquisitions/Capps Telecommunications Tower *Structure* Setback Variance, #19-064, 22078 UTL Highway 62, Garfield; 18-00305-000
- III. CMI Acquisitions/Capps Telecommunications Tower, #19-064, 22078 UTL Highway 62, Garfield; 18-00305-000

1100 0102

1

2019 2035

Representative: David McGehee, 121 Village Boulevard, Madison, MS;
representing CMI Acquisitions for Verizon

Staff gave a presentation on the CMI Acquisitions/Capps
Telecommunications Tower and the two variances, #19-064, 22078 UTL
Highway 62, Garfield; 18-00305-000

Mr. Homeyer: If you would, would you elaborate on why you still are
asking for a variance?

Mr. McGehee: Yes, sir. And if I could add one more thing to what Mr.
Reamer said, based on our revisions, we will not be requiring any tower
lighting at the top. Originally proposed at 250', we would; but, at 195', we
will not. So, the profile drawings have the light taken off.

I went back to Verizon after the first meeting and said that we needed to
address these things to see what we can do. We discussed before, due to the
geography, it is difficult to move the location that would meet all the
setbacks. So, they agreed to lower the height to 195'. We did move it a few
feet and were able to not ask for two variances; but we could not move it in
such a way that we could withdraw all those variance requests,
unfortunately. So, we tried to do that; but we couldn't quite do that. As I
said, this won't be lit at this point. It does meet the setback to the road. The
alternate locations that we originally looked at, were not able to meet the
setbacks either. I reviewed those a little more in depth after our discussion.
Hope that explains it.

Mr. Torrez: What makes the 195' on the height the magic number when you
still have to come in for a variance versus 175' where you wouldn't need any
variances?

Mr. McGehee: I see. Well, the RF engineer that designed this site, said that
195' would be the lowest that we could achieve the coverage objective to fill
the coverage gap. That's getting to the limit. Twenty feet lower and he said
that it wouldn't work. In addition, there is the issue of if a future tenant
(ATT or another carrier) were to come along, at that lower height, Verizon
would be mounted at 195', another carrier would lose 12' - 15' at 185'.

Mr. Torrez: To verify, when you say "it wouldn't work," is the coverage not
as good or it doesn't go as far with the radius? Could you still get a signal?

2018 0308

2019 2036

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2: 35

Mr. McGehee: You would still get a signal; but they are trying to close a coverage gap between the existing sites that are outside of the two-mile radius. At 175', you would get an increase near the tower, but it wouldn't reach as far and the quality of "in car or in building" wouldn't reach as far.

DEPT. HARRELL
CO. & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mr. Homeyer: So, you are saying at a lower height, it would take more towers?

Mr. McGehee: Yes, sir.

Mr. Torrez: So, more cost.

Mr. Bracy: Are you saying this tower will increase coverage in this area or provide new coverage?

Mr. McGehee: I would say both. There are places where there is very minimal coverage. It will increase the quality of the coverage and also the reliability of the coverage. Right now, there are places that, if it is there, it's a fringe coverage where you might get a signal outside but in a car, in a structure, during busy peak times (i.e. 5 p.m. in the afternoon or the early morning commute) when a lot of users would be using it. The RF engineer has provided the coverage gap map. They are called propagation maps that show the coverage before and after the site.

Mr. Bracy: You are saying that there is minimum coverage in this area. With this tower, there is a number of people who would use it (i.e. ATT, Verizon, etc.). Does this mean that all of the phone service providers have poor reception in this area?

Mr. McGehee: This application request is just for Verizon. This tower would initially be for Verizon. In a 911 call, I think any phone will work on it. Verizon will gladly lease space to any other carrier who would have a coverage gap in this area. There isn't a tower within a two-mile radius of this site. The nearest tower site of any type is on the west side of Gateway. And then there is one across the county line on 62, east of the county line. It is very likely that other carriers would have a gap here as well; but I don't have any specific knowledge of that other than the fact that there are no towers nearby.

FILED 0108

2019 2037

Mr. Bracy: Taylor (*Reamer*), do we have any idea if there is any other coverage in this area? To me, that's important. Is there no coverage or just this particular carrier?

Mr. Reamer: The only thing we could do is to research consumer-level research maps. It would mean contacting those carriers and getting a radio frequency (RF) analysis to see where their coverage exists or does not exist.

Mr. Tucker: It appears that Verizon owns this tower.

Mr. McGehee: They will build it and own it. Yes, sir.

Mr. Tucker: Is there any covenant to not allow ATT, Sprint, Cricket, whoever....

Mr. McGehee: Oh, no, not at all. We submitted a letter from Verizon stating that they would gladly lease space to any wireless carrier that would like to go on it.

Mr. Tucker: Is this tower in any way connected to the rural broad band grants given by the government?

Mr. McGehee: I don't believe so. No, sir. All of this material is coming straight from Verizon.

Mr. Tucker: So, it's just something that they want to do.

Mr. McGehee: Right.

Mr. Bracy: This tower, or any tower, not in this area, limits the 911 coverage? Without this tower, is 911 limited?

Mr. McGehee: Does the tower limit it? For Verizon, yes, it would limit it because coverage is really spotty in through there. So, yes, sir, it would be compromised.

Mr. Bracy: For Verizon. But you don't know if it would eliminate it across the board?

Mr. McGehee: The tower would improve all carriers' 911 because all 911 calls would go through this. It's not carrier specific.

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2: 35

Public Comment:

Cameron McNabb, 22065 US 62 Highway, Garfield

Focus of comments: discussed his handout from the May 1, 2019, meeting.

An alternative location is available elsewhere on the parcel. Unsightly tower.

BETSY HARRELL
CO & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mike Shah, board member of Save the Ozarks, 88 CR 326, Eureka Springs

Focus of comments: tourism in Arkansas; towers compromise visitor expectations; electromagnetic effects of towers to humans; harmful to flying species (birds, bees, insects etc.)

Tom Waggoner, Managing Director, Syntex Natural Resource Group and Director, Community Solar Partners, live near Rocky Branch off of Highway 12, Rogers

Focus of comments: extended conservation corridor and green parkway; develop a native plant nursery and an education center, mountain biking/hiking depot

Martin Greer, Martin Greer Candies, 22151 Highway 62 East, Garfield

Focus of comments: cell tower is not needed; concerns regarding radiation; tower will affect his business; beauty of area

Dave Lasure, 11765 Devil's Den Road, Winslow, AR, President of Northwest Arkansas Chapter of the Master Naturalists

Focus of comments: wish to maintain a conservation corridor and the integrity of a natural environment

Harold King, 22038 Highway 62, Garfield

Focus of comments: unsightly tower; radiation waves from tower

Susan Pang, 21320 Highland Lake, Garfield

Focus of comments: Feels CMI is stealing her land (owns adjacent property to the east of proposed tower site); donation of 52 acres to the Nature Conservancy; development of a yoga/meditation center and general eco-tourism site.

Kei Pang, 21320 Highland Lake, Garfield

Focus of comments: unsightly tower; cell towers will become obsolete; offered handout (see folder for the Planning Board meeting of this date)

Faith Shah, 88 CR 326, Eureka Springs

Focus of comments: lobbyist for nature; tourism of Natural state

Jeannette Greer, 22151 Highway 62 East, Gateway
Focus of comments: tourism; beauty of nature in Arkansas; radiation from cell towers

Public Comment Closed

Mr. Homeyer: Do you have any comments you want to make in rebuttal of some of the comments?

Mr. McGehee: Sure. We will make a couple of general comments. I am here representing Verizon. It is their tower. So, issues of land grab and that sort of thing came up. We are just the representative here.

As far as the Mark Twain nature type of statements made, I can certainly appreciate that. I live near the Natchez Trace which is kind of a land mark for us. We are not here to put something in that hurts the community. That drive through there on 62 is pretty heavily tree lined. At 200' driving through there, it's not as big as a 300' tower that you see a lot of in rural areas. From where this site is to the boundary of the Mark Twain National Park there is a pretty good bit of treed area. I think by virtue of the distance; it would be very minimally visual there. I am not sure where the trails are in relation.

I think our real estate agent talked to Mr. McNabb first. We did submit him as a possible candidate. It was one of the three that we submitted. It was looked at. I know that when I looked at it before, it was closer to the residences than this was. It did not anywhere near meet the setbacks.

I guess the other big issue is the cancer allegations. The FCC has ruled that there are no harmful effects from these towers within a large margin of error. They say it's not just a fine line but within a very large margin of error. These antennas are on top of hospitals and all around us. We are not here for some sort of money grab. This is strictly trying to put a site in to bridge the network so that it will be reliable. It's set back off the road 250'. Quite a few of those trees will remain. You might see it from the road a little bit; but there's no perfect site.

Mr. McNabb said that in the north side of Mr. Capps's property there would be a spot. But it the only spot he would let us have was way off with a lot of issues with it. I think that would be even closer to the national forest. This would probably be less visible.

There is no proven evidence that these cause cancer or have any harm. There are a lot of allegations out there, scare tactics, that sort of thing. We appreciate the people who love their community. I think at this height; it will not be as nearly invasive as these people are alleging. Like I said, we are just trying to complete the network. The wireless demand

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2:35

DESY HARRELL
CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

drives this. We are not just trying to put a tower every now and then like that. This is driven by customer demand and network issues. The engineers designed it to fill this gap. One day there may be technologies that might not require a tower. But at this time much projected. These towers are leased and will come down at a time that they are not used anymore. So, they are not permanent structures. They are pretty long term at this point.

Mr. Tucker: We have this little diagram (you've probably seen it), indicating an area 675' as the crow flies northwest and down the hill. It would be completely enclosed within the setback. Is there any reason that you couldn't use that area? Access issue? RFI coverage?

Mr. McGehee: Well, there are several reasons. One is coverage and one is that we have to work with the landowner for what they will let us use. One of the coverage objectives is Highway 62, so they chose this location.

Mr. Tucker: So, the audience understands the background on our ordinance....

After meeting with lawyers for quite a while, we pared our ordinance down to the things that we can regulate. We can regulate dimensional setback, noise and light. That's pretty much it. The Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, prohibits us, by law, from denying physical access to land. So, we cannot deny access to land by law. There was also a recent law that earmarked a billion dollars to extend broadband coverage to the rural areas of Arkansas. So, my suggestion is that if you don't want more of this, please contact our congressmen and our Federal government and tell them to quit telling us where we have to put cell towers. Because we are prohibited by law from denying access to land, except by setback, light and noise.

Mr. Torrez: One of the questions was regarding Verizon and yourself being located in Mississippi. May I ask why Verizon didn't reach out to a local engineer to assist with this project?

Mr. McGehee: Verizon's regional office that we work with is out of Little Rock. It's a very specialized science so they tend to have approved vendors that they work with. Often, they will work within several states. I think they are licensed in Arkansas. This area is called South Central (Arkansas, east Oklahoma, north Mississippi, west Tennessee).

Mr. Williams motioned to deny the setback variance. Mr. Torrez seconded the motion.

2019 JUN 10

2019 2041

Mr. Homeyer: I know that we are supposed to give a reason for the denial. I just feel like precedent has been set that we do not grant variances on cell towers.

Mr. Maienschein: Same reason.

Mr. Tucker: I will add that there is nothing geographically significant about this piece of property that it couldn't be moved, other than where the parcel is leased.

Mr. Bracy: My reason for denial is that we have set a precedence as our Chair has mentioned.

Mr. Williams: For same reason stated.

Motion (to deny) the variance approved: 7 - 0

Mr. Homeyer: The variance request has been denied; therefore, the next item cannot be heard.

Mr. Reamer: It may behoove the Planning Board to entertain with the applicant to have another redesign conversation with his client and come back to the Board for the actual tower, not requesting any variances. You may want to have that conversation.

Mr. Homeyer: Did you (*Mr. McGehee*) understand what he (*Taylor Reamer*) was saying? Would you like for us to table the tower itself and see if you could come back with a proposal that does not require any variance? If not, then it will be denied and you will have to resubmit and start over.

Mr. McGehee: Right. We'll do that.

Mr. Homeyer: So, you would like for it to be tabled? How long do you need? Three weeks or five weeks?

Mr. McGehee: Let's say five.

Mr. Homeyer: The second meeting in June, June 19, 2019.

Mr. Reamer: So, the tabling request would be for the project to be tabled or continued to the June 19th, 2019, meeting.

Mr. McGehee: I think we'll change that. I think we'll request that if it's not too late.

1105 0105

2019 2042

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2:35

Mr. Homeyer: So, you want us to vote yes or no right now?

Mr. McGehee: Right. No, we won't table it.

**BETSY HARRELL
CO. & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR**

Mr. Homeyer: Okay.

Mr. Williams motioned to deny the CMI Telecommunications Tower Site Plan Review. Mr. Maienschein seconded the motion.

Motion (to deny) the Site Plan Review approved: 6 - 1 (Mr. Tucker)

Mr. Homeyer: Both the variance and tower itself have been denied.

New Business:

- I. **WEN Investments Group, LLC Site Plan Review – Major Amendment, #19-080, 14637 East Highway 62, Garfield; 18-04272-000**

Representatives: Derek Hileman, CEI Engineering, 3108 SW Regency Boulevard, Bentonville and Will Neighbors, 11917 Hyden Road, Garfield

Staff gave a presentation on the WEN Investments Group, LLC Site Plan Review – Major Amendment, #19-080, 14637 East Highway 62, Garfield; 18-04272-000

Mr. Homeyer: Do you have anything else you want to add?

Mr. Hileman: No.

Mr. Reamer: Currently the lot runs down the center of the drive. They are now proposing to bump it out. Still in compliance with building setbacks.

Public Comments: None.

Mr. Torrez motioned to approve. Mr. Tucker seconded the motion.

Motion approved: 7 - 0

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

1. **Call to Order:**
2. **Old Business / Ongoing Applications: None**

7:00 2:00

2019 2043

3. New Business:

I. Rocky Springs RV Park Site Plan Review, #19-070, 17094 Martin Pedro Road, Siloam Springs; 18-10517-000

Representatives: Aaron Boehmler, 705 SW Sterling Place, Bentonville

Staff gave a presentation on the Rocky Springs RV Park Site Plan Review, #19-070, 17094 Martin Pedro Road, Siloam Springs; 18-10517-000

Mr. Homeyer: Do you have anything else you want to add to that?

Mr. Boehmler: Since the submittal, we won't be using spring water after discussions with the AR Department of Health. We needed a 300' buffer from that spring. We did not have adequate distance to do that so we will be drilling a well. That's under design right now. We have been in discussion with the Health Department regarding those depths and the design.

Mr. Tucker: Could you talk about how long RV's will be allowed to stay? We have a similar facility on Highway 112. Most of the RV's are permanent residents. They have similar flood plain issues and from time to time they have to pull a few out of the river.

Mr. Boehmler: These RV's will not be allowed to go over 120 days. According to FEMA, we would need different requirements and have to do things on site that the client is not ready to do. Upon arrival, the tenants (people who are staying) will be told that they can't stay more than 120 days.

Mr. Tucker: Does that mean that they can stay in stall 41 for 120 days and then move to stall 42?

Mr. Boehmler: That's right. The only thing that we should say here is that no permanent structures can be built adjacent to the RV considering that we are in the flood plain. Even though FEMA does say RV parks are great within the flood plain; however, don't build any permanent structures. Yes, they will be there for that 120 days but it won't be a typical trailer park feel, if that's what you're thinking about.

Mr. Tucker: In terms of beautiful places, this may be significantly more beautiful than the area where the cell tower was.

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2:35

Mr. Boehmler: Agreed.

Mr. Tucker: We just want to be careful with building a facility with the potential for destroying that.

BETSY HARRELL
CO & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mr. Boehmler: For sure. The clients are really excited. They are adjacent to the St. Francis and the national forest there. They are a mile and a half way from the Wedington Trail, top of the two peaks by the Illinois River, overlooking that. The tenants there that are coming for the weekends will have direct access to the forest. Their neighbors do a lot of horseback riding on their property. These applicants are excited about their project. They need people to come in with their trailers and horseback riding and need places to stay. They are usually in motor homes and are so excited to partner with their neighbors to allow that. They can then basically get to the forest from this access point.

Mr. Tucker: So, they wouldn't allow the equine trailers on site. They would be stored someplace else?

Mr. Boehmler: That's right. On the neighbor's property. They have the barns and the set ups there. They would be able to park right adjacent to them and then walk over.

Mr. Reamer: When I was discussing this project with Aaron (*Boehmler*) and the submittal requirements, etc., we did bring up the FEMA floodplain aspect. Based on some of the analysis that he has done for this project as well as some of the data that I have available from the State, the flood plain isn't necessarily 100 percent accurate on this property. Is there a risk? There sure is. There's a risk anywhere for flooding. In addition to the general application for this Site Plan Review, I also had Aaron (*Boehmler*) develop an emergency preparedness plan for it there were to be a flash flood situation or a scheduled weather event to produce an event that would affect this property, there are protocols in place. Is there a standard to go by? There is not at the County level. He has designed a program to at least have an early warning system as well as an evacuation plan.

Mr. Boehmler: What's in your packet is just preliminary. I still need to talk to Taylor (*Reamer*) about a few additional items that we should put in there. It's got maps, phone numbers to call, radio frequencies and basically what to do if that storm happens.

Mr. Williams: Does that include an alerting system?

Mr. Boehmler: It does not.

Mr. Reamer: Audible, you mean?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Mr. Bracy: When you talk about flash flood warnings here in Northwest Arkansas or Arkansas as a rule, in a plan like this there are no Federal guidelines I understand yet? If the weather department issues a flood warning, would that mean you would have to evacuate this area to another area?

Mr. Boehmler: There is an evacuation map on this proposed plan. However, what we are proposing in this plan, because the water shed and the time limit of when the water comes through is roughly 70 minutes, once that water has passed, everything is down below the low water. But the thing we need to keep in mind is that all the RV spaces by my calculated BFE, if we were to change this flood plain, is 7' higher than where I would put the BFE. So, I am very confident that no water will be where the RV spaces will be but also because our plan is saying do not leave if it's raining or flash floods. Stay here for an hour and ten minutes and then all the water will be downstream. That would be our plan. That's informed when they check in. The sheet will be posed as a PDF on the website and also right there where they are checking in. I think our game plan is good in showing everybody who is staying there enough information that they know the plan.

II. Stuckey Boat Sales Site Plan Review, #19-096, 14491 East AR Highway 12, Rogers; 18-03229-014

Representatives: Jason Ingalls, Expedient Civil Engineering, 11 Newnham Lane, Bella Vista and Ken Stuckey (property owner)

Staff gave a presentation on the Stuckey Boat Sales Site Plan Review, #19-096, 14491 East AR Highway 12, Rogers; 18-03229-014

Mr. Homeyer: Do you have anything you want to add to that?

2019 2046

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2: 35

BETSY HARRELL
CO & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mr. Ingalls: Originally, we had shown to remove concrete within the building setback that exists now. Our plans currently show removing that. We wanted to see how you felt about leaving that bit of concrete removing it since it exists. That would require a variance. We would have to fill the application out and pay the application fee but I think we have time to do that.

Mr. Tucker: What Variance?

Mr. Ingalls: The site plan doesn't show it because it's shown on my demolition and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. There is a portion of concrete that's roughly 10' to 15' width. They are within the building setback.

Mr. Reamer: We have a green space preservation for building setbacks but it is existing. That's the only difference or caveat for this particular proposal.

Mr. Ingalls: If you guys are supportive, we would just move those spaces forward and try to utilize.... As you know in boat sales, we would like to get that as close to the public as they are passing by.

Mr. Torrez: My recommendation would be to fill out the variance, see what we say, and then go from there.

Mr. Homeyer: If it's existing, it's grandfathered. Is there even a requirement for a variance?

Mr. Reamer: It would be up to the Board to determine if the green space preservation was a part of this proposal or if the existing concrete can stay. I don't think a variance or a waiver would be required. One thing I would like to add is, I don't know if parking is allowed in the front setback no matter what, if it's existing or not. I don't know if parking can even take place.

Mr. Homeyer: Yes, parking is allowed in a building setback.

Mr. Reamer: I will have to check on that. But maybe the conversation is more just a preservation of the concrete versus the removal.

Mr. Tucker: If you remove an equal amount of concrete in the back so that your runoff coefficient stays the same.

2019 JUN 10

Mr. Ingalls: We are removing quite a bit of it. The darker shaded concrete hatching is everything being removed on this exhibit. That's why we are having a decrease in run off because we are replacing the concrete with a different surface.

Mr. Torrez: Do you have a landscaping plan because I am curious to know what you had planning to put there if you had removed it?

Mr. Ingalls: I don't. It would just be grass.

Mr. Homeyer: Would you consider reducing the gravel area towards the back to offset the area that you retained in the front?

Mr. Ingalls: I would because where all the action is going to be so to speak is going to be in the front. This is a consignment lot. Most people don't want their boats sitting in the very back. How much I can give up I am sure can be worked out.

Mr. Homeyer: Discuss that and make that part of your proposal.

Mr. Bracy: Between this property and the mobile home park is a ravine with a wooded area?

Mr. Reamer: The property is outlined in yellow. There is a significant ravine that is heavily wooded between the existing commercial property and the adjacent mobile home park.

Mr. Bracy: Would the wooded area remain?

Mr. Reamer: Based on the site plans, there is no removal of vegetation. The entire development is going to be contained essentially on what is concrete now. There is no expansion if you will.

Mr. Bracy: What is to the lower right? Is that a building?

Mr. Reamer: That was a preexisting building. That is now just a building slab.

Mr. Homeyer: The yellow line is not truly accurate.

FILED

Mr. Tucker: Is a trailer park medium density ~~2019 JUN 19~~ ~~PM 2:35~~
Mr. Reamer: Per regulations, a manufactured home park is medium density.

Mr. Maienschein: This is a consignment lot?

BETSY HARRELL
CO & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

Mr. Stuckey: I will have the boats that I personally own out there; but the bulk of the boats will be owned by people who don't want to try to sell a boat from home when people are coming over to their house that they don't know. They will have a place that is very convenient to take it down to the lake for a lake trial or whatever the case. The bulk of it will be consignment.

Mr. Maienschein: So, people will be coming by to look at these boats that are in that lot. Where are they going to park? There is no parking requirement?

Mr. Reamer: By regulation, there is no parking requirement.

Mr. Ingalls: I will add that there is plenty of room to park.

Mr. Bracy: No fenced in area?

Mr. Ingalls: No.

Mr. Bracy: So, people have access to park anywhere between the boats, etc.

Mr. Ingalls: Yes sir, and in fact, if you look down at Arrowhead, there is no fencing there either except for their service area in the very back where boats are kept for service. No fencing planned.

Mr. Bracy: That will allow parking just like a car lot.

Mr. Ingalls: Yes.

III. Lakeside Storage Site Plan Review | Major Amendment, #19-097, 15509 Highway 12 East, Rogers; 18-03384-001

1. Lakeside Storage Site Plan Review | Parking Variance, #19-100, 15509 Highway 12 East, Rogers; 18-03384-001

Representatives: Corey Booth, Wilshar Steel, 325 45th Street, Rogers; (construction manager for the property owner)

2019 JUN 19

2019 2049

Staff gave a presentation on the Lakeside Storage Site Plan Review | Major Amendment, #19-097, 15509 Highway 12 East, Rogers; 18-03384-001
Mr. Homeyer: Do you have anything you want to add?

Mr. Booth: We won't be moving the existing fence. We will probably cut off the existing drive there that is not used. We will cut it straight across. It encroaches into the fire lane. That is the only difference I see.

Other representative (name unknown): Taylor (*Reamer*), I apologize but there was a drainage report prepared for this. I am not sure how it didn't get to you. I looked at the analysis before I can. On the analysis, it was about a 1.5 CFS increase with a 100-year storm. We were not proposing detention; but I am aware of that any increase has to be mitigated by some sort of BMP. Would the Board be receptive to the idea if I could prove that the receiving creek to the south could handle that slight increase? If we grade it all to that creek and it goes to that culvert?

Mr. Tucker: As much flooding problems that we are aware of downstream, that may be tough. Could you include in your drainage analysis the pre-development condition of the entire...

Other representative: Yes, the whole drainage basin comes to that culvert there at Highway 12.

Mr. Tucker: That's going to be tough. I've seen water over the top of the culvert.

Other representative: Okay. Then, we might put a little pond there; but I will have that to you.

Mr. Tucker: Bear Creek is pretty sensitive to that.

4. Other Business: None

5. Staff Updates - Administrative Approvals:

- IV. Spivey Minor Subdivision, #19-067, Rivercliff Road, Rogers; 15-18723-000
- V. Miller Tract Split, #19-084, 17975 Peach Blossom Lane, Gentry;
18-10773-013
- VI. Tumey Minor Subdivision, #19-079, 10313 Clancys Road, Rogers;
18-05192-002

2019 2050

7:00 PM

FILED

2019 JUN 10 PM 2: 36

BETSY HARRELL
CO & PROBATE CLERK
BENTON COUNTY, AR

6. Discussion Items: None

Meeting Adjourned: 8:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: June 5, 2019

APPROVED THIS 5th DAY OF June, 2019.

ATTEST:



PLANNING DIRECTOR or
SENIOR COUNTY PLANNER

APPROVED:



PLANNING BOARD CHAIR or
PLANNING BOARD VICE CHAIR

2019 2051

1111 1111