



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

November 18th, 2015

6:00 PM

Benton County Administration Building
215 East Central Avenue, Bentonville AR

**Planning
Board
Approval:**

C. Hays
12-2-2015

Meeting Minutes

PUBLIC HEARING:

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

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

Staff present: John Sudduth – Administrator of General Services, Building Inspector – J.C. Brenaman, Kevin Gambrell – Planning Director, Planning Manager – Taylor Reamer, and County Planner—Caitlynn Hays were present.

Public Present: There was one member of the public present.

Disposition of Minutes: 11-4-2015.

Mr. Williams moved to approve the November 4th, 2015 Planning Board Meeting Minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Tucker. The motion carried 6-0.

General Public Comment: None

Old Business: None

- I. **New Business: ARCO Environments Site Plan Review, #15-171, 11230 & 11232 John Zodrow Rd., Gentry**
Represented by Ron Homeyer, Civil Engineering, 701 S Mt. Olive, Siloam Springs

Mr. Homeyer recused himself as a member of the Planning Board.

Mr. Curtis asked Staff for the report of ARCO Environments SPR, #15-171. Staff gave a presentation on ARCO Environments SPR, #15-171, outlining the information in the Public Hearing Report.

Applicant Comment: None

Board Comment:

Mr. Curtis asked if the tree's existing on the property were adequate per Mr. Homeyer. Mr. Homeyer stated the tree's had been there a long time and were adequate screening to the adjacent neighbor.

Mrs. Leyva asked to see photos provided by staff of the existing vegetation.

Staff provided photos.

Mrs. Leyva asked about a small gap in the existing vegetation (along the roadway).

Mr. Homeyer stated it could be filled in.

Mr. Homeyer asked if they would still need a Notice of Automatic Coverage letter from ADEQ even though the proposed building is less than one acre impact.

Staff stated they would still like the documentation.

Mr. Tucker asked if the business predated the surround residential land uses.

Mr. Homeyer stated the business did predate the surround residential uses.

Public Comment: None

Mr. Williams moved to approve the ARCO Environments SPR #15-171 as stated by staff.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Leyva.

The motion carried 6-0.

ARCO Environments SPR was approved.

Public Hearing adjourned at 6:14 pm.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Call to Order: 6:14 pm

Old Business: None

New Business: None

Other Business: None

STAFF UPDATES:

- I. Administrative Approvals
 - A. Druskat Minor Subdivision, 15-175
 - B. Bell Minor Subdivision, 15-178
 - C. Spears Minor Subdivision, 15-180
 - D. Hendren Minor Subdivision, 15-181

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- I. County Court Facilities, continued (11-4-15)

Mr. Curtis asked if anyone from the Board had comments of the proposed County Courts Facility plan.

Mrs. Leyva asked if there was an update on the security of the buildings discussion.

Mr. Sudduth stated there was updated information he could provide about the architecture and engineered proposals. He also stated that they were looking for a group that specializes in court facility construction, security, parking, etc. Mr. Sudduth stated the Board would be notified of the information as soon as it was available.

Mrs. Leyva stated that security was a concern due to the proposed locations of the courts facility. Mr. Tucker stated that there are different security issues to discuss. Some issues include prisoners going to the building, security during court proceedings, and the judges/jurors entering the facility. Mr. Tucker stated all of those issues could be protected in an urban setting. He stated that a more rural setting does not necessarily have more of an advantage over an urban setting. Mr. Tucker stated he liked the downtown proposal and comments due to the traditional nature of a court facility location. He stated locating the facility outside of the downtown could somewhat seclude it from the downtown activity. Mr. Tucker stated it could also have more of a traffic advantage with a downtown location.

Mrs. Leyva stated she preferred the third option for the courts facility proposal due to the larger square footage size and the lesser cost.

Mr. Curtis mentioned the public safety committee meeting from April. He listed the goals outlined from that meeting.

Mr. Curtis asked if the County Courts Facility would like to remain as a discussion item for the Planning Board.

Mrs. Leyva asked when the proposal bids were due.

Mr. Sudduth stated the request for qualifications were due November 20th.

Mrs. Leyva asked if the specific information they would be looking for would not be available then until next year.

Mr. Sudduth stated that was correct.

Mrs. Leyva stated due to frequent changes it may be best to postpone discussion until the detailed information is available.

Mr. Tucker asked who actually owned the project.

Mr. Curtis stated the County owned the project.

Mr. Tucker asked who the individual owner was.

Mr. Sudduth stated it would be the County Judge, but different decisions are passed down to committees and other entities.

Mr. Tucker asked if the Planning Board would hear this project.

Mr. Sudduth said he could not answer that at this time but at least the final presentation would come before the Planning Board for input.

Mr. Curtis stated that the Planning Board has jurisdiction over County buildings.

Mr. Tucker stated due to Planning Board having jurisdiction he would rather not continue discussion until there is an actual proposal to hear.

Mr. Sudduth stated that based on discussion the Board would like to be considered in receiving information once the final report is done.

Mr. Tucker stated that since the Board has jurisdiction over the approval, he did not want to be prejudice over the outcome.

Mr. Curtis stated the final project approval was through the judge and that the Board only reviews the plans and hears the proposal.

Mr. Sudduth stated that would have to be reviewed by legal authority.

Mr. Curtis stated he felt it was the type of project that the Board has a say in, but the Board cannot deny the project.

Sue Keith Eleverston, 11297 Blue Jay Rd., Pea Ridge

Ms. Eleverston stated that the Board had the same concerns and questions that the JP's had and suggested attending the presentations given by the firm.

Mr. Curtis stated the discussion could continue after the first of the year when there was more information to be discussed.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:49 pm.