JOPLIN | PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2023
4:00 P.M.

The Planning and Zoning Commission met in a regular session, Monday, February 13, 2023. Present were Commission members Drew Kimble, Janice Steele, Amia Warren, Mary Anne Phillips, Ryan Jackson and Benjamin Rosenberg. Troy Bolander, Rachel Holcomb, Tyler Bellairs and Vicky Copeland represented the Planning, Development and Neighborhood Services Department.

1. **Roll Call:** Vicky Copeland called the roll.

MS. STEELE MOVED TO EXCUSE MR. MCCULLOUGH FROM THE FEBRUARY 13, 2023, MEETING. MR. JACKSON SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED. (6 IN FAVOR, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT)

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

MR. JACKSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 9, 2023, MINUTES. MS. PHILLIPS ASKED TO ABSTAIN FROM THE VOTE DUE TO HER ABSENCE IN JANUARY. MS. STEELE SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED. (5 IN FAVOR, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT, 1 ABSTAIN)

Public Hearings

Mr. Kimble read the Public Hearing Procedures.

Case 008-23: Street Vacation

Street Vacation-A request to vacate approximately 550 feet of S Bird Avenue South of W Junge Blvd and North of W 15th St- David Pettit (Representative of Joplin Schools)

Mr. David Pettit, Director of Facilities for Joplin Schools stated they were asking for consideration for a street vacate on Bird Ave between 1300-1500 block. He stated they own the property on both sides of that and they are requesting the vacate in an effort to enhance the safety measures for staff, students, patrons and attendees for events that were there. This would be during times of events as well as practices that take place. He stated they were struggling with safety for students and people crossing the road. He stated they were asking for this to be vacated at this time.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 008-23.

Mr. Kimble stated he noticed the street was already gated off. He stated the one that they were asking to be vacated and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Pettit stated presently they only gate that area off during an actual event. He stated they do not close that street during practices or anything currently. Typically, on Friday night events or evening events that take place for football games and track meets.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 008-23.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of Case 008-23.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 008-23.

There were none.

MS. STEELE MOVED THAT CASE 008-23 BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MS. PHILLIPS SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED. (6 IN FAVOR, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT)

Case 001-23: Rezoning

> Rezoning-Property located approximately 200 feet East of the intersection of S. Maiden Ln. and W. 2nd St, South of W. 2nd St. and North of W. 4th St. to construct multi-family housing- A request to Rezone from District M-2 (Heavy Industrial) to District R-3 (Apartment House)- Gil Stevens (Representative of the Owner)

Gil Stevens, 23 Pheasant Run, Joplin, Missouri. He stated he believed the Board had been provided proposed maps showing all ownership of the land in the area as per the request on the application. He stated M-2 to R-3 is a highly improved zoning and a pretty good asset. He stated there would be 3-4 buildings that would be built on the location, three story apartments. He stated he represented the owner, and he is not the owner. He stated in anticipation of this being improved the land had now been surveyed. He stated he noticed the stakes yesterday when he was by the property.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 001-23.

Ms. Steele stated that in addition to this being rezoned the little cut out area, just a small little lot on 4th St., she asked if the owner had control over that. She stated the M-2 on 4th St. along the area where the Barbershop is located.

Mr. Stevens stated he believed they did own the section there. He stated he could not verify the location of stakes on 4th St. He stated that was the rendering, it was not a survey, but it was a Beacon rendering of the property. He stated it was very similar to what was on the screen.

Mr. Bolander stated just for clarification he did not believe that was part of the request. He stated he thought the map that was submitted showed a hair salon owned by another party.

Ms. Steele asked if the zoning would remain the same.

Mr. Bolander stated yes. It was a commercial use, so it is not in the appropriate zoning right now. He stated it was a grandfathered use.

Mr. Jackson stated in terms of the apartment development would this be a subsidized housing or low-income housing.

Mr. Stevens stated no, market rent.

Ms. Phillips asked what the plan for the stream that goes through there. Will it be daylighted, will it be put under a conduit. What were the plans.

Mr. Bolander stated they had not seen anything yet. He stated he could not give her an answer. He stated he did not know if it would be buried or piped. He stated he thought right now it would remain open and build around it.

Mr. Stevens stated if there were any requests that would be handled at time of permitting.

Mr. Bolander stated it was not required that it be piped. He stated it is quite expensive and he was sure they would go over it in the pre-development meeting.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 001-23.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of Case 001-23.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 001-23.

There were none.

MR. ROSENBERG MOVED THAT CASE 001-23 BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MR. JACKSON SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED. (6 IN FAVOR, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT)

Case 067-22: Rezoning

> Rezoning-2629 and 2827 S. Oliver St-A request to rezone from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R-4 (Mixed Density Neighborhood)-Schuber Mitchell Homes

Mr. Jacob Lett, Schuber Mitchell Homes, presented concepts to the Board.

Mr. Kimble stated that it had been brought to his attention that numerous people had driven by the location and the sign was down. He asked how many signs had been placed in the location initially.

Mr. Bellairs stated they had only put out the first sign for the first P & Z meeting. He stated we readvertised it and sent out additional letters to owners. But new signage had not been put up.

Mr. Jackson stated so you put the one sign up in December when this was originally scheduled, and it has since been tabled.

Mr. Bolander stated it had been tabled but letters were resent to the property owners for this meeting.

Mr. Jackson asked if a sign had been put up on both lots or just one.

Mr. Bolander stated he believed one sign had been placed on the larger piece. Because most of the property sets behind the homes on Oliver Ave.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone knew how long the sign had been down before it was picked up and rehung.

Mr. Jackson stated his concern was this was something the neighborhood was told about and expected back in December. He stated he did not know this was coming up again until he sent an email to Vicky because he had some neighbors ask him when it was going to be on the agenda. So, they had not seen a sign to advertise it as they have driven by the location. He stated this was really part of the process and it was only on one of the two lots. He stated if he had driven by and only seen one sign, he would have thought it was only the one lot not another one several parcels down.

Mr. Bolander stated that was part of the reason they advertise and send letters to property owners. He stated so even though the sign was down he noticed a lot of people in attendance this evening and that was the purpose of advertising these meetings.

Mr. Jackson stated yes but he had people tell him that if they had known this meeting was happening Monday at 4:00 p.m. they would have attended but at this short of a notice they could not get off work or make childcare arrangements.

Mr. Bolander stated that was why we have a second meeting scheduled in front of City Council. He stated that not everyone can get off at 4:00 p.m. and that was why the City Council meeting was scheduled for 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Jackson stated he thought there would have been more neighbors present at this meeting had they known about it. He stated that was the feedback he had received.

Mr. Bolander stated the Board had the option to table the matter. He stated we could readvertise, put out signs and send out additional letters. He stated it was the Board's call and all options were available. We had two community meetings as well.

Mr. Kimble stated his concern was in the last two years quite often signs would be removed or blown over and not taken care of and the neighborhood was not properly aware of what was going on. He stated there were a lot of people here but the fact that the signs keep having issues was something he felt the City, he stated it is incumbent on the City to inform people what is going on.

Mr. Bolander stated we try our best. We cannot drive by there every day to make sure the sign is still up, but we can do a better job.

Mr. Jackson stated he put the sign up on Saturday.

Mr. Bolander stated that was why we have other forms of advertising. We have three ways of communicating and we hope that if a neighbor knows about it, they will tell their neighbors. He stated that by State Statue the only requirement was to advertise it in the Joplin Globe. He stated we do this in addition to what was required by State. He stated the Board had all the options available to them.

Mr. Lett stated that, if necessary, they were agreeable to tabling the request.

Mr. Kimble requested Mr. Lett to proceed with the presentation and thanked him for his patience.

Mr. Lett stated that what they were presenting today was a rezone to R-4. He stated that after cooperating with City staff and Joplin's new City code they had been exploring some of the pieces they own throughout the City of Joplin and how best to utilize those. He stated in Joplin's new City code they have a more community style development that had not been done in this area yet. He stated as the Board can see on the concept before them, they have clusters of homes surrounding community areas that were meant as low maintenance options for people who do not want to maintain a large yard, they don't want a large exterior area, but they want a walkable space with a

community style environment. So, we have cooperated with the City of Joplin to come up with this concept. He stated this was not final, they just wanted to present their ideas for the rezoning to R-4. Mr. Lett stated there were two community meetings to hear the concerns of the community. After the first meeting they did reduce density. There were concerns about density, so they went from the 55 units to 40 units. He stated they had also heard some of the concerns and in some of the petitions density, noise and traffic were all concerns. He stated they have provided a traffic study done by Anderson Engineering. The engineer is present if anyone had questions. He stated they did not find any necessity for a stop sign on either intersection but that would be up to the City. Other than that, they do intend to plat this as individually platted neighborhoods so it would be individual lots to sell to homeowners. He stated that was what they were putting forward and opened the discussion for questions.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 067-22.

Mr. Jackson stated after reading the Staff Planning Report, he read it was the lot located at 2629 S. Oliver and the lot 2027 and instead it will get all that back wooded area. He stated it would be a mini subdivision in there, correct. Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Lett to identify the residency of what these homes would be how many bedrooms and how many bathrooms.

Mr. Lett referred that question to the Director of Construction.

Oscar Antillion, Schuber Mitchell Director of Construction stated this type of community required a maintenance free product. Typically, in a community like this what had been done was the property would be maintained by the PUD. He stated they were looking to establish a two-bedroom, two bathrooms, no garage type product. Again, the goal was to provide community space. Enough green space where the residents feel like they literally have a lot of their amenities within reach of any given site.

Mr. Jackson stated in terms of the PUD maintaining this it would be maintenance free for the homeowner. He asked where you have one of these designs ready and completed using the City of Joplin as an example.

Mr. Antillion stated they do not have any in the City of Joplin. He stated they are in Arkansas.

Mr. Jackson asked where in Arkansas, he stated he worked in Rogers.

Mr. Antillion stated Centerton.

Mr. Jackson stated you mentioned these would be no car garages, two-bedroom, two bath. He asked what your observation would be to describe the existing homes in the neighborhood right now.

Mr. Antillion stated they were seeing two demographics that were highly interested in this product.

Mr. Jackson stated his question was compared to what was already existing in the neighborhood, how would you describe those homes compared to what you just described to me. He asked what would you say was across the street or next door from this proposed project.

Mr. Antillion stated a normal residence typically a three-bedroom and two bath.

Mr. Jackson stated so one of these things was not like the other, correct. You are putting these next to family homes with two car garages.

Mr. Antillion stated yes.

Mr. Lett stated with a landscaped buffer around the entire community to provide some buffer. He stated they understood it was not the same style of development. He stated they are still providing single family residences just without the garage and slightly different slightly more modern built style. We are butting R-4 on the other side. He stated there were apartment complexes very close that mirror the same style. But these would be single family instead of multiple.

Mr. Jackson stated how do you anticipate this would affect the comps of the existing homes that were in the neighborhood already.

Mr. Antillion stated it won't comp.

Mr. Jackson stated they will. It will factor in.

Mr. Antillion stated typically these would sell for more per square foot.

Mr. Jackson stated he knew he was asking for the existing homeowners and how this would affect their comps once you start putting these in the neighborhood.

Mr. Antillion stated it should increase value that was what they typically see. Every time we develop next to homes prices go up because we are improving.

Mr. Jackson stated are you familiar with the way comps work.

Mr. Antillion stated yes.

Mr. Jackson stated so they were saying this is what was in the neighborhood now.

Mr. Antillion stated yes.

Mr. Jackson stated so this will bring the average down. It would say you have this two-bedroom two bath no car garage homes next to a four-bedroom three bath home with a two-car garage. He stated if you average that out where do you think that will go for the larger home.

Mr. Antillion stated larger homes are comp'd against larger homes.

Mr. Jackson stated they were going to look at everything in the neighborhood.

Mr. Antillion stated okay. These were going to be brand new homes they would probably be $180-$210.00 per square foot. He stated he did not see the issue.

Mr. Jackson stated Schuber Mitchell had built other homes in this neighborhood similar to what was existing so why not continue with those types of development for families.

Mr. Antillion stated it has a lot to do with this type of parcel. This particular parcel does not lend itself to that type of development.

Mr. Jackson asked why.

Mr. Antillion stated just the shape.

Mr. Lett stated typically to get a R-1 lot you only have those two egresses to put a full road through to be able to do regular single-family homes. It doesn't pencil. He stated and plus with this environment kinda this area talking with City staff a community of this type seemed to fit this area well. It would not fit in other areas of Joplin, but this area surrounded by the medical school and hospital seem to be a good fit for this use of Joplin's new code.

Mr. Bolander stated it was a different type of development that you see currently in this neighborhood. He stated probably the best comparison he could give Mr. Jackson was called the Courtyard pattern that was becoming popular if you are familiar with northwest Arkansas, the Black Apple. He stated the one we have was located on

Jackson and 32nd street. Mr. Bolander stated he was not saying it would look exactly like that from design standpoint but as far as the pattern that was what it was going to look like. Mr. Bolander stated so the question tonight was is this the appropriate location.

Mr. Jackson stated so if you currently have family homes in this area and we are now looking at single occupancy type situations what makes you think this will fit the feel, the design fits the neighborhood as a whole. He stated it was nothing like it.

Mr. Lett stated you are correct it is nothing like what was currently built but there was nothing except the one on Jackson that was currently built in Joplin. He stated they saw a need in this area to provide this specific type of product being in the area that it is surrounded by the hospitals and medical schools. So, this was the best fit for the product we could see on this property. Again, we considered four or five different concepts on this. Nothing other than this seemed to fit it.

Mr. Jackson stated he was confused by why not put it in a place where it is not going to be next to this family residential area. Put it somewhere where it is its own thing in a unique setting much like northwest Arkansas.

Mr. Lett stated if you had a suggestion on a property, they would absolutely entertain another area, but this seemed to be the best fit inside of Joplin.

Mr. Jackson stated he believed it was the best fit for Schuber Mitchell but not necessarily for the neighborhood.

Mr. Lett stated he understood.

Mr. Rosenberg stated you have two avenues of ingress and egress.

Mr. Lett stated yes sir.

Mr. Rosenberg stated one shows you are going to build patio homes on and most of that looks like a very small exit. Both go on to Oliver. He asked do you have any property on Adele.

Mr. Lett stated they have pursued property on Adele rigorously currently most of the people that own it plan to build duplexes down Adele and were not willing to part with it. They did explore that option.

Mr. Rosenberg stated you were asking for rezoning on the tract with the butt on Adele and the back side of some R-1 on Monroe. Is that correct. Mr. Rosenberg asked do you own that property on Monroe that you are not asking for rezoning.

Ms. Steele stated it is not on Monroe.

Mr. Rosenberg stated he apologized it was Oliver.

Mr. Lett stated he was not familiar with what property he was talking about.

Mr. Rosenberg stated there was a bunch and the only property you were showing on Oliver were the two exits. Do you own that property between there.

Mr. Lett stated no that was all current residents.

Ms. Steele stated she just wanted to make it clear these were individually owned, correct.

Mr. Lett responded yes ma'am.

Ms. Steele asked if she heard correctly, they were two-bedroom two bath and no garages. The square footage was between 800-1000 square feet.

Mr. Antillion responded 800-1200 square feet.

Ms. Steele stated that all the homes in the current neighborhood were at least double that.

Ms. Phillips stated she understood the lots would be redivided so what happens to the common area.

Mr. Lett stated that is all HOA maintained. From a homeowner perspective this would be zero maintenance on them. They would pay yearly dues and the management would take care of all the maintenance.

Ms. Phillips stated it was a little different for Joplin.

Mr. Lett stated absolutely. He said to be frank with everyone this was the style they see a lot of the markets moving to including in Joplin. We discussed with City staff and that was the intent behind the change for the recent City code. So, we are trying to see

what benefits this piece and what benefits the community. We are trying to figure out what we can do with this and wanted to present it for rezone.

Ms. Phillips stated she tried counting there were two parking spaces for each unit.

Mr. Lett stated he believed that is what was required. Yes, two per unit.

Ms. Phillips asked so what happened if someone had a visitor or a third car. Where is it going to go.

Mr. Lett stated they are considering more options for parking. That is what is currently outlined in City code.

Mr. Antillion stated typically there would be a green space but like that second exit on Oliver would actually be considered green space. They would do some amenities through there. Usually as part of those amenities we would add additional parking. He stated this is just a very basic concept.

Ms. Phillips stated so it goes from green space to parking unless you do some impervious pavers or something fancy.

Mr. Lett stated it would be our intent to have walking trails and somewhere for people to park to go to those. Or to have some community area there. Again, this was just a concept. We are not required to submit for a rezone. We just wanted to give you, our intent.

Mr. Kimble asked about the similar Centerton project what was the demographic like who live in that housing area.

Mr. Antillion stated they had been really surprised because it had been a real healthy mix. They have seen young professionals who are very interested and have purchased several of the units and they have seen a lot of retirees. They want zero maintenance and typically they are traveling a lot and want to make sure their homes are taken care of in their absence. He stated it has been very interesting. There is actually a wide demand for this concept. He stated it is town home living without the shared wall space. He believed that was the biggest advantage.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 067-22.

There were none but Ms. Steele wanted to make a comment. She stated that of all the properties Schuber Mitchell owned surely there is a better place for this concept which we desperately need in Joplin. In her opinion she stated you are trying to put it in an area where it does not belong.

Mr. Jackson stated he did have a question. You mentioned the traffic study and your engineer. Compared to the existing traffic that is flowing in and out of the neighborhood, let's say this was all developed as R-1 as it is currently zoned what would be the difference of that traffic flow vs this.

Mr. Lett asked the traffic engineer to address this question.

Darren Juranas, traffic engineer responded by saying right now the volumes are very low on Oliver. Existing conditions there was a very minimal amount of traffic. So, with a full build out with 40 dwelling units there would roughly be an additional 20 vehicles going north and 20 additional vehicles going south in the peak hour. Just based on a traffic analysis. We are not looking at a need for additional dedicated turn lanes. He stated based on some of the comments they received there was concern about traffic speeding. Right now, the corridor is very wide and straight and there is not a whole lot of congestion out there.

Mr. Jackson stated given the number of houses you are saying there is only going to be an additional 20 cars.

Mr. Juranas stated yes.

Mr. Jackson said, walk me through this.

Traffic engineer stated for traffic you typically observe the peak hour. Based off our traffic count and local data and that is roughly between 5:00-6:00 p.m. That is typically when you will have the biggest rush hour. During that period and based on ITE trip generation and following those guidelines you will be looking at roughly 20 south and 20 north. He stated he thought the exact number was 25 going south and 15 north. But over the course of an entire weekday, you would be seeing roughly 383 vehicles additional on that roadway over the course of seven days. He stated they followed all

ITE trip generation guidelines. You could look at assigning stop signs for the north bound and south bound traffic. He stated they typically try to stay away from that.

Mr. Jackson stated he could be off on some of his count but if we say each one of these units have two vehicles each you are looking at 80 vehicles. Correct.

Mr. Juranas stated correct. He stated typically your parking is for far greater capacity during special events.

Mr. Jackson said no this is just assuming if you have two people who live there together, one car per person.

Mr. Juranas said correct. The type of event that would require all two of those vehicles for 40 dwelling units to leave within the same hour and actually hit that peak hour is not something that goes into ITE trip generation.

Mr. Jackson stated these are not homes built for a parent and a stay-at-home parent. He said he assumed both people would be working most likely.

Mr. Juranas stated definitely. Based on ITE trip generation guidelines they will come home at different times because not everyone comes home between 5:00-6:00 p.m. Based on ITE trip generation they look at the peak hour which is the worse hour. He stated right now they would be looking at roughly one out of every two of those individuals coming home during the peak hour.

Mr. Jackson stated okay. He asked in terms of streetlights that has been an issue the City has struggled with developers building a sub-division and then going to the City later and saying we have bad lit neighborhoods but that is not our problem. He asked what are you going to do about streetlights in the neighborhood.

Mr. Lett stated they follow every bit of City code. They are dictated and they must sign a contract with Liberty as soon as they construct the neighborhood. They pay for the streetlights.

Mr. Jackson asked how many would you be putting in.

Mr. Lett stated they do not have numbers on this.

Mr. Bolander stated at each intersection there will be a streetlight installed.

Mr. Jackson asked what would be classified as an intersection in this kind of neighborhood.

Mr. Bolander stated there are two accesses off Oliver so at least that location. Each of those locations if they have access coming off Oliver there will be a streetlight installed. Then internally you would have one on each of those intersections as well.

Mr. Jackson stated the reason he asked that was he previously served on City's sales tax oversight committee and the lack of things that have been done with streetlight development or ghost charges the City has gotten. One of the things that came back to us from City staff was developers do these properties and they don't put enough streetlights in and then the City was putting them up later.

Mr. Lett stated that he could say they have not developed much in the City of Joplin for several years, but we are required, and we pay Liberty upfront to go ahead and order the streetlights and they put them in per City guidelines as we go. We must pay for those up front.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 067-22.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of Case 067-22.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 067-22.

Chad Newby, 2636 S. Adele Ave. Joplin, Mo. Mr. Newby stated his feedback would be completely based on the location he owns. He stated if you look on the map where Adele is highlighted, he has a 3000 square foot home, 3 bedroom and 2 bath with a lot. He stated he recently relocated to Joplin, and he choose the home because of the view. He stated he talked with his real estate agent back in December and had him do a market analysis on his home and it came in right at $360,000 and he owns two lots to the north of his lot. He said Schuber Mitchell had never approached him, and he personally knows 90% of the people who live on Adele and none of them are for this project. He stated his biggest concern about this project is the housing density compared to the neighboring houses. The home value of the neighboring houses without a doubt would go down particularly his home. He was concerned about the construction materials proposed to be used in these homes. He stated he went to the neighborhood meeting which was very inconvenient because they did not even have it

in our neighborhood. The location of the meeting was in Silver Creek which he had to take time off work to go to that meeting. He stated he also took time off work to be here today for the meeting. He stated on his property he has a 12' easement and he was told it is on his side of the property. He said if he is sitting on his back porch based on that easement, they would be able to start building 40' from my back porch. He stated he looked at the proposal for the barrier consisting of trees and bushes, trees do not grow overnight and would probably take 20 years to be fully mature. So, people on Adele and neighboring houses would have to look at it for 20 years before they would have true privacy from this project. He stated he used to be a volunteer firefighter and he was told that these construction materials would be flame retardant. He said as close as they propose building these homes if one home became fully involved all of them would catch fire. He was initially told they were going to be 8' apart. He stated he did not believe at this point they have come up with any proposal to cut a street over to Adele. He stated he had never been approached about that and he hoped that if this passed that does not happen. He said in their proposal that they say this is something the neighborhood needs. There is nothing within walking distance to this proposal. He does not believe it fits to what is already existing in the neighborhood. He stated that on the traffic he commutes back and forth to Coffeyville and he sometimes goes down Oliver Street, it is cut through street and between 32nd and 26th and there already is a substantial amount of traffic due to that itself. Based on the map they originally said 51 homes you were going to look at 100 plus cars and now they have backed it off to 40 homes and you are looking at 80 plus cars. If someone had a 16-year-old kid, you are looking at three cars for a residence itself. He stated he believed that covered everything he wanted to cover.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 067-22.

Zola Golden, 2702 S. Oliver, Joplin, Mo. Ms. Golden stated she lived right across from one of the proposed entrances. She said about 3 ½ years ago she bought her home, and she specifically chose a single-family neighborhood, and she knows adding this density so close to her home will decrease the value of her home greatly. Also, as he said Oliver is a cut through street. There is a lot of traffic that goes down there very fast between 26th-32nd streets. She stated they have children in the neighborhood who like to ride their bicycles up and down to visit their friends in different areas of the neighborhood or they are walking on the streets or sometimes on skateboards. She said adding those cars from 40 houses potentially 80 cars all entering and exiting on Oliver Street would impact the traffic greatly and possibly put the children in danger. She stated also there is a slight rise on that first entrance where it will be difficult to see traffic.

Mr. Jackson asked Ms. Golden if she had completed a Petition of Protest.

Ms. Golden stated she had and turned it in to the City.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 067-22.

Debra Golden, 2218 W. 27th St., Joplin, Mo. Ms. Golden stated her big concern beside the traffic and the children she mentioned, and the rise is the property values. Specifically, the 2629 property if you go out and look there are eight homes there are three on one side and she thought the rest on the other side of the property. All those properties have large deep lots. She does not know whether they are ½ or ¾ acre. She stated her property was a full acre. She owns one home which is 1800 square feet on one acre. Several of the neighbors there have one home on ½ acre or ¾ acre. She said she bought her property because she wanted some space, and she knows that all those homes that will be backed up to this have large deep back yards. After the tornado the people in the neighborhood that she spoke with many of them bought property from their neighbors who did not want to rebuild so they could have that extra space. She said just by comparison one home on one acre or one home on ½ acre and Schuber has a five-acre tract, and they are proposing to put 40 homes on the property. She stated it just doesn't fit. It will ruin our property values. It is her understanding that one of the properties at 2629 one of their little courtyards will butt up right beside his house with a road on the other side. She proposed to the Board that as residents would they buy a property with 6-8 homes butted up right against your house. She stated she would not because that will devalue the property. She said she went and looked at the example at 34th and Jackson across from Ronald McDonald House and they are all crammed together with just a little courtyard. She reiterated that this does not fit the neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson stated you mentioned the community meeting that was obviously not held in your neighborhood, how would you describe that information session.

Ms. Golden stated it was a come and go event. Actually, they had a second meeting over at St. Paul's because someone suggested that because not a lot of people were able to go over to Silver Creek. It was not convenient, so she went to the meeting held at St. Paul's and they were afforded the opportunity to ask questions. She said when they said single family homes, she asked then why do you need to rezone. She believed the reasoning was because the homes are so crammed together and there are so many of them. She said she does not understand all the zoning requirements. She did not feel like she got a lot of answers other than viewing the proposed plan.

Mr. Jackson asked if they provided any pictures or details of the development, they bragged about in Centerton.

Ms. Golden stated they had a large map, and it may have been similar to what he gave you.
Mr. Jackson stated at least they figured out that St. Paul's was closer than Silver Creek.

Ms. Golden said yes, she believed that was mentioned by someone on Council.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 067-22.

Molly Williams, 2616 S. Oliver, Joplin, Mo. Ms. Williams stated so that property is basically right across the street from where the road would be to go back into this. She said her property is almost one acre. She stated her issues had pretty well been mentioned. She stated she has four children in her house, and she has a bigger house, it is a four bedroom and three bath but she lives on an acre with four kids. Her daughter rides her bike all the time and there are lots of children right next door that play outside all the time. She said the traffic really scares her and Oliver has become a thru street. That really happened when the Neighborhood Market came in and some other things. So, people coming from 32nd especially from the neighborhoods back over there really cut thru on Oliver. She stated there is already increased traffic that goes to fast as it is. She had heard at one of the community meetings that originally it was supposed to be 51 houses and they told her that they had to have 12' between the houses so that is just a ton of houses that are really really close together. She said she had gone to look at their example on Jackson it looks like an apartment complex. She realized it was not shared walls, but it is all of these houses just crammed in next to each other and the rest of us are living on these big, huge lots with single family homes. She stated it just does not fit and the other thing that is very concerning was the original plan on the bigger lot where they are wanting to put the road, they also wanted to put two teeny houses facing Oliver. She feels the look of that is just crazy. You have all these nice bigger houses on these big lots and then you have two houses in a row crammed in on what is supposed to be a single-family lot. So, the look of that is just going to stick out like a sore thumb. She said she believed the property values will go down. All the other homes on the street have garages so you are going to put 40 houses back there with no garages and carports or parking lots of some sort. She stated she has teenage children, and she has four vehicles at her house because of her teenagers. They all fit in her driveway because she has a huge lot and a huge driveway. None of her children park on the street. She believed the influx of the extra cars coming from that neighborhood will mean they will have a bunch of cars parked on Oliver Street.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 067-22.

Travis Smith, 2201 W. 27th St., Joplin, Mo. Mr. Smith stated that a lot of great points had been mentioned. He said at the first meeting he had asked about why access from Oliver St. He was given the same answer that was presented earlier which was they could not buy the properties on Adele to get access. He stated he mentioned 26th as well. He said just because you can not negotiate a price to purchase a lot where you originally wanted access does not mean you default back into the single-family homes on Oliver St. Mr. Smith does not feel that was a valid excuse. You just have to go negotiate on the lot on 26th St. or the lots on Adele St. if that is the case. The other issue mentioned at one point tonight and at the community meetings was that the medical school and the dental school would need additional housing for their students. He stated they did not know the answer then and he does not know the answer now, but it is not uncommon for colleges, universities or medical schools to provide housing for students. He stated he would be interested in knowing if KU planned to have some housing made available for its students. If that answer is yes, then it seemed like this is unnecessary for that purpose.

Christine Smith, 2201 W. 27th St., Joplin, Mo. Ms. Smith stated the main issue she was concerned about have been mentioned. The safety with the kids playing in the street. As it is right now it is a very busy street, and the kids love riding their bikes. This would present more of a hazard for the children. She stated the property values going down is another concern. Also, she sees this as an opportunity as a blank slate to keep Joplin beautiful and cohesive. Why not continue with single family neighborhoods rather than a jarring combination of housing options. She believed it would be more attractive to current residents and future residents.

Mr. Jackson asked Mr. Smith when the last time was, he saw a sign posted.

Mr. Smith stated you just put one up on Saturday.

Mr. Jackson said he found a sign down and broken on Saturday and he set it back up. He stated he had an extra stake in the back of his car. He said part of his concern was that it is very deceptive to you all as property owners if they were put up in December and told about the December meeting and then it gets moved to now and there was no fresh notice other than letters given. He stated he was not trying to knock anyone in this room because it was out of his control. On Saturday alone, he had three pieces of mail in his mailbox that went to other neighbors on his block. He said the U.S. Postal Service is not the most efficient in getting those notices out to folks. He stated he

guaranteed that. So, when was the last time you saw that sign which was the best way to flag something is happening on your block.

Mr. Smith stated they saw the sign placed back up on Saturday but prior to that it had been down since easily back into December. He said weather was originally what knocked it down and then it just stayed down. He stated he gets a nice visual of this while he is washing dishes because his window looked at the sign.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 067-22.

No further opposition.

Ms. Phillips had a question for Mr. Bolander. She was confused on the number of protests because she did not see Ms. Golden's letter in this stack or in the notebook.

Mr. Bolander stated Ms. Golden's letter came in just before the meeting and there was not time to copy it but that it was on file.

Ms. Phillips stated she usually asked the percentage of protests. She was trying to put the numbers together in person and on paper.

Mr. Bolander said we could try to get you that percentage, but the percentage applies only to City Council on the area being protested. It affects their vote, but it does not affect your vote at all. He stated right now we were at eight protest petitions and 13%.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any other questions from the Commission on Case 067-22.

MR. JACKSON MOVED THAT CASE 067-22 BE DENIED FOR REZONING. MR. ROSENBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED. (6 IN FAVOR, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT)

3. <u>Adjournment:</u>

MS. STEELE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. JACKSON TO ADJOURN. MOTION CARRIED. (6 IN FAVOR, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT)

Approved _____
Drew Kimble, Chairman

Approved Vicky Copeland
Vicky Copeland, Recording Secretary