JOPLIN | HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

MINUTES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2026 (REVISED)

The Historic Preservation Commission of the City of Joplin met Tuesday, February 17, 2026, at 5:00PM in the Council Chambers, located at Joplin City Hall.

The following commission members were present: Mr. Millard, Ms. DeTar, Dr. Mountz, Dr. Fischer, Dr. Reid-Adams, Ms. Haun, and Ms. Provin.

The following commission member was absent: Mr. Huff and Mr. Bruekner.

Thomas Walters represented the City of Joplin.

1. **Meeting Called to Order**
   Dr. Mountz called the meeting to order of the Historic Preservation Commission at 5:00PM.

2. **Roll Call**
   Mr. Kellstadt called the roll.
   DR. REID-ADAMS MADE A MOTION TO EXCUSE ALL ABSENT COMMISION MEMBERS. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. DETAR. MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

3. **Approval of Minutes**
   DR. REID-ADAMS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 20, 2026, MEETING MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. PROVIN MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

4. **Budget**

Mr. Walters presented the budget. The previous budget report did not take into account the second agreement of Phase 2 of North Heights. There will be a budget amendment to include this.

5. **Public Hearings**

Dr. Mountz read the public hearing procedures.

Local Landmark Designation 2026-02

612 West E Street – Mr. Walters gave a staff report. Mr. Walters reviewed the application and packet and determined that it was complete. The nomination was well researched and well documented. At least one criteria must be substantially met. This location was a neighborhood grocery store of which only one other is on the historic list. This location was an early adopter of the shop yourself model of stores. Mr. Walters went on to read an article about the grocery store closing and how that impacted the neighborhood. Mr. Walters noted that staff gave a recommendation for approval of the landmark designation.

Dr. Mountz entertained a motion to open the floor to discussion for local landmark designation.

MS. HAUN MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. DETAR. THE MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

Angela Hudson, 612 West E Street, spoke to how she has high hopes for the building to become a community space.

Dr. Fisher asked Ms. Hudson when did she acquire the property.

Ms. Hudson responded that property was purchased in December of 2025 and that mostly cosmetic treatments are needed before opening the facility.

Dr. Mountz asked if there was anyone present to speak against the local mark designation, to which there were none.

Dr. Mountz entertained a motion to close the public discussion for 612 West E Street.

DR. FISHER MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DR. REID-ADAMS. THE MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

Mr. Walters made a clarification. The property is currently zoned R-1 which means that using this as something other than a single-family home is not permitted. Any future exterior modifications will need to go through review.

MS. HAUN MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 2026-02. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DR. FISHER. THE MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

Certificate of Appropriateness

520 S. Main Street – Mr. Walters gave a staff report. City codes are silent on the kind of track lighting that the property owners wish to obtain the certificate of appropriateness for. Mr. Walers did go on to describe that the regulations state that holes are to be drilled in the mortar or the exterior wall rather than in the brick. Mr. Walters gave a recommendation that a conditional approval be given that stipulates that any holes drilled will be in the mortar minimizing any damage to the masonry. This will set a precedent that others in the downtown area will want to replicate.

Dr. Mountz entertained a motion to open the floor to public discussion for local landmark designation.

MS. HAUN MADE A MOTION TO OPEN THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. REID-ADAMS. THE MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

Dr. Mountz asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor the certificate of appropriateness, to which there were none.

Dr. Mountz asked if there was anyone present to speak against the certificate of appropriateness, to which there were none.

Dr. Mountz entertained a motion to close the public discussion for the certificate of appropriateness.

MS. HAUN MADE A MOTION TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC DISCUSSION. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. DETAR. THE MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

A question about the definition of track lighting was asked. Mr. Walters explained that this is like an LED strip that needs to be affixed to the building. This lighting is able to change colors and is programable.

Dr. Fisher asked if this was decorative lighting.

Mr. Walters confirmed that this is decorative in nature and not appropriate for public space lighting.

Mr. Walters was asked if there were guidelines as to what type of lighting can be affixed to the face of the downtown structures, to which Mr. Walters responded "no". We do prohibit coach lanterns in entry ways. We have no regulations affixing or prohibiting the type of lighting on the upper façade. We have provisions to protect against the false sense of historic-ness and the functional ones for entryways from safety codes. Our codes are very silent on additional lightings but there would be health and safety provisions that would trump the safety code. We do not have anything for decorative lighting. This would be a precedent.

Dr. Fisher stated that this type of lighting does not diminish the historic nature of the building. Dr. Fisher went on the state that the lighting should be approved.

Mr. Walters said that the lights can flash but that can be a conditional permit. If so directed Mr. Walters indicated that standards can be written to address the lighting standards. A conditional approval can specify the limit on lumens, flashing, and colors of the lighting.

Mr. Walters was asked if there were limits on the amount of lighting that can be placed on a building. Mr. Walters responded that they could not cover architectural features, such as windows, doors, and cornices. But we have no jurisdiction of when is inside the window.

Dr. Mountz indicated that for a conditional permit there could be limits placed on lumens, animated lights, and must be placed in mortar.

Dr. Fisher asked if a conditional approval can be given using a brightness level that is not mathematical but rather a reasonable level of brightness.

Mr. Walters stated that a decision will need to be delayed if a lumens level is to be placed. He went on to explain that if lighting is to be considered a nuisance, then a set standard will need to be established. Not every nuisance complaint is going to be followed with a compliance response. Some people are just not going to like the lighting.

Dr. Mountz recapped that the conditions are: not animated, must be placed in the mortar, and must have a dimmer switch.

DR. FISHER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CERTIFICARE OF APPROPRIATENESS WITH CONDITION PLANCED ON THE LIGHTS NOT BEING ANIMATED, MUST BE PLACED IN MORTAR, AND HAVE A DIMMER SWITCH. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. HAUN. THE MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

6. **Discussion Items**
   a. **Memorial Hall**
      Ms. Haun provided an update. There is a new board being established that will have their first meeting on April 9, 2026. RFQ's are being prepared for design services and historic consulting services.

   b. **North Heights Survey Phase I and II Update**
      Mr. Walters gave an update about the Phase II pre-application will be due relatively quickly. He will work to get approval from both the Commission and City Council to set the deadline. Mr. Walters spoke to the SHPO grants manager and learned they have fixed where we can apply for a renewal for future phases.

      Mr. Walters provided an update about Phase I in that we have received a high responsiveness to the RCP that has a wide range of bids. The best bids were from far away. The one that we are recommending moving forward with is David Taylor, whom we are very familiar with. He scored very high with his bid.

c. **May Preservation Symposium**

Mr. Walters provided the symposium agenda to the commissioners in their meeting packet. The local preservation portion has been reduced from the better part of an hour to a half an hour. Attendance is expected to be around sixty people with a cap of 100.

d. **Parks Survey**

Dr. Mountz indicated that he would keep this item on future agendas in hopes of having a plan in place by this summer. He further mentioned that he plans on having MSSU students participate in the survey.

7. **Old Business**

None

8. **New Business**

None

9. **Announcements**

Dr. Reid-Adams and Ms. Haun spoke about how the Carnegie Library is being cleaned up. The owner is considering using the building as an events center and possible BNB in the upper floors. The Carnegie will be on the lofts tour on May 2nd. It will be in limited spaces, the main floor and the south reading room.

Ms. Haun gave the dates for the Main Street Conference this year, the national conference will be held in Tulsa from April 13 – 15. The Missouri state conference will be in Springfield on July 29th & 30th.

Mr. Walters informed the commission that we will be updating the comprehensive plan. Part of that will be updating the downtown plan.

Dr. Mountz announced that the planned social will be put off for the time being.

Adjournment

DR. FISHER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 20, 2026, MEETING OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. HAUN. MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 2 ABSENT)

Approved _____
Chairperson

Approved _____
Recording Secretary