JOPLIN | PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES

MONDAY, MARCH 09, 2026

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Joplin met in a regular session on Monday, March 9, 2026, at 4:00 PM. Present were commission members, Drew Kimble, Natasha Klue-Michael, Dr. Rosenberg, Gary Spruce, Amia Warren, Mary Anne Phillips, and Crystal Harrington.

Tyler Bellairs represented the Planning, Development and Neighborhood Services Department.

1. **Roll Call**

   Eric Kellstadt called the roll.

2. **Approval of Minutes**

   DR. ROSENBERG MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE FEBUARY 9, 2026, MEETING MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION. A SECOND WAS MADE BY MS. PHILLIPS. MOTION CARRIED (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 0 ABSENT)

3. **Public Hearings**

   Mr. Kimble read the Public Hearing Procedures.

   CASE 009-26 MCINTOSH CIR - VACATION

   Mr. Bellairs, Planning and Zoning Department, City of Joplin, represented the case.

Mr. Bellairs stated that the City of Joplin and Freeman Health Systems as the applicants. He went on to explain that years back we rerouted McIntosh Circle to align it with 32nd Street to create an aligned access. This is cleaning up the descriptions. There was an error in the legal description so staff is recommending to table the vacation so that the legal can be readvertised.

Mr. Kimble opened discussion from the Commission.

Dr. Rosenberg asked who owns the nearby memorial for victims of the tornado.

Mr. Bellairs indicated that the memorial is outside of the city's property. It is in Freeman's property and remains outside of the vacation area.

Dr. Rosenberg ask if the old doctor's office that is no longer being used will be impacted.

Mr. Bellairs stated that the offices are outside the vacation as well.

Mr. Bellairs mentioned that this case was advertised as a public hearing and therefor should be open for public comment.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of the case.

Hearing none, Mr. Kimble asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to the case.

Mr. Kimble asked for a motion to table the vacation.

MS. KLUE-MICHAEL MADE A MOTION TO TABLE CASE 009-26. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG, MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 0 ABSENT).

CASE 010-26 TEXT AMENDMENT

Dustin Ellias of ProX, 809 Catherine Ave, explain that that the R-2 zoning currently requires at 7,800 square foot lot but many of the R-2 zoned lots are only 50 feet wide and 120 feet long so even though they are R-2 their square footage requirement isn't met. We are asking that that minimal lot size be 6,000 square feet rather than 7,800. This is meant to increase the number of affordable housing.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission.

Ms. Phillips asked if ProX wrote the text amendment or if the city was involved as well.

Mr. Bellairs explained that the staff report was provided by the city while the application was done by ProX. He went on to say that the way the amendment was written it does more than what was just explained. That there are two types of duplexes. One being the outward appearance of two home put together with a common wall. What ProX is typically building is what's called a multi-unit home, which has the forming, massing, and modulation of the outward appearance of one home that's just been divided into two units. This will not be the kind of suburban style that is spread out. This style of development is meant for in-fill in certain context in neighborhoods that match what they're trying to do. In a lot of our more urban neighborhoods there are several homes that you would not know that are divided into multiple units because they are in R-3 districts. Currently the zoning code allows for that type of duplex in an R-3 district at 3,000 square foot per unit. But the suburban style is still at 7,800 square feet. You will not be able to build the suburban style at 6,000 square feet. But in those neighborhoods where it is truly in-fill and the surrounding context where there is similar housing types they can do that housing style where it still looks like a single-family house from the outside, but it has two units. This is not a broad approval of duplexes within 6,000 square feet, it is very much context based depending on the housing types there and it is very much subject to the review of the type of structure they're building.

Ms. Klue-Michael asked Mr. Bellairs if we were to approve this type of build on these smaller lots are we going to be facing any cons for the city or for other people who are looking to build this type of structure? Is there going to be any negative impact?

Mr. Bellairs said that this will be context based, because the way it was written it is limited applicability only in infill situations. We reduced the lot size for single-family homes to 6,000 in an R-2. So in neighborhood like the Schuber Mitchell subdivisions that were just done were at 6,000 square foot lots, that would be a suburban context that would not be infill. Think more like the walkable neighborhoods, the original street grids that are much more urban style of development where a variety of housing types already exist, that would be an ideal location where this would be permitted only through infill. More suburban neighborhoods, the way it is written it still protects those developments from being changed to two-family or multi-family. So it does have protections in there based off the way it was written and anything that is outside infill they have to go to the commission and council through a planned development review, we can't approve

that administratively it is only in the defined very narrow context that this is allowed. It still has those protections that would ideally prevent any negative outcomes from lowering that density.

Ms. Phillips asked if this could be handled on a case-by-case basis also by the Board of Adjustment?

Mr. Bellairs indicated that this would be a code change to allow it to be infill, so no, this would not go to the Board of Adjustment. The Board of Adjustment does not have the authority under the interpretation article of the zoning code. They don't have the authority to grant any amendments to zoning or district standards like density or lot size, zoning or what uses are allowed, that is outside their review. They can grant variances to the development standard but they cannot grant variances to matters of zoning or district standards.

Mr. Kimble asked Mr. Ellias what his team is hoping to gain by going to try to change or have this amendment for R-2 rather than going with an R-3 that would fit what the current building is right now.

Mr. Ellias stated that we just want to make R-2 lots that are available where there are infill lots, we just want to make those to where they can accommodate a duplex. We're not into building multi-family homes outside of bigger than a duplex. There is plenty of inventory in lots out there that are 6,000 square feet that have been sitting there with nothing built on there for quite a while. Doing this would allow duplexes to be built on them.

Mr. Kimble said that when you say duplex are you talking about just a two-family unit or a multi-family unit that looks like a regular house?

Mr. Ellias stated that it would be just a two-family unit.

Mr. Kimble stated that everything Tyler (Mr. Bellairs) has talked about and my understanding was that this was a multi-family unit not just a two-family unit.

Mr. Bellairs indicated that the definition is multi-unit home that can be hypothetically if you have the square footage you can do a three or four unit home but in an R-2 it is still limited to two family.

Dr. Rosenburg asked, you're not asking for a change to the width of the lot, you would like to change the depth of the lot?

Mr. Ellias responded that was correct.

Dr. Rosenburg said that most of the time you come anyway and you ask for a 50-foot lot and you're going to put a single family dwelling on it. That seems to be the trend that I'm seeing. That would reduce the depth of a lot to 100 feet?

Mr. Ellias stated that it would be 120 feet. There are plenty lots along Byers.

Dr. Rosenberg asked if those lots are just unbuildable.

Mr. Ellias responded that they are not buildable for a duplex even though they are zoned for a duplex. But based on the square foot requirement we can't build duplexes.

Dr. Rosenberg asked if the lots are not necessarily as narrow as 50 feet that they might be 65 feet or 60 feet.

Mr. Ellias indicated that most of the lots are 50-foot wide.

Mr. Bellairs clarified that the density standards for the district give you a certain square footage for each type of development that you have to have. In this instance what they are referring to is that there are lots in the City of Joplin that are zoned R-2 they just aren't 7,800 square feet. In an R-2 district where the infill context is appropriate they could build a two-unit home in a 6,000 square foot lot with this change. Specifically what he is referring to is existing lots that are already zoned R-2 that just aren't at that 7,800 square foot size.

Mr. Kimble asked Mr. Bellairs could this just be a case-by-case basis rather than making an amendment to what's already there where someone is wanting to put a duplex on a lot this size because they come up and ask for the change rather than making an across-the-board change. Why not just have that happen every time rather than the overall change or amendment to the text.

Mr. Bellairs said that in our procedures we do have codes to address the fluctuation of density requirements but that is what is called a planned development or in some areas a planned unit development. There is usually a specific size where it is going to benefit more than the individual property. It is going to be more of a neighborhood style development where there is typically a size requirement for that in a PD. That would be a case-by-case basis. Because we're talking about individual lots that's the goal behind this change because you are going into an individual lot that typically is not going to qualify or meet the size requirements to do a PD on a case by case basis which is why they are requesting to amend the code to allow it by right.

Dr. Rosenberg said that it seems to me that if I remember right the housing development on North St. Louis has a whole bunch of 5,000 square foot lots for a single family dwelling.

Mr. Bellairs responded that was done through a PD and then amended the code to 6,000 square feet for single-family. That was the Schuber development.

Dr. Rosenberg stated that the whole trend is to get a smaller lot.

Ms. Phillips said that just because something is zoned R-2 is probably historically because they changed a single-family dwelling to a duplex. Just because something is R-2 we are force a duplex onto a lot that was something before we even had zoning. If there is an empty lot that's not being developed as R-2, I say put a single-family lot there. Because the infill houses that I'm seeing aren't sympathetic to the neighborhoods. Not all of them, some are not sympathetic to the single-family dwelling in the neighborhood. Though I say single-family they may be technically zoned R-2 because of historic reasons. If we did a case-by-case and the neighbors within 185 feet said "No" that's not going to look good for the neighborhood, density in this neighborhood is not a good thing or we don't want it at this time.

Mr. Ellias said that one of our big things is to reduce housing costs and to be able to provide affordable housing. As a builder I can tell you there's a duplex you get to build off of one electrical drop, one roof. There are costs that are shared between the two units. My square footage cost between building a duplex and building a single home is almost one and a half times. It's 40% higher to build a single-family home. If I'm renting the same I got to charge more for a single-family. We are trying to make it so that everybody, not just us, can build these more affordable housing in areas that are already zoned R-2. They're zoned for a duplex the code but by putting 7,800 square feet means that they're not really zoned for a duplex.

Ms. Klue-Michael asked what the rent rate would be for affordable housing.

Mr. Ellias responded that for these being brand-new homes with three bedroom and two bath, we are renting them at $1,200 - $1,250 range.

Mr. Kimble asked Mr. Bellairs to clarify why it wouldn't be better to go case-by-case rather than making a sweeping amendment on this right now.

Mr. Bellairs stated that with the issues of zoning beside the PD is that you can't do it on a case-by-case basis. The Board of Adjustment does not have that authority to grant a case-by-case exception. The only way to do that would be a PD and a lot-by-

lot basis wouldn't work. You need to look at the zoning districts across the board. We can't pick it out on a case-by-case district.

Mr. Kimble asked what happens if we pass the text amendment and this gentleman wants to come and build a house on a lot where the zoning is not aligning, the text amendment is saying that we can have this conversation.

Mr. Bellairs indicated that the text amendment is to reduce the size for that kind of development. If it were an R-1 then it would need to be rezoned. But if the property is 6,000 square feet in a neighborhood where there are already a mix of housing types and it is already zoned R-2, they wouldn't have to come back.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any other questions from the commission.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone in attendance who would like to speak in favor.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone in attendance who would like to speak in opposition.

Mr. Kimble asked the commission for a motion.

DR. ROSENBERG MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE CASE 010-26. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. KLUE-MICHAEL, MOTION DID NOT PASS. (3 IN FAVOR, 4 IN OPPOSITION, 0 ABSENT).

CASE 011-26 VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION

Zack Imbus, 8888 Keystone Crossing, Indianapolis, IN, explain his role and his associates roles with the proposed annexation and rezoning of the development. He went on to inform the commission the details of Ambrose, the real estate developer hired for the project based in Indianapolis, IN. Ambrose is experienced with doing similar projects throughout the United States.

Mr. Imbus described the property as along 32nd Street south the old Blue Buffalo plant. The existing use is undeveloped land and we are proposing a warehouse and distribution facility. Our first request is for the annexation. The existing property is located in Newton County and we are proposing it to be annexed into the City of Joplin. The current owner does control a larger parcel of about 150 acres that this will be split from. We are here representing only the 25 acres. Next is the zoning request. The existing property is unincorporated and we note that most of the surrounding property southeast of I-44 corridor is M-2. Our proposed zoning is to be

designated that same zoning, as M-2 Heavy Industrial. We believe this to be compatible proposed use and aligns with the surrounding zoning. There is no adjacent city residential nearby. Staff repost details 2012 City of Joplin Comprehensive Plan designated this property as future industrial opportunity area. The future land use plan and policies are exactly consistent with this request.

Mr. Imbus said that this will be a Class A distribution facility, roughly 130,000 square foot building. Roughly 30 foot height, single-story concrete. The intended operations include receiving, storage, staging, and shipping. I want to emphasize that this is not a data center and not a manufacturing facility. This will be a distribution facility consisting of package movement. Vehicles have a no-idle policy to reduce carbon footprint. Product is typically moved in and out of this facility within 24 hours. All operations occur inside the building. This is a very clean operation with no odor, no pollution, and no industrial waste. There is a small office component with restrooms and very modest water and sanitary usage.

Mr. Imbus went on to describe the site plan. It is along East 32nd Street, which is under the jurisdiction of the DOT. Turn lanes would be installed, that is at the recommendation of MoDOT. We have a traffic study completed and vetted by them. We will be following all their requests to ensure that traffic ensures compatibility. There will be three curb-cuts in total aligned with the existing drives. There will be designation of auto, van, and truck. The stormwater management facilities will be to the east and west to the site. Other landscaping will be done to code requirements. As far a noise, we will ensure that all local ordinances will be met. We will use extra landscaping and buffering to exceed these goals. The operational noise level of a facility like this is on the average of 55 decibels, which falls in between a running air conditioner and a running refrigerator. Similar to a white noise machine that people would sleep with at night. There will be a full photometric plan provided to the city and will meet all ordinances as such. We will use cut-off lighting which will light up our property and keep it off the neighbors. Extensive environmental and geotech studies are being performed to ensure any endangered species are protected. We don't believe that there are any on the site. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has also been engaged to ensure that any wetlands are protected. After due diligence we do not believe that there are any protected wetlands on the site. A traffic study has been done and submitted to the City and DOT.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the commission.

Ms. Klue-Michael asked a questions about the site plan visual slide that was presented by Mr. Imbus. Specifically, what are the large boxes located behind the building.

Mr. Imbus responded that those are parking stalls for vans to utilize as a queueing area for the loading operations that occur outside the building.

Ms. Klue-Michael also asked how many jobs will this bring. How many jobs can we expect to come out of this?

Jason Manglus, 1245 E Washington Street, Madison, Wisconsin, indicated that there will be about 100 new jobs of which about a dozen will be full-time salaried leadership roles.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any other questions from the commission.

Ms. Klue-Michael inquired about what kind of distribution will take place.

Mr. Manglus responded that this facility will handle items about 50 pounds about the size of a toaster oven, consumer products, electronics, occasionally extra-large items like an office chair, computer monitor, and generally dry goods. From a hazmat perspective nothing that you wouldn't find in your local hardware store.

Dr. Rosenberg asked what kind of traffic flow are you going to need on these roads I assume that you'll be doing local deliveries or within 50 miles.

Mr. Imbus stated that he does not have any counts off-hand but they have all been detailed in the study that was provided to the city, but yes, there will be a number of traffic trips and routes involved with the operation.

Mr. Manglus indicated that this facility will provide deliveries within an hour's drive. The dispatching usually takes place between 9:00 a.m. and noon in a two-hour time period on a staggered basis.

Ms. Klue-Michael asked Mr. Manglus that out of those 100 jobs, 12 would be full-time with benefits the rest would be part-time no benefits.

Mr. Manglus responded that there are some benefits available to the part-time employees. There is a variety of benefits that they have access to but medical benefits is not one of them.

Ms. Harrington asked Mr. Bellairs if there is infrastructure there.

Mr. Bellairs indicated that there is city sewer on the north side of 32nd Street at the intersection of 32nd and Quail. That is there for them to tie into.

Mr. Imbus said that they are engaged with Missouri American Water to access a nearby water main. Liberty Utilities has a substation directly to the west of the development. This property will not use any natural gas.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any other questions from the commission.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of the case.

Mr. Morris Glaze, of Joplin, asked if once the building is completed will they vacate the current building on Prigmor and move those jobs to the new building.

Mr. Imbus indicated that he is not a liberty to discuss the end user and is unable to answer Mr. Glaze's question.

Mr. Glaze went on to state how all of the local infrastructure is a result of the JIDA board has done over the years in the Crossroads Industrial Park which is on the north side of 32nd Street.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the case.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the case.

Mr. James Bicroft, 13525 Briar Wood Road, spoke to inform the commission that there are nearby residential homes to the annexation area. He asked how any additional traffic will impact 32nd Street. Mr. Bicroft also asked where are these products coming from.

Mr. Kimble reiterated that Mr. Imbus said that no city housing within the City of Joplin whereas the houses to the east are in the county rather than the city. I think they made a distinction about that specifically.

Mr. Imbus stated that they want to work with the nearby residences and make sure that their property is protected. As far as 32nd Street, this is a DOT roadway that is designed for this kind of development. They will not be approving our use and improvements unless they believe their infrastructure can handle the traffic counts that we are proposing.

Mr. Manglus responded to the question about hazardous materials and where are the products are coming from. The products will generally come from Kansas City and St. Louis but as far away as Minnesota and Chicago. In terms of hazardous materials the origin facilities are limited in what they can carry. Those facilities

would carry items that you would find in your local hardware store and nothing more than that.

Mr. Kimble asked about traffic and the type of vehicles that will be accessing the facility on a regular basis.

Mr. Manglus responded that the trucks will be arriving between 10:00 p.m. and 4:00 a.m. For passenger vehicles the largest shift starts at 1:00 a.m. and that will be about 20 to 25 individuals. The vans will be about 150 to 200.

Mr. Imbus added that the shifts of traffic movement are selected to avoid high traffic and school bus times.

Mr. Kimble asked if there is anyone else who would like to speak in opposition to the case.

Ms. Dawna Mitchell 1204 Prairie View Road, said the we live in the area directly east of this and we have doctor's appointments and if there is 150 vehicles that we will have to sit and wait and will be late for our appointments. We are not in the city limits but hope that you would be concerned with us as well.

Ms. Phillips spoke about her experiences with traffic in the area during a recent Sunday visit. She went on to ask if there would be some kind of turn lanes.

Ms. Klue-Michael reminded the commission that there would be turn lanes added for the development.

Ms. Harrington pondered if the jobs are going to be new or if just relocated and if there would truly be an additional increase in traffic.

Dr. Rosenberg reminded the commission and attending audience that this case is about annexation and the other is a separate rezoning case. He also informed everyone that this commission is an advisory board.

Morris Glaze, stated that if the developer had selected a sight on the north side of 32nd Street they wouldn't be here today because it is already in the city zoned M-2.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was a motion on the case.

DR. ROSENBERG MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE CASE 011-26. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. WARREN, MOTION PASSED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 0 ABSENT).

CASE 012-26 REZONING FROM R-1 to M-2

Zach Imbus, 8888 Keystone Crossing, Indianapolis, Indiana, spoke as to how the previous presentation directly applies to this case.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the commission about the rezoning.

Mr. Imbus stated how this development complies with the 2012 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Kimble asked if there is anyone who would like to speak in favor of the rezoning.

Mr. Kimble asked if there is anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the rezoning.

Mr. Kimble opened the floor for a motion.

MR. SPRUCE MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE CASE 012-26. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY DR. ROSENBERG, MOTION PASSED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 0 ABSENT).

CASE 013-26 REZONING FROM R-2 TO R-2HL

Mr. Thomas Walters, City Staff, 602 S. Main Street, spoke as to how the Historic Preservation Commission is requesting and forwarding a nomination for 612 West E Street. For something to be designated a local landmark it must substantially meet one of ten criteria and must be substantially researched and well documented. The Commission approved the designation based on criteria one. No one came to the commission meeting to speak in opposition. Mr. Walters explained how the landmark process is different from the special use process and how he did not wish to confuse the two with this commission. He went on to share some of the research to the commission and explained how this request has been brought to this commission and asked that it be recommended to the City Council.

Dr. Rosenberg reminisced about his memories of the grocery store that was at this location.

Mr. Walters indicated how there is one other of these type of landmarks in the city located in the Murphysburg Historic District.

Ms. Harrington explained how her daughter would visit the store and how if this would make it onto the national register it might qualify for funding.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone in attendance who would like to speak in favor of the case.

Ms. Angels Hudson, 528 N. Moffet Ave, explained how she is the property owner and hopes to restore it back to more to what it used to look like. She went on to say how she live directly cross the alley from this location and thought this was a good opportunity. Ms. Hudson spoke about her investment in her own home and her involvement in neighborhood activities.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the commission.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone else that would like to speak in favor of the case.

Ms. Mary Brokenshire, 600 Morgan Court, indicated that she is Ms. Hudson's mother. She spoke how Ms. Hudson is renovating her home on South Moffet and hope how the property in question will be renovated with the original historic features as much as she can.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the case.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the case.

Mr. Kimble opened the floor to a motion from the commission.

MS. KLUE-MICHAEL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE CASE 013-26. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. WARREN, MOTION PASSED. (6 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 0 ABSENT, 1 ABSTAIN).

4. **OLD BUSINESS**

None

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

None

Mr. Kimble asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

MS. HARRINGTON MADE TO ADJOURN. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. WARREN. MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION, 0 ABSENT).

Approved _____

Drew Kimble, Chairman

Approved _____

Eric Kellstadt, Recording Secretary