CASE 012-25: REZONING
A request to rezone from District M-2 (Heavy Industrial) to District MP (Manufactured Home Park and Small Format Home District)- 1201 S Byers- Vita Nova Village

Mr. Kimble asked if the representative would step forward and state their name and address for the record.

Troy Dunlap of 1302 S Main Street, Joplin, Missouri represented Vita Nova Village.

Mr. Dunlap stated the request to rezone is due to wanting to construct a tiny home village for the homeless community in the area. Mr. Dunlap stated that the homes would work as transitional housing, not permanent housing with a strict set of rules for the participants to follow. Mr. Dunlap also explained that the tiny home village would be gated.

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

Mrs. Klue- Michael asked Mr. Dunlap if any of the tiny homes constructed would be ADA accessible.
Mr. Dunlap stated all homes would be constructed ADA ready so with minor adjustments the home would be handicapped accessible.

Ms. Phillips asked Mr. Dunlap about the safety of water in the area and if the land was donated.
Mr. Dunlap stated that the property was bought from the City surplus auction last year.

Mr. Kimble asked if the occupants would be renting the tiny homes from Vita Nova Village and what the average amount of time an occupant would be allowed to stay in the tiny home.
Mr. Dunlap stated that they expect the occupant to occupy the tiny home for six months to two years, but there was no hard rule regarding this.

Mrs. Klue-Michael asked Mr. Dunlap how it will be determined for the amount of rent the occupant with be required to pay.

Mr. Dunlap stated that there has not been a set of hard numbers yet but hopes to be in the range of four to five hundred dollars.

Mr. Kimble asked Mr. Dunlap if they had received any feedback from adjacent property owners.

Rhonda Thompson of 407 Islington Place, Joplin, Missouri stated that she and a group of volunteers with Vita Nova Village around four to five months ago, obtained a list of property owners in the recommended area, and went to speak with them. Ms. Thompson stated the list contained few residential addresses and was mainly business. Ms. Thompson stated they also mailed letters with their contact information, due to not being able to talk to several property owners. Ms. Thompson stated the property owners they did speak with seemed concerned at first, but after explaining the project they were more open to the project due to the condition of the area.

Mr. Kimble asked about the use of security cameras for the project area.
Mr. Dunlap stated that the intent use of the security cameras would be to monitor the coming and going of occupants. Mr. Dunlap also stated that with the community being gated, they plan to have cameras along the fence also.

Mr. Bellairs stated for the record that there are building codes that restrict how a manufactured home park is constructed along with specific design requirements such as having a secure foundation and having a patio to create a courtyard pattern. Mr. Bellairs also stated that there must be communal improvements such as internal streets and community areas.

Mr. Landis asked Mr. Dunlap what the process for vetting of occupants is.
Mr. Dunlap explained that there is not a written process yet, but they require the applicant's history, who they are, where they have been, what their goals are, and it must be compatible with the village's vision. Mr. Dunlap stated that drug use will not be allowed, and occupants would be required to be sober to stay in the community. Mr. Dunlap also stated that if an occupant is found to be under the influence of drugs, they would be required to complete a treatment plan or they would be evicted from the village.

Mr. Kimble asked if the commission had any further questions for the applicant.

Dr. Rosenberg asked to make a statement. Dr. Rosenberg stated "Tyler has already explained to us, that there can't be mobile homes put on this property, or I will personally hang him, if I live long enough. Our job is not to decide how fancy a project is going to be, but whether this is an appropriate use for the piece of property. Not to say they can't change their minds and do what they want with the City Council's permission. Personally, after I've gone by this property several times, I don't think you could hurt it. And I admire and hope they can fulfill their goals and have a viable project like they've shown us on the plans. So, I'm happy."

Mr. Bellairs explained that the term mobile home is an outdated term, and HUD classifies them as manufactured homes. Any manufactured or modular homes would have to meet the development regulations of the district, and it would not look anything like the existing mobile home parks in Joplin when finished.

Mr. Kimble asked Mr. Dunlap if there would be street parking or if more parking spaces are planned to be installed.
Mr. Dunlap explained that there will be a few handicap accessible and regular parking spaces, but they plan for the majority of their occupants to not have a vehicle. Mr. Dunlap also explained that for events or meetings held, there will be off-street parking available.

Mr. Kimble asked Mr. Dunlap if the majority of occupants do not have vehicles, what modes of transportation are being recommended for the village.
Mr. Dunlap stated that occupants will be encouraged to walk, bike, use ride shares and would like to speak to the city about adding a bus stop.

Ms. Phillips asked about the parking standards for the village.
Mr. Bellairs stated the intent for this project is intended to cater to a certain demographic of the community, and certain developments may have certain needs that the commission and council may deviate from the code if it meets the intent and the code, through a planned development.

Mr. Landis stated that the homes are smaller than a standard manufactured home and are constructed completely differently.

Mr. Dunlap stated that this is correct, and the homes would not be the same large size as a manufactured home. Mr. Dunlap also explained that they are looking to have the tiny homes built on a foundation and a regular stick frame. Mr. Dunlap explained the homes would be around four hundred square feet.

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

Kyle Denham of 111 W 3rd Street, Joplin, Missouri asked to speak in favor of this case.
Mr. Denham stated that he is a member of the Board of Appeals and the properties they most often look at are homes that have been subject to fires, where the homes were vacant and broken into and someone was trying to keep warm. Mr. Denham stated that he believes this project will help with the homeless community in the area.

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

Robert Counts of 1124 S Moffet, Joplin, Missouri asked to speak in opposition to this case.
Mr. Counts stated he is in opposition to this case due to his shed being burnt down and his property being stolen.

Ms. Phillips asked Mr. Bellairs if he had received any Petitions of Protest regarding this case.
Mr. Bellairs stated that he had not received any Protest Petitions, but he believed that Mr. Counts would like to fill one out after the meeting. Mr. Bellairs explained that he doesn't believe Mr. Counts lives within the radius for the petition to count towards the percentage in this case. Mr. Bellairs stated there are no protest percentages within the one hundred- and eighty-five-foot radius.

Jason Latleen of 1122 S Moffet asked to speak in opposition to this case.

Mr. Kimble stated that since Mr. Latleen testified on the previous case, he only shares new information with the commission.

Mr. Latleen stated that he did not receive notice of this project or commission meeting.
Ms. Phillips explained that this is due to not being in the one hundred- and eighty-five-foot radius that is legally required to be given notice. Mr. Bellairs also explained that the notice of the meeting was posted in the Joplin Globe.

Mr. Latleen stated he is opposed to this project due to vandalization of his property. Mr. Latleen asked the commission what the next steps would be if this were to be passed by the commission.
Ms. Phillips explained that Mr. Latleen would be able to address the City Council since they have final approval.
Mr. Bellairs stated, Ms. Phillips was correct and further explained that the Planning and Zoning Commission is strictly a recommending body and then this case will go in front of the City Council April 7th for final approval, even if the commission decides not to approve the recommendation of this case.

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

Scott Nangle of 313 W 13th Street, Joplin, Missouri asked to speak about this case.

Mr. Nangle stated that when the property was placed on the market for sale, he recalled there being a stipulation that the property was required to be developed within a certain period, or it reverted back to the City. Mr. Nangle asked if the zoning was changed and if the property reverted to the city, would the new owner be required to rezone the property.
Mr. Bellairs stated that zoning carries with ownership and if the proposed usage changes in the future, the property owner will be required to rezone the property.

Mr. Nangle stated concerns over the railroad and the school located near the property, but he was not necessarily for or against the project.

Mr. Dunlap stated that there was a stipulation when they purchased the property from the City that it had to be developed within three years.

Ms. Phillips asked Mr. Dunlap when the property was purchased.
Mr. Bellairs stated that it was declared as surplus property around September of last year.
Mr. Dunlap stated that he believes they obtained the property around October or November of last year.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was anyone else in the audience that would like to speak in opposition to this case.

MR. LANDIS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE CASE 012-25. THIS MOTION WAS SECONDED BY MS. WARREN. MOTION CARRIED. (7 IN FAVOR, 0 IN OPPOSITION)