CB 2022-268

Case 029-22: - 3330 & 3332 N. St. Louis Ave. – A request to remove from District R-1 (Single-family Residential) and include in District R-1-PD (Single-family Residential Planned Development) for future residential development – Gaskill, Jason H & Debra S Family Trust.

Terry Mitchell, Schuber Mitchell Homes representing the Gaskills, from whom we purchased the property.

Mr. Stanton stated the details of this request, you might find easily on the plat, which is Case 030-22.

Mr. Eastman wanted to know what the rationale was going from R-1 to R-1-PD?

Mr. Stanton stated that the PD allows the applicant to request smaller lot sizes and widths. Our minimum code regulation is 65 feet per single family lot, they are requesting down to a 52-foot lot.

Joshua Oathout, 114 Sunset, Carl Junction, MO, Engineer/Land Surveyor, Anderson Engineering. The basis is we are requesting R-1-PD, but if you look at the image, we have a large area of wetlands on this site that we want to preserve. We picked an overlay district because the PD encourages the use of green space preserving natural habitat. The Southwest side of the plat in the triangle we will be doing the same thing. We are requesting the PD from the code so that we can preserve area lost to wetlands.

Ms. Phillips wanted to know how many years; months are between the phases?

Troy Nebo, Schuber Mitchell Homes, 1835 Golf St., Webb City, MO., The goal is in the next three years we will be developing this. The actual timeline will be based on sales.

Ms. Phillips mention to get to phase 6?

Mr. Nebo stated that was correct. We are planning to start on development as soon as the approval from the city is final.

Mr. Kimble mentioned that the lot sizes are thirteen feet shorter than the minimum code. What is the purpose of having the smaller lots?

Mr. Oathout stated that so much of the property is unusable because of the Army Corp, it still makes the development developable.

Ms. Brueckner-Sears asked if there were any other questions? This has nothing to do with the lot sizes, correct?

Mr. Stanton stated that it does because if you approve the overlay then that includes the reduction of the lot sizes.

Ms. Brueckner-Sears stated she has concerns with the smaller lot sizes.

Ms. Steele stated she has a question. Where else have you gone down to the 52-foot lot.

Mr. Oathout stated out at Wildwood Ranch.

Mr. Stanton stated that outside of Schuber Mitchell subdivisions a large portion of the historic grid system, Main Street, to the East and West of that, those original plats are 50-foot lots. They are very common in Joplin.

Mr. Nebo stated that we have seen on sales that the preference from buyers is the smaller lots.

Ms. Phillips wanted to know if all the houses will have garages on the front and extend further than the house?

Mr. Oathout stated the garages will be on the front and extends to the front and we have setbacks that we have to abide by the city.

Mr. Bolander stated that the lots sizes in the U.S are decreasing. People want smaller lot size. Our experience in Joplin, the 50'x 120' are very popular now.

Mr. Kimble wanted to know about the pond area to the north, given the lot sizes will be smaller. Will there be anything built in there? Trails, anything else in that green space for the families?

Mr. Oathout stated there is planned trails.

Ms. Brueckner-Sears asked if there wanted anyone who would like to speak in favor of this request? There were not. She also asked if there was anyone is opposition of this request?

Katie Proctor, my home is directly above the center, the red line. and our property touches the back of that western half. As you will notice all the properties to the north of this proposed development are 4+ acres tracts and we wanted to preserve that feeling of being in the country. Mine is right next to the easement that divides those upper rectangles, and would that become a street? There is also an easement that runs from St. Louis Ave. along the north edge of the east half of the proposed development. Where is all the traffic going to go?

Mr. Stanton explained that in the plat there will be 281 lots roughly over the eighty-two acres. As far as traffic they will have in the beginning two entrances off St. Louis. There are no connections going to the north. They will not be able to build a street to that dedicated right-of-way, because the Army Corp of Engineers protects the wetland that is located in the path of that right-of-way.

Ms. Proctor wanted to know about the intersection of St. Louis Ave. and Fountain Rd., will a light be added?

Mr. Stanton stated that the city has requested a traffic impact for that area. They came back and indicated that there was no need for improvements for St. Louis Ave., even with a full build out.

Ms. Brueckner-Sears asked if there was anyone else in opposition? There were not.

MR. EASTMAN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. MCCULLOUGH THAT CASE 029-22 BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MR. EASTMAN, MS. WARREN, AND MR. MCCULLOUGH VOTED "AYE" MS. STEELE, MR. KIMBLE, MS. PHILLIPS, AND MS. BRUEKNER-SEARS "NAY" (3 IN FAVOR, 4 NAYS) MOTION FAILED.

MS. PHILLIPS MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. KIMBLE THAT CASE 029-22 BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR DENIAL. MOTION CARRIED WITH MS. BRUECKNER-SEARS, MS. STEELE, MR. KIMBLE, AND MS. PHILLIPS "AYE" (4 IN FAVOR, 2 NAYS, 1 ABSTAIN) MR. EASTMAN AND MS. WARREN VOTING "NAY", MR. MCCULLOUGH VOTING "ABSTAIN".