Text Amendment Procedures

Applicability. Amendments to these regulations that are generally applicable throughout the city or in specific districts, or are uniformly applied to certain situations, may be initiated by the property owner, the City Council or the Planning Commission, or by Staff on behalf of these entities.

Review Criteria. A text amendment shall be reviewed according to the following criteria:

1. The amendment furthers the purposes of these regulations in Section 1.01.B.
2. The amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan and has been considered for both its long-range affects as well as immediate impacts.
3. The amendment promotes the public health, safety, quality of life and general welfare of the community in the City of Joplin.

Review Procedures. In addition to the general requirements in Table 2-1 and Section 2.01, the following requirements are specific to text amendment applications.

1. Applications may be accompanied by a related comprehensive plan amendment, or more specific plan, provided that amendment or plan has meet all of the legal and policy requirements for plan approvals independent of the proposed text amendment.
2. The City Council may recommend the application be returned to Planning Commission for further study or additional information at its next regular meeting. Failure by the Planning Commission to consider or revise its recommendation shall be considered a resubmission of its original recommendation.
3. The Planning Commission may recommend or City Council may approve a lessor change than was proposed in the notice, when considering the proposed change relative to the currently applicable standards.

Effect of Decision. Amendments to the text of these regulations shall be approved by the City Council in the form of an ordinance, and be effective after the date specified in the ordinance. The Director shall incorporate approved amendments into this code by reference to the specific amending ordinance, and indicate the newly applicable provisions and the replaced provisions, or by recodification of the official code that incorporates the approved amendment.

Text Amendment Application

Return Form to:
Planner
Joplin City Hall
602 S. Main Street
Joplin, Missouri 64801
417-624-0820 Ext. 1511
Zoning-Planning@JoplinMO.org

Office Use Only
Case No.: 010-26
Filing Fee: $550.00
Received: 2/3/26
Date Advertised: _____
Proj. No.: 26-013
Public Hearing Date: 3/9/26-PNZ
4/6/26
-CC

Applicant: Tyler Casey / Pro X Inc. Phone No.: 620-687-0425

Address: 809 Katherine Avenue, Joplin, MO Email: tyler@proxproperty.com

Owner: Tyler Casey Phone No.: 620-687-0425

Address: 809 Katherine Avenue, Joplin, MO Email: tyler@proxproperty.com

Section to be Amended: Joplin Municipal Code, Appendix 29 A (Joplin Development Code), Article 5. Building and Development Standards, Section 1. Residential Development ~~Standards, Table 5-02.~~

Present Text: ☐ ☐ Duplex / Multi-unit House
~~6K - 12K s.f.~~
3K s.f. per unit
2 - 4 units

Reason for Amendment:
To allow Duplex/Multi-Unit House in the R-2 District, under limited applicability. Substantial data and justification is attached to ~~this application, this type of land use restriction negatively~~ impacts housing affordability, private investment and job creation.

Does the Amendment...:

Yes No

(X) ( ) Add language to the Development Code?

○	⊗	Supplement an existing section?
⊗	○	Modify an existing section?
○	⊗	Repeal an existing section?

Submission of Documents: The following documents are **required** at time of submission.

Yes	No	
⊗	○	Completed and signed application.
⊗	○	One thumb drive of a .docx copy of the proposed amendment.

Applications that are incomplete or missing required documents will **not** be processed or scheduled on an agenda to the Planning & Zoning Commission until corrected and resubmitted.

Signature: Tyler Casey **Date:** 2/2/2026

docusign

Certificate Of Completion

Envelope Id: FFEB2AD3-BE54-4124-8D70-5951AF03F44B
Status: Completed
Subject: Complete with Docusign: Blank TextAmendmentApplication2022Fillable.pdf
Source Envelope:
Document Pages: 3
Signatures: 1
Certificate Pages: 1
Initials: 0
AutoNav: Enabled
EnvelopeId Stamping: Disabled
Time Zone: (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada)

Envelope Originator:
Tyler Casey
101 S Broadway
Pittsburg, KS 66762
tyler@proxproperty.com
IP Address: 67.235.135.49

Record Tracking

Status: Original
2/2/2026 2:25:53 PM
Holder: Tyler Casey
tyler@proxproperty.com
Location: DocuSign

Signer Events	Signature	Timestamp
Tyler Casey tyler@proxproperty.com CEO Pro X Franchising LLC Security Level: Email, Account Authentication (None)	Tyler Casey Signature Adoption: Pre-selected Style Using IP Address: 67.235.135.49	Sent: 2/2/2026 2:36:47 PM Viewed: 2/2/2026 2:36:55 PM Signed: 2/2/2026 2:36:59 PM

Electronic Record and Signature Disclosure:
Not Offered via Docusign

In Person Signer Events	Signature	Timestamp

Editor Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Agent Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Intermediary Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Certified Delivery Events	Status	Timestamp

Carbon Copy Events	Status	Timestamp

Witness Events	Signature	Timestamp

Notary Events	Signature	Timestamp

Envelope Summary Events	Status	Timestamps
Envelope Sent	Hashed/Encrypted	2/2/2026 2:36:47 PM
Certified Delivered	Security Checked	2/2/2026 2:36:55 PM
Signing Complete	Security Checked	2/2/2026 2:36:59 PM
Completed	Security Checked	2/2/2026 2:36:59 PM

Payment Events	Status	Timestamps

Proposed Zoning Text Amendment

City of Joplin Zoning Code
Section 5.01 – Table 5-02 (Dimensional Standards)

Current Standard (R-2 District):
Minimum Lot Area: **7,800 square feet**

Proposed Amendment:
Minimum Lot Area: **6,000 square feet**

All other dimensional standards remain unchanged.

Applicant's Rationale & Findings

1. Excessive and Unworkable Land Use Restriction

A review of existing platted lots within the City of Joplin reveals that **there are effectively no R-2 zoned lots that meet the current 7,800 square-foot minimum lot size requirement**. As a result, the standard functions as a **de facto prohibition** on new development within the R-2 zoning district rather than a reasonable regulation.

This condition exceeds what is necessary to accomplish legitimate land-use objectives and represents an **excessive restriction on property rights**.

---

2. Conflict With the Intent of the R-2 Zoning District

The R-2 zoning district is intended to accommodate **duplexes and low-density multifamily housing** as a transitional housing type between single-family neighborhoods and higher-density residential areas.

In practice, the current minimum lot size:

- Prevents duplex and small multifamily development
- Forces R-2 zoned land to function **no differently than single-family zoning**
- Undermines the original policy intent of the zoning classification

Reducing the minimum lot size to 6,000 square feet restores the district's intended function without increasing allowed density beyond what the district already permits.

---

3. Negative Impact on Housing Supply and Affordability

The current standard directly:

- Reduces housing supply
- Limits housing type diversity
- Decreases consumer choice
- Contributes to upward pressure on housing costs

By preventing otherwise lawful development, the regulation **artificially constrains housing production**, which is contrary to widely accepted housing affordability principles and local economic development goals.

---

4. Economic Development and Employment Impacts

The restriction has broader economic consequences, including:

- Fewer construction projects
- Reduced demand for local construction trades
- Decreased private investment
- Lower property tax base growth

Lots that are zoned and intended for multifamily development remain **vacant or underutilized**, resulting in lost economic activity and foregone municipal revenue that could otherwise support essential city services.

---

5. Consistency With Existing Development Patterns

A 6,000 square-foot minimum lot size:

- Aligns with existing platted lot sizes throughout Joplin
- Is consistent with historic development patterns
- Allows modest infill development without altering neighborhood character
- Does not increase height, bulk, or use intensity beyond what R-2 already permits

This amendment corrects a dimensional mismatch rather than introducing new development pressure.

---

6. Public Benefit

The proposed amendment will:

- Increase feasible housing production
- Support workforce housing needs
- Encourage reinvestment in underutilized areas
- Expand the local tax base
- Create construction and related jobs
- Better align zoning regulations with adopted land-use goals

---

Conclusion

The current 7,800 square-foot minimum lot size in the R-2 zoning district is not supported by existing conditions, zoning intent, or public benefit outcomes. Reducing the minimum to 6,000 square feet is a **measured, data-driven correction** that restores functionality to the zoning district while advancing housing availability, affordability, and economic vitality in the City of Joplin.

The Impact of Minimum Lot Size Regulations on Housing Supply, Affordability, and Economic Development

A Justification for Amending the R-2 Minimum Lot Size Requirement in Joplin, Missouri

Abstract

Minimum lot size regulations are a common zoning tool intended to manage density and neighborhood character. However, when set above prevailing development patterns, these standards can operate as exclusionary constraints that limit housing supply, reduce affordability, and suppress economic activity. This paper examines empirical research on land-use regulation and housing markets and applies those findings to the City of Joplin's R-2 zoning district. Evidence indicates that the existing 7,800 square-foot minimum lot size functions as an excessive restriction that prevents development consistent with the district's intent. Reducing the requirement to 6,000 square feet is supported by planning theory, housing economics, and public interest outcomes.

---

1. Introduction

Local zoning ordinances play a central role in shaping housing supply and urban form. Among these regulations, minimum lot size requirements directly influence development feasibility by determining whether parcels can be used at all. When such standards are misaligned with existing lot patterns or zoning intent, they can unintentionally eliminate permitted housing types, reduce housing supply, and increase costs.

In the City of Joplin, the R-2 zoning district is intended to accommodate duplexes and low-density multifamily housing. However, the current minimum lot size of 7,800 square feet has resulted in a condition where virtually no existing R-2 lots are developable under the ordinance, effectively nullifying the district's purpose.

---

2. Minimum Lot Size Regulations and Housing Supply

A substantial body of economic research finds that restrictive land-use regulations, including minimum lot sizes, reduce housing supply by limiting the number of units that can be built on available land.

Glaeser and Gyourko (2003) demonstrate that artificial regulatory constraints, rather than construction costs, are a primary driver of housing scarcity in regulated markets. Similarly, Glaeser, Gyourko, and Saks (2005) find that zoning constraints significantly reduce housing elasticity, meaning markets are unable to respond to increased demand with new supply.

Minimum lot size requirements are particularly impactful because they can render otherwise viable parcels undevelopable, leading to underutilized land and suppressed housing production (Pendall, 2000).

---

3. Effects on Housing Affordability

The relationship between land-use restrictions and housing affordability is well documented. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Federal Reserve have both concluded that restrictive zoning increases housing prices by limiting supply.

A national study by the National Bureau of Economic Research found that metropolitan areas with stricter land-use regulations experience significantly higher housing prices and rents, even after controlling for income and demand factors (Gyourko, Saiz, & Summers, 2008).

HUD (2021) specifically identifies minimum lot size requirements as a regulatory barrier that disproportionately increases housing costs by mandating higher land consumption per unit, thereby increasing per-unit land costs and excluding more affordable housing types.

---

4. Misalignment With Zoning Intent

Planning best practices emphasize that zoning regulations should implement, not undermine, stated land-use objectives. When dimensional standards prevent the development of permitted uses, the regulation functions as a de facto prohibition rather than a reasonable control.

In the case of Joplin's R-2 district, the minimum lot size effectively restricts development to single-family homes, despite duplexes and multifamily uses being permitted. This phenomenon is consistent with findings by Pendall (2000), who notes that large-lot zoning often serves to exclude multifamily and moderate-density housing, even where nominally allowed.

---

5. Economic and Fiscal Impacts

Restrictive zoning not only affects housing markets but also has broader economic consequences. Research by the Brookings Institution finds that land-use constraints reduce construction activity, limit job creation in the building trades, and suppress local economic growth (Molloy, 2016).

Additionally, undeveloped or underdeveloped land generates fewer property tax revenues than improved parcels, reducing fiscal capacity for local governments (Been, Ellen, & O'Regan, 2019). By preventing feasible development, excessive lot size requirements contribute to lost investment and foregone municipal revenue.

---

6. Policy Implications for Joplin

Reducing the minimum lot size in the R-2 zoning district from 7,800 to 6,000 square feet aligns with empirical research and planning best practices by:

- Restoring the functional intent of the zoning district
- Enabling modest infill and low-density multifamily development
- Increasing housing supply without increasing allowed use intensity
- Supporting affordability through reduced per-unit land costs
- Encouraging private investment and construction employment

Importantly, the proposed standard remains consistent with existing neighborhood patterns and does not introduce new uses, heights, or densities beyond those already permitted.

---

7. Conclusion

Academic research consistently demonstrates that excessive land-use restrictions, including minimum lot size requirements, reduce housing supply, increase housing costs, and constrain economic development. In Joplin, the current R-2 minimum lot size functions as an effective prohibition on intended development, contrary to sound planning principles and public interest outcomes.

Reducing the minimum lot size to 6,000 square feet represents a targeted, evidence-based amendment that corrects a regulatory misalignment while advancing housing affordability, economic vitality, and zoning consistency.

References

Been, V., Ellen, I. G., & O'Regan, K. (2019). *Supply skepticism: Housing supply and affordability.* Housing Policy Debate, 29(1), 25–40.

Glaeser, E. L., & Gyourko, J. (2003). *The impact of building restrictions on housing affordability.* Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review, 9(2), 21–39.

Glaeser, E. L., Gyourko, J., & Saks, R. E. (2005). *Why have housing prices gone up?* American Economic Review Papers & Proceedings, 95(2), 329–333.

Gyourko, J., Saiz, A., & Summers, A. (2008). *A new measure of the local regulatory environment for housing markets.* Urban Studies, 45(3), 693–729.

Molloy, R. (2016). *Regulation and housing supply.* Brookings Institution.

Pendall, R. (2000). *Local land use regulation and the chain of exclusion.* Journal of the American Planning Association, 66(2), 125–142.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2021). *Removing regulatory barriers to affordable housing.*

Data-Backed Comparison: A High-Restriction City vs. a Low-Restriction City (San Francisco vs. Houston)

To illustrate how land-use restrictiveness can correlate with housing affordability outcomes, consider **San Francisco, California** (a high-regulation environment with complex and discretionary approvals) compared to **Houston, Texas** (the largest major U.S. city widely described as operating **without conventional zoning**).

1) Land-use regulatory posture (qualitative comparison)

- **Houston:** Scholarly literature frequently identifies Houston as the only major North American city without formal zoning, relying instead on a mix of subdivision rules, deed restrictions, and targeted regulations rather than comprehensive use-based zoning. ScienceDirect
- **San Francisco:** California's Housing and Community Development department has described San Francisco as an outlier in approvals, citing the city's use of broadly discretionary review and a complex approvals environment that increases uncertainty and delay for housing development. California Housing Department

2) Housing affordability outcomes (quantitative comparison)

Home prices (median):

- **San Francisco:** median home sale price ~**$1.5 million** (Nov 2025). Redfin
- **Houston:** median home sale price ~**$350,000** (Nov 2025). Redfin

Median household income (Census QuickFacts):

- **San Francisco: $141,446** (2019–2023, in 2023 dollars). Census.gov
- **Houston: $62,894** (2019–2023, in 2023 dollars). Census.gov

Price-to-income (simple affordability indicator):
Using the above figures, the **median home price is ~10.6× median household income in San Francisco**, compared to **~5.6× in Houston** (computed from cited Redfin price and Census income figures). Census.gov+3Redfin+3Redfin+3

Rents (median advertised rent):

- **San Francisco:** median rent **$3,595** (Dec 2025). Zumper - Apartments for Rent & Houses
- **Houston:** median rent **$1,523** (Dec 2025). Zumper - Apartments for Rent & Houses

Rent-to-income (rough burden proxy):
Using median advertised rent (annualized) divided by Census median household income, rent equals **~30.5% of median household income in San Francisco** and **~29.1% in Houston** (computed from cited Zumper rent and Census income figures). While this is not a perfect measure of renter burden (because "median household income" includes owner households and "median advertised rent" reflects current listings), the comparison still shows that **Houston achieves far lower nominal rents and prices** and a substantially lower price-to-income ratio. Census.gov+3Zumper - Apartments for Rent & Houses+3Zumper - Apartments for Rent & Houses+3

3) Interpretation for the Joplin minimum lot size amendment

The San Francisco–Houston contrast is not proof of single-cause explanation (many factors also matter: regional demand, geography, job growth, and building costs). However, it is consistent

with the broader literature: **when regulatory structures add discretionary friction or reduce feasible housing capacity, supply responsiveness tends to fall and affordability pressures rise**. In that context, a minimum lot size that renders an intended residential district effectively unbuildable operates as a capacity constraint similar in kind (if not scale) to other exclusionary rules documented in the housing economics and planning literature