Case 024-23: Vacation of Streets

> Alley-Vacation of Streets-A request to vacate approximately 130 feet of an alley between 508 S. Virginia Ave and 512 S. Virginia Ave-200 Block Commons, LLC

Jeff Neal, 212 S. Joplin Ave. Ste 3, Joplin, Missouri. Mr. Neal stated he represented 200 Block Commons, LLC. The plans were to turn the space that was 508 S. Virginia Ave into a public greenspace. They plan to build 21 apartments.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 018-23.

Ms. Phillips asked about the trash trucks. She said right now there are dumpsters down there.

Mr. Neal stated the alley was vacated in 1916.

Mr. Bellairs stated he had comments from the trash company. He contacted the trash company on behalf of the applicant. The trash company has confirmed they can get into the alley off 6th St and back into the vacated alley running north and south.

Mr. Kimble stated to be clear. They will back in from Virginia or back in from 6th St.

Mr. Bellairs said they will back in from 6th St. He stated that was what they had done in the past and currently.

Ms. Phillips stated she did not want to see a bunch of dumpsters on Main Street or Virginia or 5th or 6th or compactors or roll off containers.

Mr. Neal stated he did not have an answer for them. He said any one of the properties from 6th back could enforce property rights.

Mr. Bolander said nothing was going to change with the trash company. That was something that Mr. Bellairs had done was to contact them to see if this was an issue. According to the trash company this would not change their practice now. They have rights to use it from the property owners and they currently back up to get the trash.

Mr. Neal said to his knowledge because of the bridges that go from the alley to the building across the alley the trash trucks don't generally go under those bridges because of the bridge height. That is also why the fire department won't go in there as well.

Mr. Kimble asked so where would the apartment trash service be located. Next to the front door on the north side of the building or the west side of the building in the back from 6th St alleyway.

Mr. Neal stated they own Pennington Building and our new trash dumpster space will actually be down the alley further behind our building. So, that was our intention to put it on our half of the vacated alley further down so the trash truck would have less space to travel.

Mr. Kimble asked if there was another door exiting that building closer from the apartments. To take out their trash they are going to have to walk down and around the corner and through the alley to the south.

Mr. Neal said no, there is currently a fire escape that goes down and the tenants would basically be walking the same distance they do now because presently they do not have trash service set up. Trash service for the Pennington Lofts as well as the Christman Lofts would be combined. So, there will not be a new dumpster down there. They will end up using the existing dumpster. It may get dumped more than once a week, but they are not increasing the number of dumpsters in the alley.

Mr. Kimble stated but they will have to walk around the corner and south to drop their trash off.

Mr. Neal stated that was correct. The dumpster currently at the Christman building is around the corner and to the north so it is effectively the same distance.

Mr. Jackson asked if they could repeat what the trash company said they would do for trash service. What was the response to the City.

Mr. Bolander stated that was one of the first things they checked on because it was a concern to the City as well. Also, there was a concern from a neighbor or property owner in that area. According to them nothing changes. Currently, they back down the alley from 6th St and then exit from that same alley. Vacated alley, he stated he should mention.

Mr. Jackson said he was just trying to figure out the access point on 6th St.

Ms. Steele stated she thought restaurants and apartment buildings were required by City code to provide an enclosure for the dumpsters. She asked Mr. Neal if he planned to enclose the dumpsters for that many units. Enclosed by a decorative fence or if not decorative well maintained.

Mr. Neal stated he did not at this point and did not think it was a requirement in this case.

Mr. Bolander stated when it is visible from the public right of way that is a requirement but a lot of the newer developments you will see that when it is visible from the public right of way but in this case behind these facilities if it is not visible between buildings you will see that wall or buffer.

Ms. Steele said to take only one parking space. Just a comment.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 024-23.

There were none.

Mr. Neal stated he wanted to make one more comment. They had already received an easement from the City on this property. That easement happened prior to them gaining ownership of the buildings to the north. So, that alley already had an easement that they are allowed to build into which is 8 feet of the 20 feet wide alley. So, at this point the alley had already been reduced to 12 feet wide by the easement they were granted a 1 year or 1-½ year ago. So, the utility of that remaining space becomes less and less.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of Case 024-23.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 024-23.

There were none.

MR. JACKSON MOVED THAT CASE 024-23 BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MR. MCCULLOUGH SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED.
(6 IN FAVOR, 0 NAY, 1 ABSENT)