

Case 033-21: End of Public Right-of-Way of W. Par Ln. – A request to remove from District R-1 (Single-family Residential) and include in District R-4 (Townhouse) for future residential development- Blake Onstot and Jordan Chapman, 4 State Builders, LLC.

John Bolte, Small Arrow Engineering, 1302 S. Main Street, Joplin, MO. This site was originally in Jasper County and was annexed into the City of Joplin as District R-1 (Single-Family Residential). Moving forward with the design and working with the owner, we realize there is a market need for Townhomes. People would like to own their own home but not having the responsibility of the yard and everything that goes with that. With the increased cost of building materials, we think it is a most efficient project.

Mr. Stanton stated that for clarification, the plat for Case 036-21 on the agenda is the same location and Mr. Bolte may be referencing this plat for the rezoning case.

Mr. Bolte stated that the original request was to rezone the whole parcel from District R-1 to District R-4. We have segmented that and lots 1-4 along Par Lane will stay as District R-1. The cul-de-sac section that extends south against the railroad will contain R-4 units. There is a buffer designed into this transition. There is also a detention basin on the south side of Par Lane. From a traffic impact standpoint, originally, we were going to have 14 units so the traffic would be 14 new residents coming and going to their homes that will now increase to 18 units. There will be double car garages on all units. The value of the construction of these sites would be similar to or exceed homes in the existing neighborhood. There are two floor plans, narrow and deep, also, wide, and shallow. That accommodates the lay of the land. The single-family homes will be 1,700 to 2,000 sq.ft. range.

Mr. Eastman asked if there were any questions for Mr. Bolte. There was not. He also asked if there was anyone in the audience to speak in favor of this case? There was not. Is there anyone in the audience in opposition of this case?

Alex Kindle, 4401 Par Lane, Joplin, MO. Where would the construction entrance be? What is the financial ability of the builder to finish this within a year or two? If it goes on too long then traffic will be obstructed for years, down to one lane.

Mr. Bolte stated the plat is designed for Par Lane extending to the west which is up against the county so there is no access in that direction. Construction access will be occurring along the street, yes that will have to be managed along the street. The land disturbance and runoff control, there will have to be big rock entrance for the trucks to clear any mud or debris for the streets. It will take the better part of construction season to get this developed.

Jerod Huber, 4311 Par Lane, Joplin, MO. He has put a lot of equity into their house, which they have lived in for six years and he feels that multi-family homes will degrade the neighborhood. We are in an HOA which will regulate how we must keep our houses and what we can and cannot do. He also stated that he has two small children, and the traffic would be a concern.

Ms. Phillips has a question for Mr. Huber. Is one of these petitions yours?

Mr. Huber stated that he filled one out this morning. He also mentioned that he did speak to the gentleman that sold the property and it seems the plan has changed multiple times.

John Padaleski, 2025 Twin Hills, Joplin, MO. This area is single-family residential, and he understands that the city cannot enforce HOA rules and regulations. He would be interested to know if this is the same developer that built the two houses on Amber Lane effectively landlocking the property so he would have to come in on Par Lane.

Mark Lane, 2230 S. Fairway Drive, Joplin, MO. His concern is the utilities. The lift stations have had problems in the past. Other concerns are the traffic, the noise, and the property values. There are a lot of families and kids that walk around the neighborhood and with the added traffic it will not be safe like it is now. It will be difficult to get school buses and trash trucks through there. If we had an emergency, they would not be able to get there.

Nancy Corey, 2109 Twin Hills Drive, Joplin, MO. She had lived in this area for 32 years and her concern is the narrow roads. Par Lane is not the standard city width for a street. There are no sidewalks and many of the houses were built before coming into the City of Joplin. Why would the city allow the change from R-1 after the annexation in a single-family residential neighborhood?

Barbara Meyers, 4410 Golf Lane, Joplin, MO. Her concern is that this is a very quiet neighborhood of elderly people, no speeding of traffic, they are allowed to walk and the two houses that were built are country homes. There are horses, it is agricultural, more acreage and this just does not fit in. The plan that she saw was dead ended I do not know what they have done now. There is not a place for the school bus to turn around and that means the children will have to walk at least a quarter of a mile. An ambulance, fire truck and even the mail truck cannot turn around. There are just too many unanswered questions and the owners have changed their minds two or three times.

Barbara Joe, 4282 Amber Lane, Joplin, MO. They moved out there because they did not want to be in the city limits of Joplin. It will hurt our neighborhood and diminish the value of our homes. It will depreciate the privacy we currently have. We absolutely oppose this case.

Ms. McCallister, 2208 Twin Hills Drive, Joplin, MO. This is supposed to be a single-family neighborhood and the traffic will make this very difficult to get in and out of our homes.

Richie Hatfield, 2026 Fairview Drive, Joplin, MO. He is the HOA President at the present time. He is speaking on behalf of all the board members, and they are all in opposition to this build. It will decrease the value of our properties. Par Lane does not meet the width standards, do not know how it will handle that traffic.

Debbie Grother, 2310 Twin Hills Drive, Joplin, MO. She does have concern about the traffic, but she does have a question for the developers. It is her understanding that these were going to be rental properties not homeowners. In the meeting they had it was talk of rentals and now they are saying they are going to sell 18 units. Are you building all 18 units and wait for them to sell or just build one or two units and wait for them to sell?

Mr. Eastman asked if there were anyone else to speak in opposition to this case? There was not. He closed Case 033-21 and asked for a motion.

Ms. Phillips had a question for Mr. Stanton. She wanted to know if all the protest petitions were in the 185 feet or are some out?

Mr. Stanton stated that we have not been able to verify all of them since there were some coming in prior to this meeting. Since our computer systems is not functioning, we do not have the capability to calculate the protest rate in the area yet. Clarification on the protest petitions. If your property is not within the 185 feet that does not mean your petition does not count.

**MS. PHILLIPS MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. MCCULLOUGH THAT CASE 033-21 BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION FOR DENIAL. MOTION CARRIED, WITH MR. EASTMAN, MS. STEELE, MR. KIMBLE, MR. MCCULLOUGH, MS. PHILLIPS, AND MS. WARREN VOTING "AYE", (6 IN FAVOR, 1 ABSENT**