

## Case 068-22: Site Plan Review

634 N. Main St.-A request to review a site plan-Gus Properties, LLC.

Bob Higginbotham, P.O. Box 687 Webb City, Missouri. Mr. Higginbotham stated this location is a duplicate of a building that he has done two additional times in the City. The last one was at 6<sup>th</sup> & Jackson and they have received an overwhelming response in the neighborhood. The consensus of the neighborhood was that it had improved the neighborhood greatly. He stated they will be building the same 12-unit apartment building. The variance will be they will be adding a triplex on that location as well. He referred to the site-plan provided to the Commissioners is a result of collaboration with the City in pre-development. He stated they had a lot of conversations about traffic flow and the speed of traffic on Main Street. How to bring tenants into these areas and back out safely.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were any questions from the Commission on Case 068-22.

Mr. McCullough asked how many units total.

Mr. Higginbotham replied 15 total, 12 in the one building and a tri-plex with three in the other building.

Mr. Jackson asked about the access into the property. Would they be able to turn in off of street into the alley. Would that be the access points in.

Mr. Higginbotham stated yes, the west alley of the property would be the safest place for ingress and egress into those locations. He stated they had looked at the traffic flow there and the speeds. The speed limit is low but the typical speeds up to there are well in advance of 55 and 60 miles per hour commonly. He stated it posed a great danger to drop out on to Main Street or to try and bring traffic in off Main Street.

Mr. Jackson asked if there was an exit point off Main Street or did he misread that.

Mr. Higginbotham stated no, he did not believe there was. They looked at the ingress and egress for fire trucks up the alley and the trash trucks. Everything in the pre-development meeting suggested they could handle the flow of the traffic and what support system was needed there.

Mr. Kimble asked if the Commission had additional questions on Case 068-22.

Mr. Kimble asked so the alley can support trash trucks obviously going through there more or less. He stated this may bleed over into the City as far as the question goes as well but if two people were to come together face to face someone would have to have the foresight to pull out and let someone come out because it is narrow. Mr. Kimble asked if there would be any widening of the alley way to accommodate for two cars or two vehicles to get by, if need be, without creating any congestion.

Mr. Higginbotham stated there are no plans to widen the alley way. He stated there was talk on the City's part they may have to visit the condition of the alley way itself. It is paved in large part there or asphalted. He stated the entrances into the development had a line of sight all the way to the crest of the hill to the south as well as to F street itself. So, it is easy to see before you leave the parking lot what is occurring in the alley.

Mr. Kimble asked if the Commission had additional questions on Case 068-22.

Mr. Jackson stated the site plan did reflect an exit on North Main Street. It shows the exit to be for south bound traffic.

Mr. Higginbotham stated that was not necessarily an error. It was in discussion in the pre-development meeting. We discussed whether we would put one there or not. The result in the pre-development meeting was the City would leave that to his discretion. He stated he indicated to them that once we spend some time up there and it looked like we could do it safely. He stated his concern was funneling cars out on to Main Street. He stated it would be of negligible costs to put an exit there, but he did not know if it was prudent.

Mr. Jackson stated it made sense to make it for south bound traffic only.

Mr. Higginbotham asked how that would be enforced, that was the question that came up. That was the topic brought up in the pre-development meeting. How would you stop traffic from going the other direction. He stated at the apex of that hill you are just asking for trouble there.

Mr. Kimble asked if the Commission had additional questions on Case 068-22.

Ms. Steele stated she did not have a question just a comment as a Commissioner. She stated that she thought Mr. Higginbotham was putting a lot of living space in a very small area.

Mr. Higginbotham stated he understood why she was saying that, but he had done it successfully in three other locations but this exact building in two. He stated it had not

been an undue burden. He stated he did not have any complaints on traffic and both neighborhoods, really all three have no issues or complaints. He stated as a matter of fact he had very positive feedback with the same exact building in more dense areas than this. He stated he understood why it looked that way, but he had replicated this in the city limits with success and with no negative experience by the neighbors.

Mr. Jackson asked if this was the same structure off Wall Street by the downtown loop.

Mr. Higginbotham stated yes at 1<sup>st</sup> and Wall. Also, the same structure at 6<sup>th</sup> and Jackson. He stated at 6<sup>th</sup> and Jackson they had a neighbor contact them this past week and let them know they are grateful for what they did in the neighborhood. They stated it was a great improvement. Mr. Higginbotham stated it was vacant land the City had taken over that had dilapidated buildings on it. He stated the neighbors had been appreciative thus far.

Mr. Bolander stated for clarification when we review the plans, we look at the density and it does meet the maximum density requirements of our code at this location.

Mr. Kimble asked if there were additional questions or comments from the Commission on Case 068-22.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of Case 068-22.

There were none.

Mr. Kimble asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Case 068-22.

There were none.

**MR. JACKSON MOVED THAT CASE 068-22 BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MR. ROSENBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED. (5 IN FAVOR, 0 NAYS, 2 ABSENT)**