STILLWATER PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 15, 2025
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OKLAHOMA OPEN MEETING LAW, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED April 11, 2025 IN THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING AT 723 SOUTH LEWIS STREET

MEMBERS PRESENT	STAFF PRESENT
Jana Phillips, Chair	Kim Payne, City Attorney
Riley Williams, Vice Chair	David Barth, Development Services Director
Mark Prather, Member	Joshua Brown, Development Coordinator
Mike Shanahan, Member	Alexandria Maged, Administrative Assistant
David Peters, Member	
MEMBERS ABSENT	Staff Absent
Mark Prather, Member	

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Chair Phillips calls the meeting to order at 5:30pm

2. PUBLIC HEARING

   a. Receive public comment regarding a request for a **MAP AMENDMENT (MA25-02),** to rezone property addressed as 818 E. Krayler Avenue from Commercial Shopping (CS) and Two-Family & Multi-Family (RTM) to Small Lot Single-Family Residential (RSS) district.

Mrs. Kim Payne, Assistant City Attorney requested that no action is to be taken on this item.

Time: 1 minute

   b. Receive public comment regarding a **MAP AMENDMENT (MA25-03)** to rezone properties addressed as 1017 and 1023 S. Husband Street from Two-Family Residential (RT) to Commercial Business (CB) district.

Mr. Joshua Brown, Development Coordinator, presents staff's report and outlines:

- The applicant requests review and approval of a Map Amendment to rezone the properties addressed as 1017 & 1023 S Husband Street from Two-Family Residential (RT) to Commercial Business (CB).
- RT zoning is located to the south, west, and north up to 10th Avenue. CB zoning is located to the east and extends north and south along the South Main Street Commercial Corridor.
- The Future Land Use Map within the Comprehensive Plan indicates that the desired land use for the subject property is Commercial.

Mr. Brown asks if there are any questions; none respond.

Chair Phillips invites the applicant to come forward and present.

Mr. Cory Williams, 621 S Husband, Applicant/Developer, comes to speak on the following:

- Explains that he is requesting Commercial zoning in a primarily residential area due to the wording of the current code.
- There is no existing section of the code that accommodates the type of redevelopment they are proposing.
- Elaborates that the plan is to build 13 single-family residences and notes that the development would be similar to The Lark in downtown Edmond.
- He is planning a pocket community, which in this case would be a zero-lot-line, walkable neighborhood featuring a pocket park.
- He adds that the current City Code does not address this type of development. Although a Planned Unit Development (PUD) is typically used, it is not feasible here because the lot is less than one acre.

Mr. Williams presents plans, to the Planning Commission, for what is planned to be built; explains that he has been working to create more living spaces around downtown Stillwater since 2008; believes the development of strip malls and big-box stores in other parts of town has drawn business away from the downtown area, and that adding more housing nearby will help restore vibrancy to the area; and adds that he has made significant investments in other homes near the proposed property, despite the risks involved due to the poor condition of the buildings.

Commissioner Peters clarifies that the zoning must be changed to Commercial Business in order to build residential homes. Mr. Williams confirms that the current code does not include a section that allows for the type of development being proposed, but hopeful that an update will be made soon.

Commissioner Shanahan notes that this is the kind of development that should be considered in future code revisions under the new Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Williams agrees and states supports for the idea, believes walkable communities with increased density, without stacking residents vertically, are beneficial.

Vice Chair Williams asks, since the current code does not explicitly support the proposed development, what led them to select Commercial Business zoning. Mr. Williams explains that their engineer, Mr. Gose, recommended Commercial Business because it serves as a "catch-all" category within the code.

Mr. Williams adds that they plan to address parking needs by creating spaces in the alley, installing diagonal parking along 11th Avenue, and adding parallel parking on Husband Street; and references *The Lark* and *The Ember* in west Edmond as examples of similar walkable community developments that they aim to emulate.

Chair Phillips states that she has a question for the engineer, Mr. Gose.

Steven Gose, of Gose & Associates, 113 E 8th Ave., introduces himself for the record.

Chair Phillips clarifies that the lot sizes being considered are just under half an acre, which would not qualify for a Planned Unit Development (PUD), as PUDs require a minimum of one acre. Mr. Gose confirms this.

Chair Phillips asks if there were any other factors that influenced his recommendation to apply for Commercial Business zoning. Mr. Gose explains that, according to the zoning district comparison table, Commercial

Business zoning allows for zero setbacks, greater flexibility in parking, and a broader range of permitted uses; and while it doesn't specifically list single-family homes, it does allow for condominium ownership.

Chair Phillips seeks confirmation that condominium ownership is allowed under Commercial Business zoning. Mr. Gose affirms this; and mentions that both he and Chair Phillips serve on the advisory committee for the upcoming code revisions, where options such as overlay districts are being considered to better accommodate non-standard zoning requests, particularly for infill development.

Chair Phillips notes that Commercial Business zoning includes buffer requirements when adjacent to residential zones and asks whether there is an intent to construct those required buffers. Mr. Gose responds that this is indeed the intent; and if complications arise, they will consider seeking a variance from the Board of Adjustment but their preference is to include screening for safety and privacy.

Chair Phillips asks if there are any further questions; none respond.

Chair Phillips opens the public hearing and asks if anyone would like to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Phillips then asks if anyone would like to speak in opposition of the item or if anyone has any questions.

Ms. Sharron Hoaker, of 3220 W. Old Forest Dr., introduces herself for the record; and expresses concern and requests clarification regarding the number of units and the number of lots involved in the project; and also asks how many stories the homes will have.

Mrs. Hoaker presents a notice for the public hearing, which shows two highlighted parcels.

Mr. Williams comes back to the podium and refers to the previously provided images to explain that the project involves two parcels containing a total of six lots, where they intend to build 13 two-story single-family residences; shows the original 25-foot-wide lots, noting that each parcel consists of combined lots, which together form a single address.

Mrs. Hoaker asks whether these are standard lots. Chair Phillips explains that they are standard for the time period in which that part of town was platted.

Mrs. Hoaker follows up by asking if they are considered standard residential lots. Chair Phillips confirms that they are standard for residential lots in that area.

Mrs. Hoaker then asks for clarification on the total combined dimensions. Mr. Williams responds that the total area is 100 feet by 140 feet.

Mrs. Hoaker questions how 13 units can fit on that space. Mr. Williams states that the plans he brought are drawn to scale.

Mrs. Hoaker comments that the houses must be very small. Mr. Williams responds that the units will range from approximately 900 to 1,300 square feet.

Mrs. Hoaker asks how many stories each home will have. Mr. Williams replies that each will be two stories. Mrs. Hoaker then inquires whether the development will encroach onto the street or stay within the standard buildable area.

Chair Phillips asks if anyone else in the audience has questions.

Ms. Jannett Rogers, 1006 S. Husband, introduces herself for the record.

Mrs. Rogers asks whether the property will be accessible via the alleyway.

Chair Phillips again asks if anyone else in the audience has questions; none respond. Chair Phillips invites the applicant back to the podium to address any remaining questions.

Mr. Williams responds that they will not be narrowing the roadway along Husband Street, as they plan to use inset parallel parking; explains that during a pre-development meeting, Stillwater Public Safety reviewed their plans to ensure that fire trucks and other emergency vehicles could still deploy their outriggers; adds that although "No Parking" signs were recently placed on the east side of the street, they are working with the city to remove those signs to accommodate the new development; and the inset parking will be within the existing right-of-way and will not reduce the road's width.

Chair Phillips revisits the earlier question regarding lot sizes for clarification.

Mr. Gose comes forward to explain that there are six originally platted lots, each 25 feet wide; addressing the alley access concern, the alley access is allowed and even encouraged in higher-density areas of town; adds that they've worked on other nearby redevelopment projects where alleys were upgraded for improved access and safety.

Chair Phillips asks him to confirm the number of units and their number of stories. Mr. Gose confirms that the plan includes 13 two-story unit; clarifies that none of the proposed structures will cross property lines or extend into the right-of-way on 11th Street or Husband Street; adds that Commercial Business zoning allows them to build up to the lot lines; In contrast, a standard residential subdivision would typically include 50–60 foot-wide rights-of-way and 50x100-foot lots.

Mrs. Hoaker returns to the podium and asks whether "no setback" means they can build right up to the cars parked along the street. Chair Phillips responds that the setback extends only to the edge of the public right-of-way, not to where vehicles are parked.

Mr. Gose elaborates, explaining that a 100-foot right-of-way includes a 50-foot half-width; of that, 13 feet is allocated for half the street and 18 feet for parking, totaling 31 feet; this leaves 19 feet between the parking area and the property line; and a six-foot sidewalk is typically included within that space.

Mrs. Hoaker asks if a sidewalk will still be included. Mr. Gose replies that, yes, there will be sidewalks on both street frontages.

Chair Phillips asks if there are further questions; none respond.

Chair Phillips closes the public hearing and invites staff back to present findings and alternatives.

Joshua Brown presents findings and alternatives:

Findings:
1. The Land Development Code allows for rezoning of land via Map Amendments.
2. CB zoning is adjacent to the two properties to the east.
3. The Comprehensive Plan calls for commercial uses in this area.

Alternatives and Recommendation:
1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed map amendment as presented.
2. Find that the map amendment is not an appropriate use for the property based upon the impacts to the surrounding vicinity and recommend the City Council disapprove the map amendment.
3. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a certain date.

Joshuan states that staff's recommendation is to accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed map amendment as presented.

Chair Phillips asks for Planning Commission discussion.

Vice Chair Williams states he thinks this is a positive project that fits the area; and that this sounds like the best zoning for the proposed use and the comprehensive plan calls for this zoning in the area.

Vice Chair Williams moves to accept the Map Amendment as presented; Commissioner Peters seconds the motion.

Chair Phillips echoes the sentiments and adds that with a PUD not being applicable to this property this would be the best proposed zoning for the property.

Roll Call:	**Phillips**	**Williams**	**Prather**	**Shanahan**	**Peters**
	Yes	**Yes**	**Absent**	**Yes**	**Yes**

Time: 27 minutes

3. MEETING SUMMARY FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

   a. Regular meeting summary of April 1st, 2025.

Commission Shanahan makes a correction on page one, "where" is corrected to "were".

Commissioner Shanahan moves to accept the minutes as with the minor correction; Vice Chair Williams seconds the motion.

Roll Call:	**Phillips**	**Williams**	**Prather**	**Shanahan**	**Peters**
	Yes	**Yes**	**Absent**	**Yes**	**Yes**

Time: 2 minutes

4. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS FROM STAFF, PLANNING COMMISSIONERS OR CITY ATTORNEY FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

    a. Next Planning Commission Meeting is May 6th, 2025.

5. ADJOURN

ADJOURNMENT. This regular meeting of the Stillwater Planning Commission was called for adjournment by Commissioner Shanahan, seconded by Commissioner Peters at approximately 6:01 PM on April 15, 2025, and the next regularly scheduled meeting will be held Tuesday, May 6, 2025 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Commission Hearing Room, Municipal Building, 723 South Lewis Street.

Prepared by – Alexandria Maged, Administrative Assistant
Reviewed by – Cindy Gibson, Administrative Services

Approved by - _____
Stillwater Planning Commission