

STILLWATER PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 3RD, 2025
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OKLAHOMA OPEN MEETING
LAW, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED June 2nd 2025 IN THE
MUNICIPAL BUILDING AT 723 SOUTH LEWIS STREET

MEMBERS PRESENT

Riley Williams, Vice Chair
Mark Prather, Member
Mike Shanahan, Member
David Peters, Member

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jana Phillips, Chair

STAFF PRESENT

Tammy Ewing, City Attorney
David Barth, Development Services Director
Henry Bibelheimer, Senior City Planner
Joshua Brown, Development Coordinator
Alexandria Holle-Maged, Administrative Assistant
Staff Absent

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Riley Williams, Vice Chair, calls meeting to order at 5:30pm.

2. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Receive public comment to establish a Planned Unit Development (PUD25-02) in Small Lot Single-Family Residential (RSS) zoning at property addressed as 1924 and 2002 E. McElroy Road.

Vice Chair Williams introduces the item and invites staff up to present.

Mr. Henry Bibelheimer, Sr. City Planner, presents the staff's report.

Mr. Bibelheimer explains that this is a request for a 42 lot PUD and goes over the location of the property, zoning, and relations to it's surroundings.

Mr. Bibelheimer continues by explaining the requested modifications to the land development code including adjustments to the minimum lot size requirements, bulk regulations of Sec23-137 (c) & (d), and parking sec 23-200; and discusses where accesses and streets will be located.

Mr. Bibelheimer discusses the regulations for the planned unit development zoning district:

1. Encourage diversified living environments, and accommodate a mixture of land uses that otherwise, would not be allowed together on the same site;
 - Staff believes the PUD does meet this item.
2. Permit flexibility within the development with respect to area and bulk standards to best utilize the physical features of a particular tract of land that would not be allowed under other circumstances;
 - Staff believes this is not relevant to this particular PUD
3. Provide and preserve meaningful open space, particularly where it is necessary or desirable for such common areas to be shared by more than one owner;
 - Staff believes the PUD does meet this item.

4. Encourage a more efficient use of land, public services, and natural resources than is generally achieved through conventional development;
 - Staff believes the PUD does meet this item.
5. Provide a smooth transition from surrounding densities, intensities, and uses with those proposed in the PUD;
 - Staff does have some concern about the transition to RSL to the north.
6. Encourage the provision of amenities beyond the minimum requirements of conventional development;
 - Staff believes the PUD does meet this item.
7. Encourage accessible and affordable housing.
 - Staff believes the PUD does meet this item.

Commissioner Shanahan asked for clarification on Item #7 from the PUD purpose list, specifically what was meant by "accessible." Mr. Bibelheimer replied that "accessible" was used in the staff report to refer to affordability, not ADA-style accessibility.

Commissioner Shanahan noted that the homes were listed in the upper-\$200K range for a 1,300square foot home and questioned if that could be considered affordable. Mr. Bibelheimer advised that the homes were proposed to be closer to 1,600sqft but the applicant could speak to the pricing more effectively.

Commissioner Prather inquired about what they mean by meaningful open space (Item #3). Mr. Bibelheimer responded that common areas were being provided beyond code requirements with two common areas, the largest being near the detention pond and then a secondary within the middle of the development labeled as "Phase 3."

Vice-Chair Williams asked whether PUDs had their own dimensional requirements or merely allowed flexibility from base zoning. Mr. Bibelheimer responded that a PUD primarily allows flexibility but does include certain limitations; for example, the proposed PUD reflects a gross density of 10.2 units per acre. Mr. Bibelheimer states that under Section 23.306(K) of the code, the maximum density permitted within a PUD is 12 units per acre and this demonstrates that while PUDs are flexible, they are not without regulatory limits.

Vice Chair Williams asked whether a PUD places limitations on minimum lot area, width, or depth. Mr. Bibelheimer responded that it does not; and similarly, no minimum setback standards are imposed by the PUD itself.

Vice Chair Williams then inquired about the side yard setback, which was listed as five feet "internal" and asked whether that referred to the distance from an interior wall to the property line. Mr. Bibelheimer clarified that it does not; instead, the five-foot setback applies to internal lots which are those situated between other residential lots rather than adjacent to a public street. Mr. Bibelheimer provides an example that within an "island" of houses surrounded by roads, the eastern setback of the westernmost lot would be considered internal, while the western side, being adjacent to the street, would follow standard street-facing setback rules.

Commissioner Prather asked when the development code was last updated. Mr. Bibelheimer estimated the last comprehensive update was around 2010.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any more questions for staff; none respond. Vice-Chair Williams asks the applicant or their representative so speak.

Mr. Steven Gose of Gose & Associates, at 113 E. 8th Ave comes to speak on the following:

- 42 homes are proposed on 4.2 acres.
- Density of 10.2 units/acre (which falls between the base RSS allowance of 8 and the PUD max of 12)
- The development has 20 ft front and rear setbacks; 5 ft between buildings.
- Two access points on McElroy—one gated with call box, one for exit only with fire access.
- Propose a 6 ft wood fence and added trees on the west side after meeting with residents. Along the north side, a 6 ft chain link fence was planned to soften the view rather than enclose it.
- Explained the detention pond is planned to go in with Phase one to address drainage, from there they could phase out the streets.
- Addresses one of the concerns from the neighborhood meeting regarding an OG&E utility easements but the set back is behind that and they do plan on dedicating an additional 7 foot of right-of-way to make it a 40 ft right-of-way, currently it is 33ft.
- Discusses that a sidewalk would be added along McElroy, but none within the neighborhood.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there will be no parking signs installed. Mr. Gose confirms that it will either have no street parking signs or they'll paint the fire lane curb red.

Commissioner Prater asks how wide the driveways will be. Mr. Gose reiterates they will be one car wide.

Mr. Gose states that in terms of the cost of the housing, the prices included in the staff report were just a note from the neighborhood meeting and the developer could elaborate.

Vice Chair Williams asks if an HOA would be responsible for the streets. Mr. Gose confirmed the HOA would maintain streets, and fire lanes would be enforced with curb paint or signage.

Vice Chair Williams asked about long-term ownership and rentals. Mr. Gose responds that homes would be permitted as single-family but could be rented; no owner-occupancy mandate would be imposed.

Vice Chair Williams asks why they went with the chain link fence on the north side. Mr. Gose explains with the solid fencing on the east and west side it started to feel more boxed in and this gives it a softer transition.

Mr. Safe Alusi, 2002 E McElroy, developer and property owner, comes to speak on the following:

- Has had the property for a few years now.
- Rezoned to RSS previously.
- Have delayed development for three years out of respect for the Roy family.
- Emphasized that the project aimed to provide "achievable" housing.
- That smaller lot development brings tax revenue and fits the housing needs of students and families.
- Trying to bring a nice, pretty gated community to the surrounding area.

Vice-Chair Williams opens the public hearing and asks if there is anyone that wishes to speak in favor or opposition.

The following come to speak in opposition:

Steve Fairbanks, 1724 E. McElroy

Jacqueline Morrison (Hooper), property owner to the east

Kathy Fairbanks, 1724 E. McElroy
Jen Sanders, 1702 E. McElroy
Larry Roy, speaking on behalf of his mother Jolene Roy at 1819 Linda Ave

The following comments are expressed:

- The PUD is inconsistent with surrounding homes and neighborhoods and he believes the RSS zoning is better suited for the area.
- Raised concerns about traffic on McElroy, lack of sidewalks, fire hazards, and insufficient parking.
- Questioned lawn maintenance history and management oversight.
- Opposed to architectural style, fence height, and economic benefits going out-of-town.
- Questioned use of local labor and materials.
- Opposed development as believes it is incompatible with the surrounding area and potentially unsafe.
- Expressed concern about traffic, children's safety, parking limitations, and privacy.
- Suggested higher fencing and questioned garage usage habits.
- Proposed keeping density to 8 units/acre to improve design flexibility.
- Believes a turn lane should be required.
- Requested clarification on setback distances to adjacent properties.
- Supported original RSS zoning but opposed the PUD.
- Cited incompatibility, potential property devaluation, and water runoff concerns.
- Disputed the claim that it would resemble Wedgewood.

Mr. Gose comes back up to address some concerns:

- In regard to infrastructure capacity, states that so far the city engineering review model showed no issues.
- For the sidewalks, they will be installing a sidewalk on McElroy along the property.
- For the setbacks, there will be 20–22 ft from the surround property lines.

Mr. Alusi also addresses some of the proposed questions.

- Shows the proposed architectural images to address the question on aesthetics.
- Highlighted his ties to Stillwater and stated there would be a use of local labor.
- Have looked at many different plans for the neighborhood and they have reduced density from earlier versions.
- Was a former firefighter/paramedic and fire safety has been seriously considered outlining that new construction fire standards are much higher than they used to be.
- Reiterated that these homes would be producing additional property tax for the city.
- Explained there would be HOA governance, and added value of gated design.
- Reiterated that they would be using local suppliers and labor.

Commissioner Prather asked for clarification on guest parking location per the discussed parking concerns. Mr. Gose shows on the map where the guest parking was located in Phase 1 near the detention and Phase 2 near the east side of the island.

Vice Chair Williams asked if there was a traffic study done on McElroy. Mr. Gose says they are significantly under the requirements to trigger a traffic study.

Vice Chair Williams asked if they considered the 32-unit density. Mr. Gose says they have looked at many different iterations for this site plan, this is what is most effective for the space.

Commissioner Peters observed that it is possible to put less units on it. Mr. Gose confirmed that there is only two houses currently but practically for the development, the economics of that do not work.

Vice Chair Williams brought up the point of fencing height and that residents asked for 7–8 ft fences). Mr. Alusi explained that as long as they didn't have to remove trees they could be flexible with the fence height.

Mr. Bibelheimer presents staff findings, alternatives, and recommendation.

Findings:

1. The proposed use of Conventional Single-Family is allowed by right in the RSS zoning district.
2. PUD-25-02 requests significant variations to the lot size requirements, to facilitate the increased density.
3. The Proposed Planned unit Development substantially meted the purpose of a PUD found in SEC.23-295
4. SEC.23-308 states that "The approved preliminary PUD may serve as the PUD preliminary plat."

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Planned Unit Development.
2. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Planned Unit Development subject to specific conditions being met.
3. Find that the Planned Unit Development is not an appropriate use for the property based upon the impacts to the surrounding vicinity and do not recommend that the City Council approve the request.
4. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a certain date.

Recommendation:

Based on the surrounding land uses, staff recommends approval of the proposed Planned Unit Development for Cowboy Landing.

Commissioner Prather voices concerns about density and parking.

Vice Chair Williams agreed but noted that the parking concerns would be something people would have to consider before deciding to move there.

Commissioner Prather says he likes the aesthetics.

Commissioner Peters says he agrees that there are a lot of nice features but believes the density is an issue.

Commissioner Shanahan says he too thinks scale is an issue here but needs to be balanced with the need for housing; that he has seen a few similar cases come though with similar issues and although there are some drawbacks, the Planning Commission needs to weigh the benefits; and continues that they should maybe consider additional requirements for additional screening/fencing.

Commissioner Prather says he does think this meets the seven (7) conditions of a PUD.

Commissioner Prather moved to recommend approval of the PUD to City Council with two conditions:

- 1. Fence on west side (wood) to be a minimum of 8 feet.**
- 2. Fence on east side to be a minimum of 7 feet**

Vice Chair Williams Seconds the motion.

Roll Call:	Phillips	Williams	Prather	Shanahan	Peters
	Absent	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Time: 1 hour 6 minutes

3. MEETING SUMMARY FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION

- a. Regular meeting Summary of May 6th, 2025

Vice Chair Williams lists corrections to positions of the commissioners as well as one page 1, one of the dates from his talking point needs to be corrected from 2025 to 2015

Commissioner Peters moved to approve the minutes with corrections. Commissioner Peters seconds the motion.

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

Time: 2 minutes

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

- a. Next Regular Meeting is June 24th 2025

3. ADJOURN

ADJOURNMENT. This regular meeting of the Stillwater Planning Commission was called for adjournment by Commissioner Peters, seconded by Commissioner Shanahan at approximately 6:39 PM on June 6th, 2025 the next regularly scheduled meeting will be held Tuesday, June 24th 2025 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Commission Hearing Room, Municipal Building, 723 South Lewis Street.

Prepared by – Alexandria Holle Maged, Administrative Assistant

Reviewed by – Cindy Gibson, Administrative Services Manager

Approved by - 
Stillwater Planning Commission