

**STILLWATER PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 8TH, 2025
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OKLAHOMA OPEN MEETING
LAW, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED July 3rd, 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

STAFF PRESENT

Kim Payne, Assistant City Attorney
David Barth, Development Services Director
Henry Bibelheimer, Senior City Planner
Joshua Brown, Development Coordinator
Alexandria Holle-Maged, Administrative Assistant

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jana Phillips, Chair

Staff Absent

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Vice Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Receive public comment regarding a request for a Specific Use Permit (SUP24-01) for a medical marijuana dispensary in the Commercial Shopping (CS) district at property addressed as 209 N. Perkins Road.

Mr. Josh Brown, Development Coordinator, presents staff report and asks if there are any questions.

Vice Chair Williams asks if this is a new dispensary. Mr. Brown responds that it is an existing dispensary moving to this new location.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any further questions for staff; none respond. Vice-Chair Williams asks the applicant or representative to come forward.

Mr. Brian Dowel, 209 S Perkins Rd., representative for Vice Dispensary comes to the podium and states that they have another location in town which will remain open and this will be a second location.

Mrs. Kim Payne, Assistant City Attorney asked for clarification that they are moving a existing license they have to this location because there is a moratorium on new dispensaries. Mr. Dowel confirms they have a location in Stillwater that is not moving but they have another location outside of Stillwater they are moving to this location.

Mrs. Payne reiterates that this is a transfer of an existing license and points out that the license included in the packet states that it expired but staff verified with OMMA it was actually valid though October.

Discussion is held regarding the moratorium; the state has put a moratorium on new licenses; it's been in effect since 2022; most of what the Planning Commission sees are licenses that businesses are transferring which are still valid as no new ones are being issued; and there is no known time frame for the moratorium.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any further questions for the applicant; none respond. Vice Chair Williams opens the public hearing and asks if anyone would like to speak in favor or opposition; none respond. Vice-Chair Williams closes the public hearing and asks for staff findings and alternatives.

Mr. Brown returns to present findings and alternatives, which are:

Findings:

1. The Land Development Code allows medical marijuana dispensaries in the Commercial Shopping (CS) zoning district with a Specific Use Permit.
2. The Comprehensive Plan calls for Commercial uses at the property's location.

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed specific use permit.
2. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council conditionally approve the proposed specific use permit subject to conditions being met which can include, but are not limited to:
3. Find that the specific use permit 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.

Staff recommends approval of this Specific Use Permit

Commissioner Peters moved, Commissioner Shanahan seconded to approve the Specific Use Permit as presented.

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

Time: 7 minutes

- b. Receive public comment regarding a Preliminary Plat (SUB25- 10) in the Small Lot Single-Family Residential zoning district with a Planned Unit Development overlay (RSS_PUD) at property addressed as 505 E. 18th Avenue.

Mr. Joshua Brown, Development Coordinator, presents the item and discusses the following points:

- Shows maps of the location and in relation to surrounding properties.
- Explains it is 15 lots and one (1) outlot.
- In April 2021, the preliminary PUD was approved by Planning Commission, and per Section 23.308, the preliminary PUD may serve as the project's preliminary plat, which is the case in this situation.
- In May of 2021, the PUD was approved by City Council, and then an ordinance passed in June of 2021 officially rezoning the property from light industrial to RSS, or small-lot single-family residential.
- Per Section 23.63.F.2, the preliminary plat — or preliminary PUD — shall expire two years from the date of approval unless a final plat of any portion is filed.
- That didn't occur and it's been four years; therefore, the preliminary plat has expired.
- The applicant seeks to move forward with the final plat because improvements are progressing.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any questions for staff; none respond. Vice Chair Williams asks the applicant or representative to come forward.

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

- This project started this back in 2021.
- There were some off-site water improvements necessary that Habitat and the City partnered on to get a waterline in Fern upgraded and looped.
- The on-site improvements are done and where the homes go now has been graded.
- The sewer lines are stubbed up, and they're working on paving that parking area in the middle.
- Explains this has been on hold with Habitat for a variety of reasons but now that they're ready to start getting closer for those homes and they received some state funding for construction for a few of those homes, they're ready now to get the final plat approved.

Commissioner Prather asks for some clarification on some of the addresses as it varies in the packet. Mr. Gose clarifies that the 18th Avenue address is the Habitat office, which was the original address and the 19th address is where the actual plat is going to be.

Commissioner Prather asks if anything has changed from the original submittal. Mr. Gose says everything is the same except the title which says preliminary site plan and preliminary plat.

Vice Chair Williams opens the public hearing and asks if anyone would like to speak in favor or opposition; none respond.

Vice-Chair Williams closes the public hearing and asks for findings and alternatives.

Mr. Brown returns to present findings and alternatives, which are:

Findings:

1. The proposed preliminary plat matches the preliminary plat/PUD which was approved in 2021.
2. The Comprehensive Plan recommends Low Density Residential uses at this location.
3. The proposed density is in alignment with the RSS-PUD zoning requirements.

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and approve the proposed preliminary plat as presented.
2. Approve the proposed preliminary plat with conditions, noting what conditions should be met for the approval of the final plat.
3. Reject findings and deny the proposed preliminary plat as presented.
4. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a decision and table the request to a certain date noting that action must be taken within 60 days of the public hearing.

Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat as presented.

Commissioner Prather moved to accept the preliminary plat as presented, Commissioner Shanahan seconds.

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

Time: 7 minutes

- c. Receive public comment regarding a request for a Map Amendment (MA25-04) to rezone property addressed as 320 S. Walnut Street from Small Lot Single-Family Residential (RSS) to Two-Family Residential (RT). (Tabled from the June 24th, 2025 meeting.

Mr. Joshua Brown, Development Coordinator, presents the item and discusses the following points:

- Shows pictures of the subject property, surrounding area and zoning.
- Shares a definition taken directly from the comprehensive plan: it states that “within the low-density residential category, conventional single-family detached dwellings, two-family units, and low-density multifamily are found — with single-family being the primary.”
- The gross density allows for up to 20 dwelling units per acre this proposal is 9.68 dwelling units per acre, three townhomes, three units.
- In August 2024, the Planning Commission heard a map amendment which proposed to rezone this property from RSS to RTM, the Planning Commission recommended denial of that request with a 5-to-0 vote.
- The map amendment was then withdrawn by the applicant before being heard by the City Council.
- This request was tabled from the June 24th, 2025 meeting.

Commissioner Shanahan asks Mr. Brown to refresh them on the reasons the previous item was denied. Mr. Brown explains that RTM is the most intensive multifamily zoning district and the Planning Commissioners previously felt that that was too intense for being next to the RSS Westwood Overlay. Mr. Brown states that staff believes this zoning is a better step down transition.

Vice Chair Williams adds that at the previous meeting the developer did not have a plan for what would be constructed.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any further questions for staff; none respond. Vice Chair Williams invites the applicant forward to present.

Mr. Aaron Ferguson of Bancroft Design, 923 S. Lowry, comes to speak on the following:

- They have looked at a couple different zoning options, and the developer looked at a couple different ideas on what he wants to do with the property.
- States that the property meets the dimension requirements for RTM and RMI.
- Continues that Initially they looked at rezoning to RMI, but even though it meets the code dimension requirements, it doesn't meet the code overall area requirements for those zonings.
- Are requesting to rezone to RT because it gives more flexibility on the specific use of townhomes.
- There are apartments across the street and just down the street, so they believe this is in line with those uses.
- That staff had a couple issues with parking and with the dumpster location but thinks those have been resolved to staff satisfaction.

Vice Chair Williams clarifies that the next item on the agenda is the applicant applying for a Specific Use Permit to construct town homes. Mr. Ferguson confirms, and states there is a site plan included.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any further questions; none respond. Vice Chair Williams opens the public hearing and asks if anyone would like to speak in favor or opposition; none respond. Vice-Chair Williams closes the public hearing and asks for findings and alternatives.

Mr. Brown first clarifies that townhomes are allowed in RSS and RT with a SUP; the reason for the RT request is the density requirements; believes in RSS it is 8 units per acre, and then in RT it is 11 units per acre; and the applicant is proposing 9.68.

Mr. Brown presents findings and alternatives, which are:

Findings:

1. The Land Development Code allows for the rezoning of land via Map Amendments.
2. RTM and RMI are located in the vicinity to the east and southeast with various high-density further east of the subject property.
3. The proposed townhomes align with the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for Low-Density Residential for the subject property location.

Alternatives:

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 do not recommend that the City Council approve 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.

Staff recommends Alternative 1.

Vice Chair Williams says he believes this zoning is better than what was previously presented as it allows for more of a transition zoning.

Commissioner Shanahan moved to accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed map amendment as presented , Commissioner Prather seconds.

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

Time: 10 minutes

- d. Receive public comment regarding a request for a Specific Use Permit (SUP25-03) for property addressed as 320 S. Walnut Street to allow townhomes in the Two-Family Residential (RT) district. (Tabled from the June 24th, 2025 meeting.)

Mr. Brown, Development Coordinator, presents staff report and discusses the following points:

- Shows the item and reiterates this is in relation to the previous site.
- There is a conceptual site plan and it does meet all setbacks.
- The dumpster is located within the property line.
- The parking actually is still in the right-of-way along the street.
- That request has been submitted to the Engineering Department for review, and then it will go down to City Manager's Office for approval.

Commissioner Prather asks for clarification about the parking being in the right-of-way. Mr. Brown confirms and shows that the dashed lined on the map is the property line; continues that they do exceed parking

requirements as it is proposed where 9 were required and the project has 8 on the property and 7 in front of the building; however, the request to utilize the public right-of-way will still need to be approved.

Mr. David Barth, Development Service Director, comes to clarify that you are allowed to use on-street parking to count towards the parking; however, there is the need to have two on-street parking spaces to one space on the property to meet requirements.

Further discussion is held regarding parking, parking requirements, if not approved by City Manager's office, design modification to the site would be required to match the number of units to parking requirements; request is to allow townhomes, not necessarily the quantity of townhomes; and there being no code limit to the number of bedrooms per unit.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any further questions for staff; none respond. Vice-Chair Williams asks the applicant to speak.

Mr. Aaron Ferguson with Bancroft Design, 923 S. Lowry, comes to speak on the following:

- Here on behalf of the applicant.
- Believes the Planning Commission has heard pretty much most of it right now.
- Asks if there are any questions to the townhomes.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there any plans for screening. Mr. Ferguson responses that there is requirements for screening in the city code; at this point, the architect has only given a conceptual site plan.

Discussion is held about potentially making screening a requirement; presumes questions or issues were addressed for those that previously came to speak at the last meeting; the Westwood neighborhood being very conscientious about their area; there being similar types of complexes on S. Walnut; some two-story and some three-story units; multiple apartment complexes in the area; and noted issue previously expressed was to have someone looking down on them and the conceptual drawing showing a three-story unit – other three story units are across the road.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any further questions; none respond. Vice-Chair Williams opens the public hearing and asks if there is anyone else that wishes to speak in favor of this item; none respond. Vice-Chair Williams asks if there is anyone that wishes to speak in opposition of this time; none respond.

Vice-Chair Williams closes the public hearing and asks for staff to present findings and alternatives.

Mr. Brown returns to present findings and alternatives, which are:

Findings:

1. The Land Development Code allows Townhomes in the RSS or RT Districts.
2. Two-Family and Multi-Family District (RTM) and Multi-Family Intermediate (RMI) are located in the vicinity to the east and southeast along with various high-density further east of the subject property.
3. The proposed townhomes align with the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for Low-Density Residential for the subject property location.

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the specific use permit as presented.
2. Find that the specific use permit 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 specific use permit.

3. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a certain date.

Staff recommends Alternative 1.

Vice-Chair Williams asks if there are any questions or comments.

Commissioner Prather moved to accept Alternative 1 to accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the specific use permit as presented.

Vice-Chair Williams states he would like to add a screening requirement as parking in the rear of the development.

Discussion is held regarding conditions that can be placed on the Specific Use Permit such as the use, lot sizes, setbacks, height limits — is what you were speaking of — lighting, signage, landscaping, parking and loading capability, land use density, and other standard requirements; landscaping can be considered view blocking; placing conditions on this now or later; this item would not come back to Planning Commission if City Council approved the Specific Use; and the motion dies for lack of a second.

Vice-Chair Williams moved to accept Alternative 1 to accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the specific use permit with the stipulation of a minimum six (6) foot opaque fence be placed on the west side of the property.

Further discussion is held regarding the number of occupants in this three (3) story building with five (5) bedrooms; there being no code restriction for number of unrelated occupants outside of the Westwood Overlay district; potentially placing a restriction on the building height but not wanting to place that restriction on the developer; no one here this evening to speak in opposition of the use, height or occupant number; this location being seen as a transition; express concern on the number of occupants, parking and the impact on the surrounding neighbors; there being 15 parking spaces proposed for this development; only way to limit the number of occupants is to not approve the request.

Vice-Chair Williams moved to accept Alternative 1 to accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the specific use permit with the stipulation of a minimum six (6) foot opaque fence be placed on the west side of the property, Commissioner Prather seconds.

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

Time: 19 minutes

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

- a. Next Regular Meeting is July 15th 2025

4. ADJOURN

ADJOURNMENT. This regular meeting of the Stillwater Planning Commission was called for adjournment by Commissioner Shanahan, seconded by Commissioner Peters at approximately 6:15 PM on July 8th, 2025. The

next regularly scheduled meeting will be held Tuesday, July 15th 2025 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Commission Hearing Room, Municipal Building, 723 South Lewis Street.

Prepared by – Cindy Gibson, Administrative Services Manager

Approved by - 
Stillwater Planning Commission