

STILLWATER PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 24TH, 2026
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OKLAHOMA OPEN MEETING
LAW, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED February 19th, 2026 IN THE
MUNICIPAL BUILDING AT 723 SOUTH LEWIS STREET

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

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

MEMBERS ABSENT

Staff Absent

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

2. GENERAL ORDERS

- a. Consider request for a Final Plat (SUB25-12) named Stillwater High School Addition in the Public (P) zoning district at 410 W. Franklin Avenue.

Mr. Henry Bibelheimer, Sr. Planner presents the staff report and asks if there are any questions.

Chair Phillips questioned the timing of the request, noting that building construction is nearing completion and expressing surprise that the platting process had not occurred earlier. Mr. David Barth, Development Services Director, clarified that while platting typically precedes building permits, this project required the completion of public improvements, specifically water and sewer lines before the final plat could be accepted as there are manholes and hydrants could not be set to final grade until the parking lot and site work were nearly finished, the public improvements were only recently ready for formal acceptance.

Mr. Barth confirmed that while the sequence is not typical for standard developments, it aligns with the technical requirements for this specific site's infrastructure.

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

Mr. Bibelheimer presents staff's findings and alternatives.

Findings:

1. The proposed final plat meets the subdivision and zoning requirements.
2. Envision Stillwater 2045, recommends Public uses at this location.

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed final plat as presented.

2. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a future Planning Commission meeting.
3. Find that the final plat is not needed and do not recommend that the City Council approve the request.

Staff recommends Alternative #1 to accept findings and recommend that City Council approved the proposed final plat as presented.

Commissioner Prather moves to approve the Final Plat as presented, Vice Chair Williams seconds the motion.

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

Time: 6 minutes

- b. Consider request for a Final Plat (SUB25-22) named Fern Street Cottages in the Small Lot Single-Family Residential district with a Planned Unit Development overlay (RSS-PUD).

Mr. Henry Bibelheimer, Sr. Planner presents the staff report and asks if there are any questions; none respond.

Mr. Bibelheimer presents staff's findings and alternatives, which are:

Findings:

1. The proposed final plat matches the preliminary plat/PUD which was approved in 2021.

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed final plat as presented.
2. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a future Planning Commission meeting.
3. Find that the final plat is not needed and do not recommend that the City Council approve the request

Staff recommends alternative number 1.

Commissioner Peters moves to approve the Final Plat as presented, Vice Chair Williams seconds the motion.

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

Time: 3 minutes

3. PUBLIC HEARING

- a. Receive public comment regarding a request for a Map Amendment (MA25-16) to rezone from Small Lot Single Family Residential (RSS) & Agriculture (A) to Commercial General (CG) at the property addressed as 799 W. 12th Avenue.

Mr. Bibelheimer presents staff's report

Chair Phillips requested that staff display the graphic indicating the floodway and floodplain and asked for confirmation that the blue hatched area on the map represented the floodplain. Mr. Bibleheimer confirmed that the blue hatching indicates the floodplain.

Chair Phillips followed up by asking if the line represented a 100-year or 300-year floodplain. Mr. Bibleheimer stated his belief that it is the 100-year floodplain; and clarified that while the comprehensive plan map does not differentiate between floodplain and floodway, the area shown is the 100-year floodplain, noting that the floodway likely sits entirely south of the gray-shaded development area.

Chair Phillips raised a point of order regarding where to address technical concerns about earth change permits and floodplain modifications.

Mr. David Barth, Development Services Director, clarified that while his department does not choose the project location, they review the submitted plans against established city and state codes. He detailed the following regulatory standards:

- The bar set by city code and state law is that a development must have no adverse impact on surrounding properties.
- Standard regulations require that the post-development flow rate (Q) does not exceed the pre-development flow rate.
- Explained that this project presents a unique hydraulic situation. The applicant conducted a timing study demonstrating that it is more advantageous to allow water to flow out of the site and into the channel immediately. This will allow the water to exit now prevents it from combining with the peak storm surge that eventually flows down Stillwater Creek. Based on this study, the YMCA is not providing on-site detention, as releasing the water early is considered safer for the overall system in this specific location.

Mr. Barth concluded that while he did not have every granular detail of the study at hand, the applicant's team had fulfilled all technical requirements requested by the city.

Chair Phillips invites the applicant forward to address and remaining questions.

Austin Burton, Civil Engineer of Record (Kimley-Horn and Associates), comes forward and speaks on the following:

- Noted his firm's extensive experience with floodplain development.
- Compensatory Storage - explained that per state and city regulations, any soil used to raise the site (fill) must be sourced from the property itself to avoid reducing the floodplain's capacity.
- The Borrow Pit - The project includes a large borrow pit located south of the main facility. This area is being excavated to a bottom elevation of 849 feet. The soil removed from this pit will be used to raise the building pad.
- Site Elevations - Existing Grade: Approximately 860 feet.
 - Base Flood Elevation (BFE): 865.7 feet.
 - Proposed Building Pad: 869 feet.
 - Margin of Safety: The building will be elevated 9 feet above its current grade and over 2 feet above the BFE, exceeding the city's 1-foot requirement.

Chair Phillips inquired about the specific location of the floodway in relation to the borrow pit and building site. Mr. Burton clarified that by state regulation and city code, no work or fill is allowed in the floodway; demonstrated on the map that the floodway boundary follows the bow of Stillwater Creek and lies entirely south of the proposed work; the only work occurring in the floodway is a drain pipe connecting the borrow pit to the creek; how they worked "hand in hand with FEMA," using FEMA models to develop boundaries; and this work was coordinated with WSB (the city's third-party consultant) to ensure it aligned with WSB's ongoing general study of Stillwater Creek.

Commissioner Shanahan asked what time frame or data set determined the 100-year floodplain being used. Mr. Burton responds that he was unsure if they used city drone footage from the 2019 flood to correlate experienced flood elevations with their survey; noted the "Total Health" building to the west sits at 868 feet; drone footage showed that the 2019 event did not inundate that building, though it reached the parking lot; and by setting the YMCA at 869 feet, it will sit one (1) foot higher than the neighboring medical facility.

Chair Phillips asks what the second building on the property would be. Mr. Burton clarifies that this is just a conceptual site plan but they are doing a mass grading of the whole site as that is what is most cost effective.

Commissioner Prather asked why the project required Commercial General (CG) zoning—the city's broadest commercial category—and whether Public (P) zoning could meet the needs of the YMCA. Mrs. Kim Payne, Asst. City Attorney clarified that Public zoning requires the land to be owned by a governmental agency (City or University), therefore, as a private entity, the YMCA is ineligible.

Mr. Henry Bibleheimer explained that because there is no specific use category for the YMCA, it was classified as "Recreation"; this use is allowed in very few districts; and CG was chosen to accommodate both the building and the potential future soccer complex.

Chair Phillips opens the public hearing and asks if anyone would like to speak in favor of the item.

Mr. Wayne Smith, 1724 S. Husband Street states he has been a resident for 60 years, spoke as a neutral party; expressed support for the YMCA but emphasized the critical importance of flood control, noting that historical flood control structures are the only reason past floods weren't significantly worse. Mr. Smith offered his historical knowledge of the area's water behavior to the engineers, stressing that the project needs to be done right.

Chair Phillips asks if anyone else would like to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Phillips asks if there is anyone that wishes to speak in to speak in opposition; none respond.

Chair Phillips closes the public hearing and invites the applicant back up to address concerns.

Mr. Austin Burton provided a brief technical clarification regarding the borrow pit's role in the flood study and site development.

- The only work occurring within the floodway is the installation of a very large 8-foot wide by 4-foot tall reinforced concrete box.
- The purpose of this structure is to allow the creek to back up into the borrow pit when it begins to flood.

- Because the borrow pit is only a few feet above the bottom of the creek, it effectively "broadens" the creek during a flood event. This creates additional working volume at a deep elevation, allowing the site to be developed and paved without creating negative impacts upstream or downstream.

Chair Phillips asked for clarification on whether the borrow pit would retain water. Mr. Burton clarified that the borrow pit is not intended to hold water permanently; as the creek level drops following a flood event, the borrow pit will drain back into the creek through the large concrete box; and noted that the size of the structure was specifically requested by WSB (the city's consultant) to ensure the creek and borrow pit function in unison.

Chair Phillips inquired about the responsibility for keeping the borrow pit and the 8x4-foot box structure free of debris. Mr. Burton noted that while existing trees will be cleared, new landscaping could eventually create on-site debris.

Mr. Barth clarified that since the borrow pit and drainage structures are located on private property, the property owner (YMCA) is responsible for maintenance which includes mowing the pit and ensuring trees or debris do not obstruct the drainage structures.

Chair Phillips asks staff for findings and alternatives.

Mr. Bibelheimer presents findings and alternatives, which are:

Findings:

1. The proposed recreation facility is allowed by right in the Commercial General (CG) zoning district.
2. The YMCA development generally aligns with the Future Land Use Map of Envision Stillwater 2045.

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Map Amendment as presented.
2. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a future Planning Commission meeting.
3. Find that the Map Amendment is not needed and do not recommend that the City Council approve the request

Planning Commission has further discussion regarding:

- The implications of rezoning the property to Commercial General (CG).
- Risk of Future Use: Expressed concern that if the YMCA project were not to proceed, the property would remain "wide open" to any high-intensity commercial use allowed under the CG designation.
- Best Practices and Floodplains: a philosophical objection to developing in a floodplain regardless of the zoning, noting it is not "best practice."
- Argued that the Land Development Code lacks a straightforward path for "civic" uses that are not government-owned, leading to a "disconnect" where the CG request does not truly follow the Comprehensive Plan's "Public and Civic" designation.
- Zoning Precedent: The risk of a project failing after a rezone is a scenario the Commission faces with every development, suggesting it should not necessarily preclude approval if the current plan is sound.
- Exploration of Alternative Zoning and Overlays

- Public (P) Zoning Limitations: Staff and Legal Counsel clarified that Public zoning requires ownership by a governmental agency.
- The PUD Option: In response to inquiries about limiting CG uses via an overlay, Mr. Barth explained that a Planned Unit Development (PUD) is the only tool available to approve a rezoning while restricting it to specific uses; noted a PUD could also be used to adjust regulations like lot coverage if the Commission pursued an Agriculture (A) or Office (O) designation with a Specific Use Permit (SUP).
- Specific Use Permits (SUP): Mrs. Payne, Asst. City Attorney, clarified that the Commission could not recommend an SUP tonight because it requires a separate notice and application process; and advised they must strictly recommend approval or denial of the move to CG.
- Alignment with the Comprehensive Plan as the Commission debated how the YMCA fits into the Envision Stillwater 2045 plan.
- Recreation Classification: Mr. Bibleheimer noted that "Recreation" is only allowed by right in CG and CB (Commercial Business), or via SUP in Office (O) and Agriculture (A).
- Civic Intent: argued that while the YMCA is a nonprofit, it provides a community service that aligns with the "Civic" designation; however, they remained hesitant about the CG designation itself as a vehicle for that use; and
- Engineering Protections: noted that while they understood the hesitancy regarding floodplain development, the city has established guidelines and engineering requirements that the applicant has successfully met.

Commissioner Peters moved to accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Map Amendment as presented, Commissioner Prather seconded.

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

Time: 56 minutes

- b. Receive public comment regarding a Text Amendment (TXT26-03) to Stillwater City Code Chapter 23, Land Development Code, Article VI, Land Use Classifications, Division 4, Commercial Districts, Section 23-152, CB Commercial Business District; Repealing all ordinances to the contrary; and providing for severability.

Mr. Bibleheimer presents staff's report and asks if there are any questions.

Commissioner Prather asked for clarification that this particular use was not allowed at all in the Commercial Business (CB) category, and now it's being added as a Specific Use. Mr. Bibleheimer confirmed.

Commissioner Shanahan stated that staff mentioned there are five (5) existing businesses and asked what those were where those were location. Mr. Bibleheimer stated that there are a couple of mechanic shops, one off Lewis and one on Main Street with another mechanic shop further south on Main, and a used car dealership; and the CB district extends to areas on 6th Ave.

Chair Phillips opens the public hearing and asks if anyone would like to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Phillips asks if there is anyone that wishes to speak in to speak in opposition; none respond. Chair Phillips closes the public hearing and asks staff for findings and alternatives.

Mr. Bibelheimer presents findings and alternatives.

Findings:

1. The proposed text amendment provides a potential path forward for the existing vehicle and equipment sales and service to come into compliance.
2. The proposed text amendment allows City Council to review and impose conditions on any request for vehicle equipment sales and service within the CB zoning district.

Alternatives:

1. Accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Text Amendment as presented.
2. Find that additional information or discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation and table the request to a future Planning Commission meeting.
3. Find that the Text Amendment is not needed and do not recommend that the City Council approve the request.

Staff recommended to accept findings and recommend that the City Council approve the proposed Text Amendment as presented.

Commissioner Prather motions to approve the proposed text amendment as presented. Commissioner Peters seconds.

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

Time: 6 minutes

4. MEETING SUMMARY FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION.

- a. Regular meeting summary of January 27th, 2026.

Chair Phillips asks if there are any changes and/or additions; none respond.

Commissioner Peters moves to approve the minutes as presented. Vice Chair Williams seconds.

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

Time: 1 minute

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

- a. David Barth, Development Services Director, introduces Ann Collina, Development Services new Civil Engineer.
- b. Next Regular Meeting is March 3rd, 2026.

5. ADJOURN

ADJOURNMENT. This regular meeting of the Stillwater Planning Commission was called for adjournment by Vice Chair Williams, seconded by Commissioner Shanahan at approximately 6:36 p.m. on February 24th, 2026. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held Tuesday, March 3rd, 2026, 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