

**STILLWATER PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY  
SPECIAL MEETING OF November 3, 2020  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OKLAHOMA OPEN MEETING  
LAW, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED October 30, 2020 IN THE  
MUNICIPAL BUILDING AT 723 SOUTH LEWIS STREET**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brad Rickelman, Chair  
Jana Phillips, Vice-Chair  
Mike Shanahan, Member  
Vicky Jerome, Member  
Brett Allred, Member

STAFF PRESENT

Dennis McGrath, Assistant City Attorney  
Beth Ann Childs, Special Counsel  
Paula Dennison, Assistant City Manager  
Monty Karns, Director of City Engineering  
Lanc Gross, Development Review Manager  
Rian Harkins, Senior Planner  
Chelsey Jones, Administrative Assistant

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER.

Chair Rickelman states that due to the number of people wanting to speak during the public hearing period, comment time will be limited to five minutes or less and asked all to not repeat the same points. Chair Rickelman comments that in order to hear agenda item 2.c for the preliminary plat for those in attendance, a motion will be necessary to move the agenda item up. Chair Rickelman asks for a motion.

**Vice-Chair Phillips motioned to hear SUB19-23 first, Commissioner Shanahan seconded.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Time: 2 minutes**

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- c. CHC Management, LLC, PRELIMINARY PLAT – REVISED (SUB19-23), requesting reconsideration of a preliminary plat to create 131 residential lots and three (3) outlots on property currently address as 1798 N. Payne Street, in the Residential Single Family Small Lot (RSS) district.

Rian Harkins, Senior Planner explained the revised preliminary plat and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions of staff; none respond. Chair Rickelman opened the public hearing as asked to hear from the applicant or representative.

Stephen Gose, Gose and Associates 113 E 8<sup>th</sup> on behalf of the applicant commented on the following:

- 131 Lots

- Two points of access, one in the Northwest corner at Krayler and Skyline and another one on Payne
- The development will be in two phases
- Both access points will be apart of phase one
- This does take into consideration two of the three conditions from the conditional approval
- One is the removal of Moore to make it a pedestrian access
- Two is that Grandview in Eastridge the road is complete and will be open prior to phase two
- Traffic impact analysis has been done in consultation and approved by the city engineering staff

Chair Rickelman asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone who was there to speak in opposition and deferred over to Mrs. Paula Dennison, Assistant City Manager.

Mrs. Dennison said that they have established an overflow area for the planning commission meeting at the library and that there are two individuals there that would like to speak.

The following attendees at the Stillwater Public Library come to speak and have the following comments:

Mathew Wyckoff, 1824 E Sunrise Ave

- Doesn't trust the developer because he has not come through on any promises made
- Took longer than expected to repair his driveway that was cut and didn't repair it back to original state or let it cure long enough
- Will be putting all of the traffic in the school zone that is already over loaded
- The developer is willing to do the barest minimum to get what he wants out of the property instead of the right thing

Leslie Myer, 1102 N Payne St

- This is the fourth time that she has spoken before the commission concerning Skyline East
- Trying to protect their investments and maintain the safety and integrity of their neighborhood
- Hundreds of man hours and hundreds of dollars have been spent by ordinary citizens to defend what they hold dear
- The developer does not want to pay for the condition that was imposed by the Planning Commission and wants it to be approved without access to Jardot being required
- Assumes that drainage is another issue from all the runoff associated from all the heavy rain which is possibly why there has been a change from 132 homes and two outlots to 131 and three outlots
- Runoff from the construction site ruined the neighbors pond
- Already have traffic and safety concerns before adding 131 new houses
- With the increase in developments there will be an increase in kids walking to the Jr High

Mrs. Dennison states that these were the only individuals signed up to speak from the the library.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who wanted to speak in opposition.

Lanc Gross, Development Review Manager states that they are in the council chambers and there are three individuals who would like to speak.

The following attendees at the Municipal Building City Council Meeting Room come to speak and have the following comments:

Simon Ringsmuth, 1705 E Linda Ave

- Has a power point presentation
- On Feb 18<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission approved the plat with three conditions one being an access road to Jardot and now the developer doesn't want to pay for that road
- The traffic study did not measure any of the traffic closest to Skyline East or pedestrian foot traffic
- Skyline and Krayler are already packed at school drop off and pick up
- The two access points both go out directly to a school zone
- Sunrise is not standard width and is too narrow for two cars to pass each other without one going into the grass
- Access to Jardot will keep from adding to the problem as well as let emergency vehicles come and go to the neighborhood without going through other neighborhood streets
- The developer knew before starting construction that they would have to pay for the road and that there was never an expectation that the city was going to share the cost of it
- The developer wants to do another traffic study, however the numbers wouldn't be accurate because of the pandemic and schools not being open
- The road has already been build and is used daily by construction vehicles, it just needs to be paved

Bart Douglas, 1523 N Skyline commented on the following:

- Traffic is already bad and the traffic study wasn't done where it needed to be
- The existing road is already too narrow to handle the traffic

Mr. Gross comments that this was everyone that was there to speak.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone on zoom or anyone else that would like to speak in opposition; none respond. Chair Rickelman closes the public hearing and asked for staff to present the findings and alternatives.

Mr. Harkins presented the findings and alternatives and asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions from the commission for staff; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was any discussion among the commissioners or a motion.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked Mr. Gose if the parcel of land that has connection to Brook St from the proposed development to Jardot was not included in the original plat yet now that access is made available and if that was under the ownership of the developer at this time. Mr. Gose said that he is not sure of the exact ownership but understands there is an agreement to allow construction access through there and storage of excess soil material from the excavation that has happened on site but isn't aware of the exact ownership.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked if he would know if it was owned by the developer. Mr. Gose states that earlier in the year, at the time the conditional approval was made, it was not owned nor controlled by the developer nor were any agreements in place; those were put in place after Planning Commission; and

most of it was trying to get the large construction work off the neighborhood streets and to come in the back.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions or comments of the commission.

Vice-Chair Phillips comments on the following:

- That in looking at a broader picture, some items that are addressed in the comprehensive plan as well as in the transportation enhancement plan might provide a little more information as to why this connection is a good idea;
- The comprehensive plans states that local streets should be designed for low speed traffic with an emphasis on providing access;
- The connection to Jardot could provide that access to the major arterial; the transportation enhancement plan talks about the primary function of local streets is to provide access so that traffic speed and traffic volumes are low and travel distances are short;
- Seems that Brook St access would provide that function;
- In looking back at the comprehensive plan as the topic of safety of concern communicated
- Need to ensure new development patterns facilitate safety and providing street patterns that promote maximum safety and mobility for all modes of transportation while preserving the integrity of the neighborhood;
- This additional street to Jardot would be in keeping with that mantra.
- Also the other street that has been made to be a pedestrian only access that was also a requirement that was mentioned in the earlier approval, a recommendation from the Commission to the City Council which is certainly in keeping with the comprehensive plan.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other comments from the Planning Commissioners.

Commissioner Jerome asked staff or Monty Karns, Director of City Engineering what was is the City's desire for the connection to Jardot. Mr. Karns responds that he is one staff person among many that provide input; he agrees with the traffic engineering study and that he has been on record with saying that but that doesn't mean that he doesn't recognize that it will be an increase in traffic. Mr. Karns states agreement with the study in that the existing system will handle it. Mr. Karns continues commenting that when considering the whole and looking out into the future, would rather have the traffic coming to Sunrise and over to Jardot as opposed directly to Jardot, but that's not to say one is any better than the other.

Commissioner Jerome asked if the traffic study was done according to the guidelines set by the city; Mr. Karns responds that is correct and according to the Institute of Traffic Engineers guidelines as well.

Commissioner Shanahan expressed agreement with Vice-Chair Phillips comments about the comprehensive plan and how it relates to this development. Commissioner Shanahan comments that one of the citizens, Anthony Shores, provided a great job in an email outlining the similar points that Vice-Chair Phillips made and while the traffic study was done according to the guidelines, believes that it is fundamentally flawed in reflecting the living experience of the neighborhood as well as the future experience. Commissioner Shanahan asked if the traffic study was commissioned by the developer or the city.

Mr. Harkins responded that it was provided by the developer did at this stage to help illustrate their views on the traffic patterns related to this development and normally, traffic impact analysis is required when the final plat is submitted but they did it in advance.

Commissioner Shanahan questioned the objectivity of the traffic study given the source of the commission as nothing has changed since they made their determination at the February 18<sup>th</sup> meeting and doesn't believe that they should approve a plat that is trying to renege on a commitment that was made on the ingress/egress to Jardot and the pedestrian access on Moore.

Commissioner Allred stated that he feels like they have heard from most of the neighborhood, thanked them for speaking out, and their voices are heard; the Planning Commission will take that into consideration for tonight; and commended each and every one of them for reaching out as that is part of the democratic process and wished more people would take the time to do that.

Commissioner Shanahan comments that he believes the level of engagement of the citizens is something not only to be encouraged but to be grateful for as they're doing this and they weren't just speaking their mind and did a large amount of detailed research in making their case.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions or comments from the commissioners or if there is a motion.

Vice-Chair Phillips comments that she echoed the comments from Commissioners Shanahan and Allred and appreciates all of the neighborhood letting them know how they felt and that is was fairly objective.

Mr. Stephen Gose asked if he could participate and respond to the questions and allegations.

Beth Ann Childs, Special Counsel advises that if the Chair wanted to give the applicants' representative an opportunity to address a couple of the concerns with a set period of that that she didn't think there would be any harm in doing that.

Chair Rickelman states that if Mr. Gose had some comments that he would like to add that he may do so but that they aren't going to get into any back and forth he said she said.

Mr. Gose comments on the following:

- That he would like to defend his profession and the process that they've gone through with regard to the TIA being characterized as fundamentally flawed.
- It's the developers onus to provide a traffic impact study with a development at the final plat process.
- At the request of the Planning Commission and in conjunction with the developer, a traffic impact analysis was prepared with the preliminary plat to aid in these discussions.
- Discussed with city engineering staff prior to preparation of the scope and the study to clearly define what was expected to be analyze and look at.
- The report was reviewed by the city engineer and approved, saying it's fundamentally flawed and that engineers don't know what they are looking at, they followed the guidelines and followed the process and looked at what needed to be looked at.
- Local streets are meant to handle local traffic, small backups can be expected on those.
- To Monty's point Sunrise is a collector and the point of it is to get to Jardot.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was a motion unless there was more comments or discussion.

Roger Gose, Gose and Associates at 113 E. 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue comes to speak on the following:

- Here on behalf of the developer
- Sunrise keeps getting misrepresented and that it is represented as a safety problem.
- City of Stillwater paved it at 20 feet wide which doesn't meet any standards and it ought to be on the neighborhood or city to make that street safe.
- It being already not safe you shouldn't have a developer come and and say that they will fix it.
- Even though they are not asking for Sunrise it keeps coming up as an issue.
- Believes that Mr. Stephen Gose covered the traffic study but that the allegation that engineers don't know what they are doing goes all over him especially from a Planning Commissioner who is not trained in that field.

Chair Rickelman states that to progress they must come up with at least one of the three alternatives and that if they can't come up with a decision tonight, will have to choose the one that says to ask for additional information, or they reject or accept.

Vice-Chair Phillips states that she would like to talk through some possibilities about this and that it says to accept the findings and recommend to approve the proposed preliminary plat which is not the same plat that was previously approved and has the connection of Brook; it also says that alternative number two is to find that the plat is not appropriate use of the property which appears, in her opinion, that it is an appropriate use of the property but that the next bit of that alternative states that based on the impacts of the surrounding vicinity and believes that is where they are hung up. Vice-Chair Phillips states that if according the comprehensive plan, the transportation enhancement plan, and what was decided previously and recommendation by the Planning Commission to the City Council was to have the connection of Brooke from this development to Jardot that she would like to uphold the previous approval.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked staff if it is option three that is needed to request additional information to show a plat that has that connection.

Mrs. Childs states that if they are interested in a conditional approval of the plat, that they have the ability to do that with any specific recommended changes. Mrs. Childs states that the motion could be to approve the preliminary plat with the condition that the connection to Jardot is reflected on the documents submitted back to staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if they have to give a reason based on specifics or if they can just state it as that.

Mrs. Childs comments that having handled some of these matters before, her recommendation would be to make the motion if that's the direction they choose to go and make the recommendation of the conditional passage with the Jardot connection being constructed or identified on the plat and would follow it up with a subsequent identification as voted on by the Planning Commission of the areas of the comprehensive plan and the code that they feel like aren't being met; however, if they choose to go in this direction there should be a third motion that would instruct staff to draft a letter to the applicant identifying the reasons noted by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Jerome states that she is not sure that there has been a preliminary plat presented with Brooke to Jardot. Chair Rickelman responds that all they have in front of them is the proposed plat that they have presented, if they want something different it has to be noted at that.

**Vice-Chair Phillips moved to make a conditional approval of accepting the plat with the connection of Brooke from the proposed development to Jardot as previously found by the Planning Commission citing the items mentioned from the comprehensive plan and the transportation enhancement plan, Commissioner Shanahan seconded the motion.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

*Time: 56 minutes*

Chair Rickelman states that since three was enough for the motion to pass, now need a motion to give their reasons for approval and why they added that additional condition.

Commissioner Allred states that he regrettably has to leave, appologized and left the meeting at 6:27 pm.

**Vice-Chair Phillips motioned referencing the comprehensive plan in chapter two where it addresses goals and guiding principles particularly the portion that promotes street patterns to provide maximum safety and mobility and provide a greater connectivity between different neighborhoods, they want to ensure a new development pattern that facilitates safety, connectivity, and mobility; Commissioner Shanahan seconded.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Absent

*Time: 3 minutes*

Chair Rickelman states that the final point that Mrs. Childs made was that a motion to instruct staff to send a letter clarifying the reasons thereof and send it to the developer. Vice-Chair Phillips asked if that needed to be made in a motion as well; Chair Rickelman responded that he believes that is what Mrs. Childs was saying, so that city staff knows that they are directing them to do something. Mrs. Childs said that it's a really good way to memorialize the action of the Planning Commission.

**Vice-Chair Phillips moved to request staff to prepare a letter that would document both the chapters of the comprehensive plan and the transportation enhancement plan that she referenced so that there is a record of that; Commissioner Shanahan seconded.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent

*Time: 2 minutes*

- a. OZMJC, LLC, **MAP AMENDMENT (MA20-05)**, requesting review and approval to rezone property addressed as 815, 817 & 823 N. Jefferson AND 924 W. McElroy Rd from Residential Two-Family (RT) to Residential Two-Family and Multi-Family (RTM) district to construct multiple principal structures on a lot at a higher density.

Mr. Harkins presents staff's report and states that he believed that the agent for the applicant was in attendance and asked for questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions for city staff; none respond. Chair Rickelman opened the public hearing and asked for the representative to speak.

Mrs. Kelly Harris, Keystone Engineering at 923 S Lowry comes to speak on the following:

- The client is looking to add some infield development on the property.
- The area has a wide range of housing options from single family, duplexes, and small apartments.
- The owner would like to create a pocket neighborhood on the property and in order to do that, will need to be able to construct more than one principal structure on the property.
- In the current zoning classification of RT that is not allowed and that even though it's not allowed there are several properties within their development that are already using the multiple structures as separate living units.
- This request is updating on how the property is currently being used.
- Their development would add several more small single family home structures to the property in a common grass area in the middle.
- Even though there are several properties involved in the development, they will be limited in the density allowed due to the small size of the property.
- This type of development appeals to a wide range of demographics from university students to retired folks that are moving back to Stillwater but want to be able to walk to University events.
- Here to answer any questions.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions of the applicant; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone there to speak in opposition of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman closed the public hearing and asked for staff's findings and alternatives.

Mr. Harkins presented the findings and alternatives and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was any discussion or a motion.

**Commissioner Jerome moved to accept findings and recommend approval as presented; Commissioner Shanahan seconded.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent

**Time: 8 minutes**

- b. Twenty 20 Investment Group, LLC, **MAP AMENDMENT (MA20-06)**, requesting review and approval to rezone property address as 908 E. 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Residential Single Family Small Lot (RSS) to Residential Multi-Family Urban (RMU) district.

Mr. Harkins states that the applicant has requested this item be deferred to the next Planning Commission meeting on November 17<sup>th</sup> due to scheduling and logistics issues. Mr. Harkins presented the map amendment and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Commissioner Jerome asked if he could explain what the structure is on the property right now. Mr. Harkins responds that to his understanding it was a structure that served as elderly housing; and they are looking at using it for a diversion type of program where people could choose to go there rather than serving a sentence in jail for drug or alcohol related offenses.

Commissioner Jerome said that she thought it had been used as a rental for multiple people since the time it was a nursing home and that it is still zoned RSS. Mr. Harkins responds yes, it is zoned RSS and that in the RSS zoning the only thing that is currently allowed is the traditional single family detached structure hence the request to rezone through the map amendment process to allow for something that might be more fitting.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was a motion to defer to the November 17<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission.; and that the Planning Commission didn't have to accept the request but that is what is being requested.

**Commissioner Jerome moved to allow them to defer to the November 17<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting; Vice-Chair Phillips seconded.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent

**Time: 5 minutes**

- d. C-Star Construction Services, PRELIMINARY PLAT (SUB20-16), requesting review and approval for a preliminary plat to create 16 residential lots for a new multi-family development on a portion of property addressed as 401 S. Cstar Blvd in the Residential Two-Family & Multi-Family (RTM) district.

Mr. Harkins presented staff report; comments that the the applicant was there to explain further; and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Shanahan asked if there was a notation in staff notes regarding the location in a floodplain. Mr. Harkins responds there was and that they did discuss that with the applicant's engineer and they are trying to locate the majority of the development outside of the floodplain and the remainder of the lots would be in the floodplain.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked if there was a requirement for a fire truck turn around. Mr. Harkins responds that this was discussed during the review process and that they have noted that engineering has looked at it and believe it adequate. Mr. Harkins comments that they do normally give these applications to fire as well as part of the review process and fire did not provide any comments requiring a turn around.

Mr. Harkins states that he would also note included are requests for variances to the subdivision process as part of the staff report as an attachment; and in order to do this, they are asking for those variances at the time of preliminary plat approval.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions of staff; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked to hear from the applicant or the agent.

Mr. Stephen Gose, Gose and Associates at 113 E. 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue comes to speak on the following:

- Here on behalf of C-Star asking for approval of this preliminary plat.
- It is eight building, thirty two units in the northwest corner of the Bourbon Street Square development.
- This area was brought out of the floodplain years ago with a mass grading plan associated with the overall development.
- The majority of this lot is outside the floodplain.
- There is a portion of it on the west side along the west property line there's a common swale between this and Squires Landing.
- Proposing to subdivide, each building would be on a lot and each building has four units.
- It would be held in a property owners association for common maintenance of the drives, parkings, and buildings to allow investment by individuals to buy buildings that are then managed by a parent company to rent them out.
- Each lot - for instance lot one, would have a lot "a" and a lot "b". The "b" portion would be in the floodplain west of that drive lane so that for insurance purposes, they're only mortgaging the portion that is outside the floodplain and therefore don't have to get flood insurance if they don't want to.
- Its served by a common ingress/egress easement that runs north-south on the west side of the buildings.
- There is a "T" turnaround between lots six and seven that complies with the fire code, it has been on the plan from day one to meet fire code and to provide a place for trash trucks and other service vehicles to turn around.
- Utilities are available adjacent to the site and have worked through initial layouts with electric, sewer, and water with city services and also talk to ONG.
- The exceptions they are asking for are to the RTM bulk standards with regard to lot area, lot size, and rear yard setbacks. These are listed on the face of the plat in the lower right hand corner. Typical rear setback in RTM is twenty feet, in this case these buildings abut a detention pond borrow area, part of the mass grading, the hole that was dug to pull dirt out of when the whole site was brought up out of the floodplain or the developable area. They are backing up to a lot that can never be developed and that fifteen feet will serve also as the electric easement based on discussions with Stillwater Electric.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions of the applicant.

Vice-Chair Phillips comments that one of the items noted in the report was regarding that the engineering drainage was not submitted but then there is a reference for drainage analysis and will that be submitted later or is the drainage analysis that is shown accepted as is. Mr. Gose responds that there was a master drainage study done when the earth moving process happened and the creation of all the associated documents are with that; provided a preliminary drainage letter referencing that document and talked to engineering staff who have requested a full version of that study with the submittal of infrastructure improvement plans; and will further clarify with city engineering after approval of this preliminary plat and as preparation of the improvement plans begin.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman closed the public hearing and asked for staff's findings and alternatives.

Mr. Harkins presented the findings and alternatives and asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions, comments, or a motion.

Commissioner Shanahan said that this plan is an appropriate use of the area but that he would like it noted in the minutes that he has a concern about the floodplain, especially noting what happened in the spring and summer of 2019.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was a motion.

**Commissioner Jerome moved to accept findings and to recommend approval as presented; Vice-Chair Phillips seconded.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent

**Time: 13 minutes**

- e. Crafton Tull & Associates, FINAL PLAT (SUB20-15) requesting review and approval for the final plat of Frye Farms, Phase 1 to create a residential subdivision of 102 residential lots on property currently addressed as 1998 W. 32nd Avenue in the Residential Single Family Small Lot (RSS) district.

Mr. Harkins presented the final plat and asked if there were any questions for staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any questions for staff.

Vice-Chair Phillips comments that the report states that, at the time the report was developed, that there were requested changes from the preliminary plat that have not been addressed and asked if staff has received a response on those requested changes.

Mr. Harkins responds that staff has not seen a complete set of changes. Mr. Harkins further comments that one of the things that has come in right before they looked at the adjacent subdivision was the traffic impact analysis; after reviewing the TIA recommended that when these subdivisions were at full buildout there would be a need for a roundabout to be constructed at the intersection of 26<sup>th</sup> and Western but no specifics were discussed regarding the timing as far as when to be built between which phases or who would pay for it or right-of-way; the other information dealt mainly with connections for infrastructure and some of those questions have not been fully resolved yet; for example, looking at a lot of unplatted land between this phase and the lift station that they are connecting to to the north and the adjacent subdivision; they don't know how they are making those connections, whether it be through an easement that's temporary or other means; and the applicant's engineer may have some of those questions that they can answer.

Chair Rickelman asked for confirmation that the letter that staff sent to them dated October 22<sup>nd</sup> have not been answered and or updated to give responses to all those pieces. Mr. Harkins responds that is correct as they are still working through those but believes that they can work through them but that the applicant can answer to that as well.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions of staff; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked for the applicant or agent to speak.

Brad Reid, Crafton Tull & Associates 300 Pointe Parkway BLVD Yukon on behalf of the applicant:

- Working with SMC Consulting for the sanitary sewer system who will be building a lift station and providing a sanitary sewer connection at their northeast property line for them to tie into.
- The traffic impact analysis was turned in recently, the main issue was the intersection at 26<sup>th</sup>.
- There were no other issues on the comment letter which cause him any concern for the final plat.

Vice-Chair Phillips comments that she agrees that there are quite a few items that seem to be detail oriented or just clarifications that can be tidied up moving forward; the items of more concern are the infrastructure the water, waste water, and storm water; and there are a lots of items that could impact the plat.

Mr. Reid said that he is not very familiar with the City of Stillwater's process but normally work with the City along the way even if they have received Planning Commission approval; it has to be accepted again and don't see any issues working with the city that will change the plat drastically.

Vice-Chair Phillips states that she appreciated Mr. Reid's response.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions for the applicant; none respond.

Chair Rickelman opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was someone there, and were they wanting to speak in favor of or against the item.

Mr. Roger Gose, Gose and Associates 1120 E Connell comes to speak on the following:

- Expressed that he wasn't against the plat but that he had some comments on it.
- Has read through staff's review letter and there are comments on it that if not resolved at this point, will be additional easements, possibly easements removed, and there are deminsions missing.
- They are being asked to approve a final plat that goes forward to the City Council and he's never seen one come forward with 3 ½ pages of conditions.
- Asking staff, did the traffic impact analysis consider Western and 32<sup>nd</sup> and full buildout of those streets as the southwest part of the town continues to develop.
- Will there be additional right-of-way needed on Wester and 32<sup>nd</sup>.
- Western is showing a 50ft on one side but he doesn't know if that will be enough with the turn lanes and whatever else is needed.
- Also hasn't been able to look at a site distance diagram where 29<sup>th</sup> comes out.

- There is a pretty good hill there and he doesn't know if there is enough site distance, which should have been addressed in the traffic impact analysis, if not, in the improvement plans and that this would be something for Mr. Karns to look into.
- There are just a lot of things left and doesn't think it is complete at this point and asked if anyone had any questions for him.

Mr. Karns states that in regards to the site distances and the traffic impact study, that he had met with transportation staff earlier in the week and asked them to get the improvement plans and check the site distance on Western where those intersections are coming out; one of the other comments was whether or not center left turn lanes into the subdivision was needed based on the traffic engineering study and they have asked for additional information on that; they did note in the traffic engineering report that one entrance to serve both subdivisions would probably be the preferable way to have that design; and this is one of the reasons staff would like to see a traffic impact analysis at the preliminary plat stage as apposed to the final plat stage, they raise some of these issues early on.

Chair Rickelman thanked Mr. Karns for speaking up on the topic. Chair Rickelman appologized for cutting anyone off and asked if there was anyone else there that was wanting to speak for or against. Chair Rickelman closed the public hearing and asked for staff's findings and alternatives.

Mr. Harkins presented the findings and alternatives and asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Shanahan asked what the standard practice was in terms of accepting a final plat such as this that has so many open items or issues. Mr. Harkins responds that the standard practice would be to try and work through those issues before it goes to City Council; the improvements, according to the land development code, have to be at a minimum accepted by the city; and if there are additional easements or things that are needed as part of the infrastructure those things would have to be worked through and approved by the city before staff would take the final plat and improvement plans to City Council to be accepted.

Chair Rickelman asked if any other commissioners had any further comment or questions. Chair Rickelman said that this is a part of a larger development and that there have been a number of different pieces come up in the past few meetings each time with a different person or representative from their organization and each one has made it seem that they are only there because the other guy wasn't. Chair Rickelman states that there are some concerns as there are a lot of open items in terms of a final plat and would feel more comfortable if they had a sense of the progress; and all there is at this point is a list of problems some of which are minor but others would have a large impact. Chair Rickelman states that he is not against this but is uncomfortable going forward at this time.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked if the Chair would be willing to entertain a motion; Chair Rickelman responds yes.

Vice-Chair Phillips verified with the applicant which date would be better to table the item to; Mr. Reid said that he didn't think that staff would have proper time to review if it was set for the next meeting and that a month out would be better.

**Vice-Chair Phillips moved that additional information be presented before they make a decision and that that information be in the form of a response to the staff letter with the requested questions and**

information answered and be tabled until the December 1<sup>st</sup> Planning Commission meeting; Commissioner Shanahan seconded.

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent

*Time: 20 minutes*

3. MEETING SUMMARY FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

- a. Regular Meeting Summary of October 20, 2020

**Commissioner Jerome moved to approve; Commissioner Shanahan seconded.**

Roll call:	Rickelman	Phillips	Shanahan	Jerome	Allred
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Absent

*Time: 1 minutes*

4. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS FROM STAFF, PLANNING COMMISSIONERS, OR CITY ATTORNEY:

- a. Next Planning Commission meeting November 17, 2020.

5. ADJOURN.

This special meeting of the Stillwater Planning Commission was called for adjournment by Vice-Chair Phillips, seconded by Commissioner Jerome at approximately 7:16 p.m. on November 3, 2020 with all members present in agreement, the next regularly scheduled meeting will be held November 17, 2020 at 5:30 p.m. in the City Commission Hearing Room, Municipal Building, 723 S. Lewis Street.

Prepared by – Chelsey Jones, Administrative Assistant

Approved by - \_\_\_\_\_  
Stillwater Planning Commission