

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
116 WEST NEEDLES
BIXBY, OKLAHOMA
February 19, 2013¹ 6:00 PM**

STAFF PRESENT:

Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner
Patrick Boulden, Esq., City Attorney

OTHERS ATTENDING:

See attached Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Thomas Holland called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM.

Chair Thomas Holland introduced the meeting as the “Continuation of the meeting February 19, 2013.”

The agenda items were taken out of order and agenda items number 2 and number 3 were considered at this time.

PLATS

4. **Preliminary Plat / Final Plat – Bixby Centennial Plaza II – Rosenbaum Consulting, LLC.** Discussion and consideration of a Preliminary Plat and a Final Plat and certain Modifications/Waivers for “Bixby Centennial Plaza II,” Lot 7 and the N. 42’ of Lot 8, Block 1, *Bixby Centennial Plaza*.
Property Located: Approximately the 11900-block of S. Memorial Dr.

See Minutes for the February 19, 2013 Regular Meeting held on February 19, 2013.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. **PUD 76 – Scenic Village Park – Tanner Consulting, LLC.** Public Hearing, discussion, and consideration of a rezoning request for approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for 92 acres in part of the E/2 of Section 02, T17N, R13E.
Property Located: South and west of the intersection of 121st St. S. and Memorial Dr.

¹ This record reflects the Continued part of the February 19, 2013 Meeting held February 27, 2013.

3. **BZ-364 – Tanner Consulting, LLC.** Public Hearing, Discussion, and consideration of a rezoning request from AG Agricultural District to CG General Commercial District for 92 acres in part of the E/2 of Section 02, T17N, R13E.

Property Located: South and west of the intersection of 121st St. S. and Memorial Dr.

Chair Thomas Holland introduced agenda items number 2 and number 3 and asked Erik Enyart for the Staff Report and recommendations. Mr. Enyart summarized the Staff Report as follows:

To: Bixby Planning Commission
From: Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner
Date: Friday, February 22, 2013
RE: Report and Recommendations for:
PUD 76 – “Scenic Village Park” – Tanner Consulting, LLC, and
BZ-364 – Tanner Consulting, LLC

LOCATION: – The 7300-block of E. 121st St. S.
– South and west of the intersection of 121st St. S. and Memorial Dr.
– Part of the E/2 of Section 02, T17N, R13E

LOT SIZE: 92 acres, more or less

EXISTING ZONING: AG Agricultural District

EXISTING USE: Agricultural

REQUESTED ZONING: CG General Commercial District & PUD 76

SUPPLEMENTAL ZONING: None

SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USE:

North: (Across 121st St. S.) RS-3, RS-1, AG, & OL/CS/PUD 51; The Fox Hollow and North Heights Addition residential subdivisions; the Fry Creek Ditch # 2 and the North Elementary and North 5th & 6th Grade Center school campuses to the northwest zoned AG; agricultural land to the northeast zoned OL/CS/PUD 51.

South: AG & CS/PUD 37; Fry Creek Ditch # 1 to the south zoned AG and the Crosscreek “office/warehouse” heavy commercial / trade center and retail strip center zoned CS with PUD 37.

East: AG, CG, RS-3, OL, CS, & RM-2/PUD 70; Agricultural land, the Easton Sod sales lot zoned RS-3, OL, & CS, the Encore on Memorial upscale apartment complex zoned RM-2/PUD 70, a Pizza Hut zoned CG, and a My Dentist Dental Clinic zoned CS; Memorial Dr. is further to the east.

West: AG & RS-4; Fry Creek Ditch #2; beyond this to the west is vacant/wooded land owned by the City of Bixby, the Three Oaks Smoke Shop located on a 2-acre tract at 7060 E. 121st St. S., the Seven Lakes I and Seven Lakes II residential subdivisions, and additional vacant land zoned RS-4 for a future “Seven Lakes” phase or phases.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Corridor + Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land.

PREVIOUS/RELATED CASES:

BBOA-367 – Holley Hair for Charles Roger Knopp – Request for Special Exception approval to allow a Use Unit 20 “golf teaching and practice facility” on part of the subject property – BOA Conditionally Approved 04/02/2001 (not since built).

BBOA-442 – Charles Roger Knopp – Request for Special Exception approval to allow a Use Unit 20 golf driving range (evidently same as BBOA-367) on part of the subject property. Approval of BBOA-367 expired after 3 years, per the Staff Report, and so required re-approval – BOA Approved 05/01/2006 (not since built).

BL-340 – JR Donelson for Charles Roger Knopp Revocable Trust – Request for Lot-Split approval to separate a 41.3384-acre tract from the southern end of the large 140-acre acreage tracts previously owned by Knopp, which includes subject property – It appears it was Administratively Approved by the City Planner on 07/20/2006, but the Assessor’s parcel records do not reflect that the land was ever since divided as approved.

PUD 70 & BZ-347 / PUD 70 (Amended) & BZ-347 (Amended) – Encore on Memorial – Khoury Engineering, Inc. – Request to rezone from AG to RM-3 and approve PUD 70 for a multifamily development on part of subject property – PC Continued the application on 12/21/2009 at the Applicant's request. PC action 01/19/2010: A Motion to Recommend Approval failed by a vote of two (2) in favor and two (2) opposed, and no followup Motion was made nor followup vote held. The City Council Continued the application on 02/08/2010 to the 02/22/2010 regular meeting "for more research and information," based on indications by the developer about the possibility of finding another site for the development. Before the 02/22/2010 City Council Meeting, the Applicant temporarily withdrew the applications, and the item was removed from the meeting agenda, with the understanding that the applications were going to be amended and resubmitted.

The Amended applications, including the new development site, were submitted 03/11/2010. PC action 04/19/2010 on the Amended Applications: Recommended Conditional Approval by unanimous vote. City Council action 05/10/2010 on the Amended Applications: Entertained the ordinance Second Reading and approved the PUD and rezoning, with the direction to bring an ordinance back to the Council with an Emergency Clause attachment, in order to incorporate the recommended Conditions of Approval. City Council approved both amended applications with the Conditions of Approval written into the approving Ordinance # 2036 on 05/24/2010.

Preliminary Plat of "Scenic Village Park" – Request for Preliminary Plat approval for a subject property – Pending PC consideration March 18, 2013.

RELEVANT AREA CASE HISTORY: (not necessarily a complete list)

BZ-54 – [Charles] Roger Knopp – Request for rezoning from AG to OM & CG for a 3.56-acre area to the east of subject property at approximately the 12600-block of S. Memorial Dr. – PC Recommended Approval of CG zoning 02/28/1977 and City Council Approved 03/01/1977 (Ord. # 328).

BZ-135 – Eddie McLearn – Request for rezoning from AG to CS for an approximately 19-acre tract at 12300 S. Memorial Dr. abutting the subject property to the east (now the Easton Sod business) – Withdrawn by Applicant 03/21/1983.

BZ-139 – Eddie McLearn – Request for rezoning from AG to RM-2, OL, & CS for an approximately 19-acre tract at 12300 S. Memorial Dr. abutting the subject property to the east (now the Easton Sod business) – Planning Commission recommended Modified Approval of RS-3, OL, & CS Zoning on 04/25/1983 and City Council Approved RS-3, OL, & CS Zoning on 05/02/1983 (Ord. # 482).

BZ-196 – Donna Saunders for Nuel/Noel Burns – Request for rezoning from AG to CG for a 2-acre tract at the 7700-block of E. 121st St. S. (then possibly addressed 7600 E. 121st St. S.) abutting the subject property to the east – PC Recommended Denial 01/21/1991 per notes on the application form. Lack of ordinance and other notes in the case file indicate it was either withdrawn, not appealed, or not finally approved by the City Council.

BZ-200 – Charles Roger Knopp – Request for rezoning from AG to CG for an approximately 2.27-acre area to the east of subject property at approximately 12340 S. Memorial Dr. – PC Recommended Approval 07/20/1992 and City Council Approved 07/27/1992 (Ord. # 671).

BZ-214 – City of Bixby – Request for FD Floodway Supplemental District for all of the (then proposed) Fry Creek Ditch drainage system right-of-way, including a section abutting the subject property to the west – PC Tabled Indefinitely 11/20/1995.

BZ-279 – Charles Norman/Martha Plummer Roberts et al. – Request for rezoning from AG to CS, OM, RM-1, and RS-2 for 73 acres, more or less, located across 121st St. S. to the north of the subject property, which 73 acres became Bixby Centennial Plaza and Fox Hollow and an unplatted 11-acre tract later approved for PUD 51 – PC Recommended Approval as amended for CS, OM, OL, RS-3, and RS-2 on November 19, 2001 and Approved by City Council December 10, 2001 (Ord. # 842).

BZ-317 – Sack & Associates, Inc. for Martha Roberts et al. – Request for rezoning from OL to CS for part of an unplatted 11-acre tract located across 121st St. S. to the north of subject property – PC Action 08/21/2006: Motion to Approve failed for lack of a Second, and Chair declared the item "denied by virtue of there being no second to the motion." See PUD 51.

PUD 51 – [No Name] – [Sack & Associates, Inc.] – Request to approve PUD 51 and a partial rezoning from OL to CS for an unplatted 11-acre tract located across 121st St. S. to the north of subject property – No application submitted, but prepared by Sack & Associates, Inc. in support of

the CS and OL zoning proposed per BZ-317 – PC recommended Approval 10/02/2006 and City Council Approved 10/23/2006 (Ord. # 951/951A).

BSP 2010-03 – Encore on Memorial – Khoury Engineering, Inc. (PUD 70) – Request for Detailed Site Plan approval for a multifamily development on 14 acres to the east of subject property – PC Conditionally Approved 07/19/2010.

Preliminary Plat of Encore on Memorial (PUD 70) – Request for Preliminary Plat approval for a multifamily development on 14 acres to the east of subject property – PC recommended Conditional Approval 07/19/2010 and City Council Conditionally Approved 07/26/2010.

Final Plat of Encore on Memorial (PUD 70) – Request for Preliminary Plat approval for a multifamily development on 14 acres to the east of subject property – PC recommended Conditional Approval 08/16/2010 and City Council Conditionally Approved 08/23/2010 (plat recorded 04/12/2011).

BZ-355 – Town & Country Real Estate Co. – Request for rezoning from AG to CS for 1.6 acres, more or less, located at the 7700-block of E. 121st St. S. (possibly previously addressed 7600 E. 121st St. S.) abutting the subject property to the east – PC Recommended Approval 03/19/2012 and City Council Approved 03/26/2012 (Ord. # 2077).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

At its regular meeting Tuesday, February 19, 2013, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing and considered these two (2) applications. After a lengthy discussion, the Planning Commission Continued both applications to a Special Meeting on February 27, 2013 (or rather, Continued the February 19, 2013 Regular Meeting to a special meeting date, February 27, 2013 per the City Attorney).

Also on February 19, 2013, the Applicant submitted hard copies of the PUD Text and Exhibits package, and the Staff Report was revised to reflect recommendations from the original Staff Report which have been satisfied with that submittal. Staff presented both the revised Report and revised Text and Exhibits package to the Planning Commission at its meeting.

On the date of this report, February 22, 2013, Staff received a revised copy of the PUD Text and has updated this report to reflect recommendations from the last Staff Report which have been satisfied with this submittal. The revised PUD Text is attached to this report.

ANALYSIS:

Subject Property Conditions. The subject property of 92 acres is relatively flat and appears to drain, if only slightly, to the south and west. The development will be planned to drain to the south and west to the Fry Creek Ditch # 2 and # 1, respectively, using stormsewers and paying a fee-in-lieu of providing onsite stormwater detention. It is zoned AG (CG and PUD 76 is requested) and may or may not be presently used for agricultural crops.

The subject property appears to presently be served by the critical utilities (water, sewer, electric, etc.) and has immediate access to the stormwater drainage capacity in the Fry Creek Ditches abutting to the west and south. Plans for utilities are indicated on Exhibit F and are discussed in the City Engineer's memo.

Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as (1) Corridor and (2) Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land.

The "Matrix to Determine Bixby Zoning Relationship to the Bixby Comprehensive Plan" ("Matrix") on page 27 of the Comprehensive Plan provides that CG zoning May Be Found In Accordance with the Corridor designation of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

The Matrix does not indicate whether or not the requested CG zoning would be in accordance with the Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land Land Use designation of the Plan Map. However, this Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land designation cannot be interpreted as permanently-planned land uses, and so the specific land use designation test as indicated on Page 7, item numbered 1 and page 30, item numbered 5 of the Comprehensive Plan, would not apply here.

Per the Matrix, PUDs are In Accordance with the Corridor designation of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

General. Because the review methodology is similar, and both applications are essentially rezoning-related and propose to prepare the subject property for the same multiple-use development, this review will, except as noted, include both applications simultaneously, and not attempt to differentiate between the analyses pertaining to each of the different applications.

The submitted site plans do not show specific planned improvements, but rather, general land use categories associated with each of the eight (8) Development Areas (DAs) by means of permitted uses listed in the Development Standards within each, summarized and commented upon as follows:

DA A: "Uses permitted as a matter of right in the CS District and customary accessory uses, provided however, uses within Use Unit 19 Hotel, Motel And Recreation Facilities are excluded." This would include Use Units (UUs) 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. Uses within UU 19, otherwise allowable in CS, may be too intensive relative to the proximity of the Fox Hollow neighborhood, and the Applicant has excluded this Use Unit as previously recommended.

DA B: "Life Care Retirement Center as set forth within Use Unit 8 Multi-family Dwelling And Similar Uses and customary accessory uses. Other uses within Use Unit 8 are excluded."

DA C: "Detached or attached residential dwelling units including single-family, duplex, patio home, townhouse, and multifamily, and customary accessory uses, including common area facilities such as club house, swimming pool and recreational open space."

DA D: "Uses permitted as a matter of right in the CG Zoning District, and uses permitted by special exception within the CG Zoning District or uses required to be submitted within a Planned Unit Development, which include but not limited to Use Unit 23 Warehousing And Wholesaling (office/warehouse), and Use Unit 16 Ministorage and customary accessory uses. Permitted uses shall be conducted within enclosed buildings."

Staff understands this DA is intended for multi-tenant "office/warehouse" / "trade center" (such as that found in Crosscreek to the south), ministorage, and/or automotive-related businesses. These three (3) land use types are found in UUs 15, 16, and 17, respectively. This DA would include UUs 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 19.

Staff believes that the location and configuration of Development Area D and the character surrounding area satisfactorily meet the expectations of Zoning Code Section 11-9-16.C.13 for ministorage developments.

DA E: "Uses permitted as a matter of right in the CS Zoning District, and customary accessory use, provided however, Use Unit 19 Hotel, Motel And Recreation Facilities shall be limited to hotel use." This would include UUs 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 19 (hotel only). Although, like DA A, DA E is relatively close to Fox Hollow, it is separated therefrom by the collector street and an 11-acre commercial development tract on the north side of 121st St. S., so the recommendation for DA A regarding UU 19 is not held here.

DA F: "Uses permitted as a matter of right in the CG Zoning District, and office/warehousing as set forth within Use Unit 23 Warehousing And Wholesaling, and customary accessory use, provided however uses set forth in Use Unit 17 Automotive And Allied Activities shall be excluded." This would include UUs 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 23.

DA G: "Uses permitted as a matter of right in the OM Zoning District, and customary accessory use." This would include UU 1, 5, 10, and 11 (offices).

DA H: "Uses permitted as a matter of right in the CG Zoning District, and office/warehousing as set forth within Use Unit 23 - Warehousing and Wholesaling uses."

And alternative standards: "As an alternative use within Development Area G, multifamily dwellings are permitted, not exceeding 15 acres, and customary accessory uses, including common area facilities such as club house, swimming pool and recreational open space."

Combined, this would include UUs 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, and 23.

As noted above, the PUD development appears to have been written for maximum land use and design flexibility. Although there may be a limited number of development types expected, no absolutely known land uses are indicated for any particular development area. Probable land uses may be inferred by reading the lists of land uses permitted in each Development Area. Thus, the PUD Text does not describe, nor do the Exhibits reflect particular buildings, parking areas, internal driveways, or other such site development particulars.

Zoning Code Section 11-7I-8.B.1 requires:

"1. A site plan reflecting:

a. Proposed location of uses, including off street parking, open spaces and public uses;

b. Development standards for location, height, setback and size of buildings and other structures;

c. Public and private vehicular and pedestrian circulation;

d. The approximate intensity of residential uses expressed in number of dwelling units and the approximate intensity of nonresidential uses expressed in floor area, allocated to each identifiable segment of the planned unit development;

e. Proposed screening and landscaping;

f. Proposed location, height and size of any ground sign; and

g. Sufficient surrounding area to demonstrate the relationship of the PUD to adjoining uses, both existing and proposed.” (emphasis added)

Because of the way the PUD is structured in terms of land use flexibility, the Applicant has not represented proposed location of uses, off-street parking, open spaces, public and private vehicular and pedestrian circulation, or signage. The PUD chapter of the Zoning Code may anticipate such generalized PUDs, as it includes in Sections 11-71-8.B.1.b and .d requirements that are conventionally expressed in the PUD Text, and not on the site plan itself.

To satisfy the spirit and intent of the specific informational elements of the PUD conceptual site plan, Staff has listed certain recommendations at the end of this report, including the connection of required elements between the Text and the site plan Exhibits.

Zoning Code Section 11-71-6 gives the Planning Commission authority and discretion to require adequate perimeter treatments, including screening, landscaping, and setbacks. Staff believes that the site plan should, regardless of the absence of other elements, reflect any and all proposed screening, perimeter landscaping, sidewalks, and perimeter trails (existing and as may be improved) on the site plans Exhibits C, C.1, and C.2. This also goes for a development entrance sign if/as may be proposed at 121st St. S., advertising developments without arterial street frontage and accessed via the proposed collector street. Such may be anticipated per language in PUD Section III.E.

Grade elevation changes, minimalistic signage, and generous landscaping can be used to good effect and result in attractive, upscale developments, and the developer should consider incorporating standards for these measures in the PUD.

In the interest of efficiency and avoiding redundancy, regarding PUD particulars for needed corrections and site development considerations, such as screening, buffering, and exterior materials, please review the recommended Conditions of Approval as listed at the end of this report.

The Fire Marshal’s, City Engineer’s, and City Attorney’s review correspondence are attached to this Staff Report (if received). Their comments are incorporated herein by reference and should be made conditions of approval where not satisfied at the time of approval.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed PUD 76 at its regular meeting held February 06, 2013. Minutes of that meeting are attached to this report.

Access & Circulation. As proposed, primary access to the development would be via a proposed collector street connecting 121st St. S. to Memorial Dr. via the existing 126th St. S. constructed in the past couple years. By this collector road, all the Development Areas within the PUD would have access. There is a gap between the existing 126th St. S. right-of-way and the subject property, suggesting the necessity of separate instrument dedication of right-of-way to connect to 126th St. S. This should be explained in the Access section of the PUD Text and connection will be a Condition of Approval of this PUD.

The collector street is proposed to intersect with 121st St. S. at the location where there is an existing curb cut/driveway entrance constructed when 121st St. S. was widened. To the west of this, there is a smaller street proposed to intersect with 73rd E. Ave., which serves Fox Hollow and the North Heights Addition.

Per PUD Section III.E, the collector street will have an 80’ right-of-way and 38’ roadway width. A typical section for the collector street and the minor streets may also be employed for further illustration.

Per Subdivision Regulations Ordinance # 854 Section 9.2.2, these geometries would be consistent with a residential and/or office collector road. As this is a commercial development, a “Commercial Collector” street would have 80’ of right-of-way and 42’ of roadway width. Thus, the PUD should qualify this statement that such geometries must be recommended by the City of Bixby Staff and be approved by the Bixby City Council for Waiver from the Subdivision Regulations.

The proposed access points to 121st St. S. require City Engineer and/or County Engineer curb cut approval, and the Fire Marshal’s approval in terms of locations, spacing, widths, and curb return radii.

Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.S provides:

“S. Street Offsets: Street centerline offsets of less than one hundred twenty five feet (125’) for minor streets shall be avoided.”

The City Engineer and City Planner believe that the intent of this Subdivision Regulations design standard is to have streets and/or major curb cut/driveway entrances align, for traffic safety, flow, and accessibility purposes.

To facilitate acceptable traffic flow and accessibility, in the future, traffic lights may be warranted at certain of the intersections of these streets with Memorial Dr. and/or 121st St. S.

Sidewalks are required by the Subdivision Regulations along 121st St. S. and along internal streets to be constructed within the PUD. The PUD Text section entitled “Access and Circulation” reflects that sidewalks will be constructed as required.

During the TAC meeting held February 06, 2013, Staff suggested to Tanner Consulting, LLC that the Fry Creek Ditch access drives could be improved as a walking trail amenity for the development. If the developer would be willing to make this improvement, appropriate language should also be added to the PUD Text section entitled “Access and Circulation.”

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use. Surrounding zoning is a mixture of AG, CG, CS, OL, RS-1, and RS-3. See the case map for illustration of existing zoning patterns, which are described in the following paragraphs.

To the north (across 121st St. S.), the Fox Hollow and North Heights Addition residential subdivisions are zoned RS-3 and RS-1, respectively, the Fry Creek Ditch # 2 to the northwest is zoned AG, and an 11-acre agricultural/vacant tract to the northeast is zoned OL/CS/PUD 51.

The Fry Creek Ditch # 1 to the south is zoned AG and the Crosscreek “office/warehouse” heavy commercial / trade center and retail strip center is zoned CS with PUD 37.

The Fry Creek Ditch #2 abuts to the west and is zoned AG. Beyond this to the west is vacant/wooded land owned by the City of Bixby, the Three Oaks Smoke Shop located on a 2-acre tract at 7060 E. 121st St. S., and along Sheridan Rd., the Seven Lakes I and Seven Lakes II residential subdivisions and additional vacant land zoned RS-4 for a future “Seven Lakes” phase or phases.

To the east is agricultural land zoned AG, CS, and CG, the Easton Sod sales lot zoned RS-3, OL, & CS, the Encore on Memorial upscale apartment complex zoned RM-2/PUD 70, a Pizza Hut zoned CG, and a My Dentist Dental Clinic zoned CS. Memorial Dr. is further to the east.

Per the Comprehensive Plan, all the land between Fry Creek Ditch # 1 and # 2 and 121st St. S. and Memorial Dr., including the subject property, approximately 180 acres in all, is planned for Corridor-intensity development, which provides that all of the available Zoning districts are either In Accordance or May Be Found In Accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. This 180 acre area is anticipated to be developed intensively, as it is in a prime location, is one of the last, exceptionally large undeveloped acreages in all of South Tulsa County north of the Arkansas River, has all the necessary utilities, has Memorial Dr. frontage and improved access by the widened 121st St. S., and is out of the 100-year Floodplain.

Circa 2005, 121st St. S. between Sheridan Rd. and Memorial Dr. was widened to a 4-lane major street with a 5th, dedicated turning lane in the center, consistent with its designation on the Tulsa City-County Major Street and Highway Plan (MHSP) and Bixby Comprehensive Plan as a Primary Arterial. This infrastructure improvement has further enabled the intensive development of this 1-mile major street corridor.

It appears that, with the exception of the approximately 320’ of frontage on 121st St. S. belonging to Fox Hollow, all of the private land along 121st St. S. between Sheridan Rd. and Memorial Dr. has, or is planned or expected to develop/redevelop with intense uses.

In a trend accelerating since the street widening, the 121st St. S. corridor between Sheridan Rd. and Memorial Dr. has seen a significant amount of intensive zoning and development activity. The land to the northwest is the Bixby North Elementary school on a 23-acre campus, and next to that is the Bixby North

5th and 6th Grade Center on a 10-acre campus and the LifeChurch 4.4-acre facility. The Three Oaks Smoke Shop is located on a 2-acre tract approximately 1,100 feet from the subject property on the south side of the street, and all of the balance of the land to the west along the south side of 121st St. S. has been zoned CS with PUD 53 and platted in WoodMere for commercial use and office buildings. The 11-acre tract to the northeast was approved for CS and OL zoning and commercial development per PUD 51 in 2006. The 40-acre Bixby Centennial Plaza is just beyond that to the east, and was approved for CS zoning, in 2001, and for commercial development by the plat of Bixby Centennial Plaza in 2006. A 1.6-acre, more or less, tract located at the 7700-block of E. 121st St. S. (possibly previously addressed 7600 E. 121st St. S.), abutting the subject property to the east, was rezoned to CS in March of 2012.

The requested CG zoning and PUD 76 propose a moderately intensive, multiple use suburban development of the subject property. Within the 180-acre area above-defined, there are three (3) instances of approved CG zoning immediately east of the subject property. Immediately south of Fry Creek Ditch # 1, the Crosscreek development is more consistent with CG zoning than its existing CS zoning. Across Memorial Dr. to the east of the 180-acre area above-defined, there is an existing ministorage business, Spartan Self Storage, and just to the east of that is a 16-acre tract approved for "office/warehouse" / "trade center" and ministorage development (PUD 68). Thus, there is located in the immediate area precedent for CG zoning and all of the uses contemplated by this multiple-use PUD. Therefore, Staff believes that, for the most part, the applications are consistent with the surrounding zoning, land use, and development patterns and are appropriate in recognition of the available infrastructure and other physical facts of the area.

Development Quality / Multifamily Use PUD Element. Not including assisted living facilities, Bixby has four (4) apartment complexes. Parkwood Apartments was constructed in or around 1973. The Links at Bixby was developed in or around 1996, and was done with PUD 16. Marquis on Memorial was developed in 2008/2009, and was done with PUD 61. Encore on Memorial was developed in 2011 and was done with PUD 70. Since 1973, no apartment development has been developed in Bixby absent a PUD, and the PUDs arguably contribute to the improvement of the value and quality of such projects. To ensure the highest value and quality for any multifamily development that may occur on the subject property, consistent with the City Council's recent Conditional Approval of multifamily PUD 75, Staff recommends the PUD specify the following, which should help ensure the development product is of adequate quality and is adequately invested for the long term:

1. Consistent with the most recent and relevant three (3) multifamily development approvals in Bixby, the adequacy of multifamily construction quality shall be determined by means of a PUD Detailed Site Plan, to be approved by both the Planning Commission and the City Council. The Applicant has provided this requirement in PUD Section III.J.
2. Consistent with the Encore on Memorial project and PUD 75, this PUD should and has proposed a specific masonry requirement for each multifamily development building type: a 25% masonry requirement for any apartment buildings and a 45% masonry requirement for any leasing office.

Staff has the following additional recommendations pertaining to overall development quality:

3. There is an existing stand of mature trees along the west side of the acreage. As recommended by Staff, the Applicant has provided in PUD Section III.B, "Reasonable efforts shall be made to preserve existing mature trees." Staff recommends this language be enhanced further, such as "Each such tree which is removed for the purpose of parking shall be replaced within the concerned lot or lots at a two to one (2:1) ratio in accordance with the landscaping requirements of the Bixby Zoning Code."
4. During the TAC meeting held February 06, 2013, Staff suggested to Tanner Consulting, LLC that the Fry Creek Ditch access drives could be improved as a walking trail amenity for the development. Internal trails could also be planned, linking each DA to the Fry Creek trails. If the developer would be willing to make such improvements, appropriate language should also be added to the PUD Text section entitled "Access and Circulation."
5. Describe specific plans and add measurable minimum standards for land use buffering and compatibility needs. Perimeter treatments normally include screening fences or walls and vegetative screening, and setbacks and massing adjustments are normally provided to buffer less-intensive land uses in proportion to their relative elevations and proximities. An appropriate narrative can be added to Section III.B, summarizing plans and requirements that can otherwise

only be inferred from the Development Standards provided in the text (setbacks, height restrictions, etc.).

Zoning Code Section 11-7I-8.C requires PUDs be found to comply with the following prerequisites:

1. Whether the PUD is consistent with the comprehensive plan;
2. Whether the PUD harmonizes with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas;
3. Whether the PUD is a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the project site; and
4. Whether the PUD is consistent with the stated purposes and standards of this article.

Regarding the fourth item, the “standards” refer to the requirements for PUDs generally and, per Section 11-7I-2, the “purposes” include:

- A. Permit innovative land development while maintaining appropriate limitation on the character and intensity of use and assuring compatibility with adjoining and proximate properties;
- B. Permit flexibility within the development to best utilize the unique physical features of the particular site;
- C. Provide and preserve meaningful open space; and
- D. Achieve a continuity of function and design within the development.

For the sake of development and land use compatibility, as described more fully above, Staff would be supportive of the Zoning approvals supporting the development proposal if it (1) offers quality-enabling standards such as mature tree preservation plans and quality of life upgrades (e.g. walking trails), (2) provides for land use buffering and compatibility needs, and (3) helps ensure the highest value and quality for any multifamily development that may occur on the subject property by means of minimum masonry requirements and a requirement for Detailed Site Plan approval by both the Planning Commission and City Council. If these were satisfactorily provided for, Staff believes that the prerequisites for PUD approval per Zoning Code Section 11-7I-8.C will have been met.

Staff Recommendation. For all the reasons outlined above, Staff believes that the surrounding zoning and land uses and the physical facts of the area weigh in favor of the requested PUD and rezoning applications generally. Therefore, Staff recommends Approval of both requests, subject to the following corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval:

1. Subject to the satisfaction of all outstanding Fire Marshal, City Engineer, and City Attorney recommendations.
2. The approval of CG zoning is subject to the final approval of PUD 76 and vice-versa.
3. There is an existing stand of mature trees along the west side of the acreage. As recommended by Staff, the Applicant has provided in PUD Section III.B, “Reasonable efforts shall be made to preserve existing mature trees.” Staff recommends this language be enhanced further, such as “Each such tree which is removed for the purpose of parking shall be replaced within the concerned lot or lots at a two to one (2:1) ratio in accordance with the landscaping requirements of the Bixby Zoning Code.”
4. During the TAC meeting held February 06, 2013, Staff suggested to Tanner Consulting, LLC that the Fry Creek Ditch access drives could be improved as a walking trail amenity for the development. Internal trails could also be planned, linking each DA to the Fry Creek trails. If the developer would be willing to make such improvements, appropriate language should also be added to the PUD Text section entitled “Access and Circulation.”
5. Site Plan Exhibits B, C/C.1/C.2, etc.: Please include, represent, identify/label, and/or dimension, or otherwise correct site plan drawings as follows:
 - a. Street names as follows (confirm first with all appropriate City Staff):
 - i. East-west Collector Street: East 126th Street South
 - ii. North-south Collector Street: South 74th East Avenue
 - iii. North-south minor Street: South 73rd East Avenue
 - iv. East-west minor Street: East 121st Place South
 - b. Rights-of-way and roadway widths per other recommendations in this report
 - c. Consistent with other recommendations in this report, please identify what screening will be proposed for which property lines (where known; can be qualified as appropriate)
 - d. Sidewalks
 - e. Fry Creek Ditch access roads on adjoining right-of-way tracts

- f. *Perimeter and/or internal trails (if/as may be planned)*
 - g. *Development entrance sign if/as may be proposed at 121st St. S.*
6. *There is a gap between the existing 126th St. S. right-of-way and the subject property, suggesting the necessity of separate instrument dedication of right-of-way to connect to 126th St. S. This should be explained in the Access section of the PUD Text and connection will be a Condition of Approval of this PUD.*
 7. *Per PUD Section III.E, the collector street will have an 80' right-of-way and 38' roadway width. A typical section for the collector street and the minor streets may also be employed for further illustration. Per Subdivision Regulations Ordinance # 854 Section 9.2.2, these geometries would be consistent with a residential and/or office collector road. As this is a commercial development, a "Commercial Collector" street would have 80' of right-of-way and 42' of roadway width. Thus, the PUD should qualify this statement that such geometries must be recommended by the City of Bixby Staff and be approved by the Bixby City Council for Waiver from the Subdivision Regulations.*
 8. *Subject to City Engineer and/or County Engineer curb cut approval for the proposed access points to 121st St. S., and the Fire Marshal's approval of locations, spacing, widths, and curb return radii.*
 9. *Section III.B: Please specify what screening and landscaping will be proposed for which property lines (type and height) per Zoning Code Section 11-7I-8.B.1.e. This section may also be used to describe height and setback restrictions within specific non-residential Development Areas in relation to residential land uses and zoning districts. Specifics should address proximate properties and zoning districts including, but not necessarily limited to:*
 - a. *Fox Hollow to the north*
 - b. *Non-residential Development Area D in relation to Seven Lakes subdivisions to the west, residential areas to the southwest, and multifamily residential to the east (Encore multifamily)*
 - c. *RS-3 zoning in the Easton Sod sales lot abutting to the east (may be qualified as appurtenant only if actually developed residentially)*
 - d. *Non-residential alternate for Development Area H in relation to multifamily residential to the south (Encore multifamily)*
 10. *Section V: Please correct citation to Exhibit I.*
 11. *Consider whether the PUD should add a measure of flexibility with mutual parking privileges language, in an effort to reduce unnecessary parking and its construction and maintenance expense, and the other externalities excessive parking may generate.*
 12. *Development Standards:*
 - a. *DA C: 5' side yard setback and 20' setbacks between "townhome buildings" provided, but setback not provided between townhouse units within a "townhouse development." Please add per Zoning Code Section 11-7B-4.A.1 Table 3: "...0 feet on attached side only."*
 - b. *DA C: In anticipation of possible multifamily development (up to a fourplex), provide a setback for multifamily buildings from DA and lot line boundaries, such as 20'.*
 - c. *DA D: In anticipation of possible ministorage development, add height restrictions commensurate with those listed in UU 16 or specify in the Development Standards that the height listed also applies to ministorage buildings.*
 - d. *DA D: In anticipation of possible ministorage development, add proposed setbacks between ministorage buildings as required by Zoning Code (30' or as otherwise required by the Fire Marshal).*
 - e. *DA E, F, & H: Minimum landscaped percentage: 10% is already required by Code if commercial, but 15% would be required if office. Specify 15% for office or otherwise please remove (to allow default to Code).*
 13. *For the recommended Conditions of Approval necessarily requiring changes to the Text or Exhibits, recognizing the difficulty of attaching Conditions of Approval to PUD ordinances due to the legal requirements for posting, reading, and administering ordinance adoption, please incorporate the changes into appropriate sections of the PUD, or with reasonable amendments as needed. Please incorporate also the other conditions listed here which cannot be fully completed by the time of City Council ordinance approval, due to being requirements for ongoing or future actions, etc. Per the City Attorney, if conditions are not incorporated into the*

PUD Text and Exhibits prior to City Council consideration of an approval ordinance, the ordinance adoption item will be Continued to the next City Council meeting agenda.

14. *A corrected PUD Text and Exhibits package shall be submitted incorporating all of the corrections, modifications, and conditions of approval of this PUD: two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic copy (PDF preferred).*

Erik Enyart stated that the Applicant had, just prior to the meeting, submitted new PUD Text which satisfied most of Staff's recommendations. Mr. Enyart stated that, if it was the Planning Commission's intent to recommend Approval of the applications, he recommended the Motion for Approval be subject to Staff's recommendations, as that would cover all of those not yet [completed]. Mr. Enyart clarified that there were 14 recommended [corrections, modifications, and] Conditions of Approval.

Chair Thomas Holland addressed the audience and noted that these applications had been heard at the previous meeting, and admonished those speaking on the items, in the interest of time, to refrain from repeating concerns already expressed.

Chair Thomas Holland recognized Applicant Roy Johnsen. Mr. Johnsen stated that he believed he had pretty much covered all of Staff's recommendations. Mr. Johnsen stated that the current PUD [Text] was now the fourth version he had written in response to the recommendations. Mr. Johnsen noted that he had met with Erik Enyart on the Tuesday prior, and "I think I've pretty much covered" all the concerns. Mr. Johnsen stated that he would discuss the changes briefly. Mr. Johnsen stated that, in Development Area A, which was in front of the life care facility, the uses were limited to [those allowed within] CS, [and he anticipated] those things supporting of [the life care facility's] main business. Mr. Johnsen stated that there was a concern expressed about a hotel being allowed as within Use Unit 19, and so he made an adjustment to remove Use Unit [19] altogether. Mr. Johnsen stated that it was somewhat related: In Development Area E, [he and his client] left Use Unit 19 in, but limited it to a hotel, as the client actually considered a hotel to be a very good use. Mr. Johnsen stated that there had been a lot of discussion regarding Development Area C. Mr. Johnsen stated that, in the neighborhood meeting there was concern expressed from the single-family neighborhood to the west—Seven Lakes—and so he had made a series of adjustments in Development Area C. Mr. Johnsen stated that the changes included limiting the Development Area to 75 dwelling units and restricting multifamily buildings to no more than four (4) units within a two (2) story height. Mr. Johnsen stated that he expected the Development Area to have duplexes as the predominant use, but perhaps townhomes and perhaps single-family homes. Mr. Johnsen stated that his client intended to spend \$200,000 per unit for duplexes, so this would be a "very high" quality development, which would find a very good market here. Mr. Johnsen stated that, for Development Area D, [he and his client] had listened to the neighborhood's and City Planner's concerns. Mr. Johnsen stated that the west boundary will have a screening fence, even though there is already a very wide Fry Creek Ditch. Mr. Johnsen stated that there would also be, on the west and north side, a masonry requirement of 25%, and he had removed the language allowing open air storage with Planning Commission approval.

Chair Thomas Holland asked for clarification on whether the open air storage was [proscribed] by taking out the verbiage or restricting it outright. Erik Enyart consulted the latest PUD Text and responded that it had simply been taken out, and so it would default to the Zoning Code, which prohibited open air storage. Roy Johnsen stated that, if it would make the Commission more

comfortable, he could put in affirmative language that [open air storage] wouldn't be there. The Commissioners indicated agreement.

Roy Johnsen stated that Development Areas E and F would be planned for general commercial. Mr. Johnsen stated that Development Area G would be limited to office, which was a good use. Mr. Johnsen stated that 121st St. S. was "a very strong street," and was "basically five (5) lanes; four (4) and a turn lane," and was of "very good quality." Mr. Johnsen stated that there had been concern that the right-of-way did not presently exist [to connect the subject property to 126th St. S.]. Mr. Johnsen stated that, outside the PUD, "we have a contract with [the seller] at closing that they will dedicate" [the right-of-way], and "under the PUD we are required to extend [126th St. S.] to Memorial [Dr.]. Mr. Johnsen stated that this was covered in the words and circumstances. Mr. Johnsen stated that there may be some slight wording change, which he would work out with Erik before the City Council meeting. Mr. Johnsen noted that the Staff recommendation was favorable, and asked the Commission for approval with Staff recommendations to be finalized before the City Council.

Chair Thomas Holland clarified with the other Commissioners that they preferred that he invite other people in attendance to speak on the item before asking questions of the Applicant.

Chair Thomas Holland recognized Jan Swafford of 11974 S. 73rd E. Ave. from the Sign-In Sheet. Ms. Swafford thanked the Commission for working with [the area residents]. Ms. Swafford expressed concern over the land uses proposed.

Chair Thomas Holland recognized Jay Mauldin of 7341 E. 119th Pl. S. from the Sign-In Sheet. Mr. Mauldin summarized the following written statement:

"There are two things from last week's meeting that I want to clear up. Ms. Swafford made reference to the City Council commenting, three years ago, that there would be no more apartment complexes in this corridor and I recall some confusion on the part of a couple of Commissioners. I don't think that was a ruling that the City Council made. My recollection is that it was discussed by one or more Councilors and/or one or more Planning Commissioners, at that time.

"Also, last week, Ms. Toll[i]son made reference to and read a letter concerning 73rd East Avenue extending all the way to 131st Street. Three years ago, there was some master planning being contracted by the city and at that time, when we through the PUD 70 discussion, there was, in fact, a plan contemplated to take 73rd East Avenue all the way to 131st Street. I know that's not contemplated here, but since it was brought up last week, I just wanted to point out that she wasn't crazy. There was actually talk about that three years ago. She read you a letter from a neighbor who was opposed to this PUD on that basis and I wanted to address that concern.

"Regarding the PUD that is in front of us, hotel use has been removed from Area "A" and that is a good thing. As I understand the language, Area "B" is limited to Life Care Retirement Center only, the potential of multi-family use has been removed and that is a great thing. In Area "C", the building height has been reduced and the intensity of multi-family, to the extent that it exists, has

been limited and that is a good thing. I have concerns about Area “D” but I will defer to my friends at Seven Lakes with regard to Area “D”. In Area “E”, as counsel has pointed out, Use Unit 19 has been limited to hotel use only. I would rather see that use in Area “H”, but, nonetheless, I appreciate the limitation to hotel only for Use Unit 19 in Area “E”. That’s about all I have for you regarding the permitted uses of the land. I appreciate the developer and his folks receiving the feedback that has been provided and addressing the concerns that have been advanced.

“With regard to the “fairly debatable” argument, if you will, situating this proposal on this tract of land, I have always thought that 121st & Memorial is a great place for the City of Bixby to have serious sales tax revenue collection. Some years ago, I had suggested that all 180 acres should be retail. But, I also understood that was probably not going to happen and that we would end up with something like this collector street, which will provide some definition to this area and what it can be now.

“Regarding the permitted uses of this PUD on the west side of that collector street, for example, in Area “A”, I believe the merchants would like having the traffic that would come with a large commercial environment at 121st & Memorial. The folks in the Retirement Center, I think, would like to be able to literally walk across the street to one of the nicest shopping environments in all of Tulsa County. I think that the folks in the upscale dwellings in Area “C” would be amenable to that as well.

“I’ve had a brief discussion with the developer and discussions with others, in both the public and private sectors. The consensus I have identified is that the window for this opportunity is closing. With this very PUD, it is beginning to close. I believe that the City should reorder its priorities and endeavor to have a public-private partnership to espouse a clear vision as to what should happen in this corridor. I know that the City is trying to un-tarnish its image and I believe that would go a long way towards helping to make it happen. This PUD, as it exists, would not necessarily preclude that from happening. It may even help to accelerate that process and act as a spark plug, if you will.

“Again, I want to thank Mr. Dodson and his associates. I want to thank you gentlemen and I want to thank the City Planner for the outstanding work that he does.”

Chair Thomas Holland recognized David Wagner of 12563 S. 71st E. Ave. from the Sign-In Sheet. Mr. Wagner commended Erik Enyart for returning his voicemail and commended the developer for working with him and the neighboring property owners. Mr. Wagner stated that he did not hear if there was a height restriction in Development Area D. Mr. Wagner reiterated his statement from the previous meeting that a fence would be a disappointment, and that he would prefer a more substantial screening method, such as a [higher] berm topped with trees and shrubs. Mr. Wagner stated that a fence would catch trash. Mr. Wagner stated that, in regard to the matter of open air storage, he appreciated the directives made. Mr. Wagner summarized his concerns as pertaining to (1) the building height and (2) a more aesthetically pleasing [screening method].

Chair Thomas Holland asked if anyone else in attendance had any questions or comments.

Erik Enyart addressed Chair Thomas Holland and stated that, while on the same topic, Development Area D had a 35' height restriction for general commercial, and a 12' height for ministorage buildings. Lance Whisman clarified the difference with Mr. Enyart. Roy Johnsen stated that there was a landscaping requirement along the west boundary of Development Area D as well [as a screening fence and masonry requirement].

Chair Thomas Holland stated that there was a pretty good berm on Fry Creek that separated the subject property from Seven Lakes. Mr. Holland stated that the 25% masonry requirement is usually on the bottom of the building, and thus applying that to the "wholesale distributorships like those on the south [side of Fry Creek # 1 in Crosscreek]" would "do no good aesthetically" for the residents of Seven Lakes. Mr. Holland noted that they would [each] be "still a metal building." Mr. Holland noted that, if the height was capped at 35', the developer still "could build a two (2) story structure there."

Chair Thomas Holland recognized Applicant Rick Dodson. Mr. Dodson stated that [he and his partner] wished the whole 160 acres could go commercial, but "we feel if we can get this going, it will bring additional [retail] to [the balance]" of the acreage. Mr. Dodson stated that he was waiting on [ordering] the site plan [for future building(s)] to discuss them with [representative(s) of] Seven Lakes, and he [would do that there then] if he had their approval. Mr. Dodson stated that there would be a "good aesthetic look to the west."

Chair Thomas Holland asked Erik Enyart, "Can that be added as # 15?" Mr. Enyart responded looked to Mr. Holland for clarification and stated, "I don't think I caught the full gist of that."

Rick Dodson stated he would have a "stucco finish on the west—100% masonry." Roy Johnsen added that there was a Detailed Site Plan approval process also. Mr. Dodson indicated that, in lieu of meeting with the Seven Lakes representative, [he was offering] "Stucco, fence, and landscaping, all per city—that's about the most you can ask [for]." Mr. Dodson addressed Erik Enyart and asked, "Would that be easier for you to write if that way?" Mr. Dodson clarified that he was volunteering 100% masonry on the west-facing buildings. Mr. Enyart responded, "That will actually be in the PUD itself."

Chair Thomas Holland stated, "I couldn't ask for more than that."

Chair Thomas Holland clarified with Roy Johnsen that there would be a maximum of 75 dwelling units in Development Area C.

Lance Whisman stated that he had one final comment on this matter: he heard someone in Seven Lakes state that the metal roof in [Crosscreek] reflected sunlight into the [upstairs] windows of their home. Mr. Whisman expressed desire that a Condition be placed on the Approval such that, if there is a reflective metal roof, the developer paint it so it does not reflect in to the houses [in Seven Lakes]. Rick Dodson stated, "I haven't designed them yet, but my gut feeling is that [the roof would have a] north/south facing slope, and you would see the gable to the west." Mr. Whisman indicated that the green metal roof on the Bixby North Elementary school building did not reflect into his house because it was painted green. Mr. Whisman stated, "Stucco is more than accommodating."

Chair Thomas Holland asked to entertain a Motion. Erik Enyart suggested, if the Commission was inclined to recommend Approval, the wording of the Motion as follows, "Motion to Approve subject to the corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval as recommended by Staff, and to include the amendments made by the Applicant during this meeting." A Commissioner asked what those amendments were. Mr. Enyart scanned through his notes, and Ricky Jones of Tanner Consulting, LLC read from his notes the three (3) amendments the developer had offered as follows:

1. Adding positive language excluding open air storage [in Development Area D],
2. 100% stucco on the west side [of buildings in Development Area D], and
3. Colored roof [for metal roofs in Development Area D to prevent glare].

Larry Whiteley made a MOTION to Recommend APPROVAL of PUD 76 and BZ-364, subject to the corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval as recommended by Staff, and to include the three (3) amendments made by the Applicant during this meeting as follows:

1. Adding positive language excluding open air storage in Development Area D,
2. 100% stucco on the west side of buildings in Development Area D, and
3. Color painting of metal roofs in Development Area D to prevent glare.

Jeff Baldwin SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Holland, Baldwin, Whiteley, & Whisman
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
MOTION CARRIED: 4:0:0

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Approval of Minutes for the January 21, 2013 Special Meeting²
-

Chair Thomas Holland introduced the item and asked to entertain a Motion. Jeff Baldwin made a MOTION to APPROVE to the Minutes as presented by Staff. Lance Whisman SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Baldwin, Holland, & Whisman
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: Whiteley.
MOTION CARRIED: 3:0:1

² At the February 19, 2013 Regular Meeting held February 19, 2013, Chair Thomas Holland declared this item PASSED to the next Regular Meeting Agenda, which would be March 18, 2013. However, since it was still on the agenda during this Continued Meeting, new action was taken which nullified the previous action.

During the Roll Call, Larry Whiteley explained that he was voting “Abstain” as he was not present at that meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

Chair Thomas Holland asked if there was any Old Business to consider. Erik Enyart stated that he had none. No action taken.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chair Thomas Holland asked if there was any New Business to consider. Erik Enyart stated that he had none. No action taken.

ROLL CALL:³

Members Present: Larry Whiteley, Jeff Baldwin, Thomas Holland, and Lance Whisman.
Members Absent: John Benjamin.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chair Thomas Holland declared the meeting Adjourned at 6:44 PM.

APPROVED BY:

Chair

Date

City Planner/Recording Secretary

³ The Roll Call was temporarily skipped and was completed just prior to Adjournment. All four (4) Planning Commission members reflected in the Roll Call were in the meeting at the time of the Call to Order and through the entire meeting to the Adjournment.