

**City of Bixby
City Council Meeting
Minutes
City Hall Municipal Building
116 W Needles, Bixby, OK 74008
August 8, 2016 6:00 P.M.**

The agenda for the regularly scheduled meeting of the City Council of the City of Bixby was posted on the bulletin board at City Hall, 116 West Needles Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma on August 5, 2016 on or before 5:00 p.m.

Mayor Easton called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Yvonne Adams City Clerk called roll and all members were present, except for Vice Mayor Guthrie. Councilor Stewart arrived at 6:04 p.m.

Members Present

**King
Decatur
Stewart
Easton**

Staff Present

**Patrick Boulden, City Attorney
Jared Cottle, City Manager
Ike Shirley, Police Chief
Charles Barnes, Finance Dir.
Bea Aamodt, Public Works Dir.
Marcae Hilton, City Planner
Jason Mohler, Dev. Service Dir.
Yvonne Adams, City Clerk**

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Invocation was given by City Clerk Yvonne Adams

Mayor Easton said Item #1 on the Consent Agenda is:

CITY CLERKS REPORT

Consider and approve:

- a) Minutes for the Regular City Council meeting dated 07/25/16.
- b) Acknowledge receipt of Permit No. SL000072160442, Residences at Boardwalk apartments, Sanitary Sewer Extension, Facility No. 20438 to serve the City of Bixby.
- c) Acknowledge receipt of Permit No.WL000072160443, Residences at Boardwalk Apartments, Water Line Extension, Facility No. 3007243 to serve the City of Bixby.

Mayor Easton asked if there are any questions or amendments to the consent agenda.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion. Councilor Decatur made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor King. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 3-0

Yes: Decatur, King, Easton.

No: None.

Mayor Easton asked Council to move to item #7 so we can wait on Councilor Stewart to arrive. Councilor Stewart arrived at 6:04 p.m.

Mayor Easton said item #1 on the Regular Agenda is:

Continuation, discussion and action on the approval of Comprehensive Plan Amendment (*BCPA-15*), Planned Unit Development (*PUD 93*), and Rezoning (*BZ-389*) from RS-1 (Residential Single-Family) to OL (Office Low Intensity)-Applicant Jr Donelson of JR Donelson Inc.; in part of Section 35, T17N, R13E, 7749 E. 118th Street S, generally located west of Memorial and one-half mile south of 111th Street.

Presented by: Marcae Hilton

Others who spoke: JR Donelson Inc., 12820 S Memorial Dr., Harley Lundy 11647 E. 73 E. Ave, Lynn Ledford 7734 E. 118 St. Pat Moore, Noel Malan 11655 S. 75 E. Ave, Doug Welch 9120 E. 115th St. S, Jay Mauldin 9341 E. 119 Pl.

City Planner Marcae Hilton stated that this is a continuation from a previous meeting and the item was heard at the July 11th City Council Meeting, during that meeting council voted to table that item to be on the next agenda. Marcae stated that it was originally approved by the Planning Commission and it was approved with a couple of comments. Marcae asked council to refer to the memo she had handed out previously and this is a PUD and the applicant has asked for a Comprehensive Plan change and a zoning change, Marcae in order to the zoning and PUD zoning the approval the Comprehensive Plan would have to be amended or excepted first. Marcae continued to explain portions of her staff report that was in the council packet and the memo she handed out before the meeting. Councilor Stewart stated that normally there is a project and with this we have no project, I would like to know what's going on here. Marcae stated that she sees your point and overall the PUD is restrictive for a lot of good uses, Marcae stated that it is common in many communities to establish a PUD and zoning because it makes it a little easier to sell.

Discussion Ensued on Item #1 pertaining to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, PUD 93 and Rezoning from RS-1 to OL.

JR Donelson Inc. stated that with regards at answering Mr. Stewart's first question about the lot sizes and from the handouts on exhibit 3 PUD it shows Lot 11 9ft wide with 205 ft. depth, Lot 12 at 100 ft. wide and 203 ft. in depth, Lot 13 69 ft. wide and 200 ft. in depth. JR stated that we are in agreement with Staff's recommendations to approve the PUD, the PUD will allow the existing CS (Commercial Shopping) on Lots 12 and 13 remain and the Lot 11 will be OL (Office Low Intensity) and the PUD would be similar with is across the street on the south side of 118th. JR explained that in reference to a project the owners made efforts to market the property unsuccessfully because of the fact the one Lot is zoned RS and no one has come forward to take the chance of spending money and not to be able to build the project they desire. JR stated that this PUD approval will allow the land to be marketed as one parcel of land and that is what the owners are making an effort to do. JR stated that we will met the criteria of the PUD and be an asset to

this city community just as Jiffy Lube has been a good business partner and a good neighbor in North Heights and those are good reasons we would like this city council to approve this PUD, the zoning application and the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan with Staffs recommendations.

Harley Lundy 11647 S. 73 E. Ave. stated that he is the Vice President of the North Heights Home Owners Associate and I have appeared before you before on this issue. Harley stated that and would like to correct something from the last meeting which I was not able to attend and the option was left that North Heights is not for developing this and that is not right, North Heights wants to see it developed and we were responsible for Jiffy Lube coming in, and I spoke in behalf of Jiffy Lube and I thought they would be a good neighbor and they have certainly have been a good neighbor. Harley stated that what we are oppose to is high traffic situation on which would be a very bad street corner, and we are not prepared to support something with high traffic and also if we knew what was coming in I am sure we would be supportive.

Lynn Ledford 7734 E. 118 St. stated that I am one of four neighbors closest to the zoning proposal and my personal option is that if the applicant had approached us like Jiffy Lube wanting their office building we would have been a lot more receptive and understanding, I also agree with Mr. Stewart that the zoning, PUD and Comprehensive Plan is hard to understand and I wasn't approached about this until Friday and we wanted to have a meeting with citizens in the neighborhood and see what is going on and we never did met. We met with Jiffy Lube and things didn't always go our way or their way but compromised and the end result is even better than what we bargain for we getting brick on a nice office building down there and we appreciate that and we would like to do the same thing with the Green property.

Pat Moore stated that I just found out the project two hours ago and JR helped us with the original project and the City help us also and the neighborhood was fantastic in helping to put together our project. Pat stated that it wouldn't be far of me to tell another business man you can't have what we have, however our project was laid out in great detail and I have no objections to the change in the zoning however we don't know what's going there and I do have some concerns about traffic build up since we don't know what the project is, and I can't stand against the neighborhood in what they want in this matter.

Noel Malan 11655 S. 75 E Ave stated that read the definition of transperance and by now means accusing the owner or developer or realtor of being deceitful and in the absence of the transparency one tends to wonder what the hidden agenda is and I get this filling we are tap dancing around something which is not being clearly defined. Noel stated that what is being requested is a blank check to allow the owners of Lots 11, 12 and 13 to do as they please without consideration of the neighboring property owners and or the community. Noel stated that all we want is open honest dialog and I think Pat from Jiffy Lube invited us to come along and discuss his project and that is really all we are asking for. Noel stated that when considering the covenant currently in place it seems any changes the usage of these properties must be approved by the majority owners of Block 7 with signatures of owners of 8 of the 13 Lots opposing any proposal Lots 11, 12 and 13 to be used for non-residential purposes until such time as the specific use of the lots is made clear and approved in a manner that is consistent with our Protective Covenants, and all we ask for is transperance dialog. Noel stated that we are asking you of the governing body who is responsible

for the well-being of the majority of this city to oppose any kind of a blank check given to this development until what is going to go in there.

Mayor Easton asked City Attorney Patrick Boulden did you research the covenant concerns. City Attorney Patrick Boulden stated that under the Oklahoma and generally accepted nationwide the zoning and private covenants are considered separately and independently of one another and the most restrictive provision apply and you are not bound by covenants in any decision you make.

Doug Welch 9120 E. 115th St. S stated that he represents the North Height Church of Christ and we are north neighbors to the lots in question. Doug stated that he wanted to express his concern that would disrupt anything that we are doing in our worship service, we have offices in there for the minister during the week, Wednesday evening bible studies, we operate the meals on wheels on Monday's, Wednesday and Friday mornings also weddings and funeral that take place there. Doug stated that we want to express our concern is there is something going in there to disrupt what we are doing, we have two drives that come in off of Memorial and the South drive would be on the north boarder of those properties, and if the restriction is not to use any other exit other than 118th I could envision they would come north and use our drive to get out on to Memorial and that would not be desirable. Doug stated that Mr. Green has been a wonderful neighbor.

Jay Mauldin 7341 E. 119 Pl. stated that "This is restrictive" PUD is supplemental zoning, can change in a heartbeat, the restriction can change tomorrow. 3 things, Comp Plan Amendment, Look in Red Dot Handout-Page 6 of Comp Plan, Land Use Map. Right now Lot 11 is low intensity/residential applicant is asking for Medium Intensity/Commercial Area. Zoning being sought is OL, last year Erik Enyart and City staff had the opinion red-dot hand out, simply remove the residential area designation from the Land Map. Once you change the Land Map that allows you to rezone the lot. Once you rezone the lot, it doesn't matter if the land map says low intensity, medium intensity or high intensity. What controls how the land is used is the zoning and the PUD overlay. An applicant can come back and not use the PUD and develop through straight zoning and that is a concern of mine. What is being asked for tonight, would be to change the land map, Lot 11.

Mayor Easton asked if Patrick addressed to you, joint panel with Planning Commission, required a PUD.

JR stated that is correct voted on by City Council.

Jay stated that on that topic, response to your inquiry, I don't believe the lands in question was part of the corridor, I was present you may recall at the joint meetings when you approved.....given the apparent, we are not all sure or exactly 100%. My concern..., raise your hand if you are from North Heights or Fox Hollow, my concern is, if the PUD is not implemented and development occurs through conventional zoning, what you do tonight by adopting the proposed language, which last year the city planner, the city staff said it was unnecessary.

If you do this, we are going to make Lot 11 Medium Intensity, then in a Commercial Area. Then once the dust settles, you can rezone it OL, once the dust settles, an applicant can come and say I

would like to turn lot 11 into CS, and at that point, you will be hard pressed to not allow a Commercial Zone. As I told the Planning Commission standing right here, it were me, if I bought it, it was zoned OL the land map says Medium Intensity/Commercial Area, and you won't give me CS, we are going down town, and I am going to win. Here is what I think the court will say..., I think a district court judge will tell you, you don't have to zone it CS, but you can't refuse a commercial district because your land map recommends medium intensity with a commercial area.

Mayor asked Patrick application of comp plan-guideline.

Jay stated that what I submit to you right now, the land map recommends Lot 11 be developed with low intensity as a residential area, you will be changing that tonight as medium intensity in a commercial area, it is not necessary to get OL zoning, that is the point.

Look at red dot handout. Low Intensity designation would be retained for Lot 11 subject property. Further, down OL zoning may be found in accordance with the low intensity land use map. On Page 2, this method does not require amending the comprehensive plan to extend medium intensity or commercial zoning farther into North Heights neighborhood. to a 180 degree policy shift from last year.

Councilor Stewart asked Jay what is it that you can vision a win win situation.

Jay stated that understand, per our City Code any time you implement a PUD and more than two zoning, no one has a problem with OL just basis or predicate of getting OL . If you have OL and CS, through straight zoning, OL stays on Lot 11, with PUD, OL on Lot 11 can be reallocated. The OL can be against Memorial. OL and CS can be moved around.

Jay explained that once the PUD is overlaid the zoning can be reallocated.Win, Win, Let's be conservative, no blank checks. If I were sitting in that chair right now, the one that is empty, I would tell you the same thing. I think most of you know, I am would tell you what I am telling you, I am just standing here. I think the way to do this, is to do the comprehensive plan amendment, the way it was suggested last year, unless you are going to tell me that staff was incompetent last year, it can be done the way it was proposed last year. That will get you to OL, that will unlock the residential area designation from Lot 11 and then you can do your BZ-389 rezoning and turn it into OL and then you can pass the PUD, but anything that requires a special exception....major amendment to PUD.

City Manager Jarod Cottle stated that the process and preference not staff competence.

Jay explained that I have every confidence and I am very optimistic of our new staff members.....not about dumping on our new City Planner or new City Engineer... not a slight on current staff....Mayor...

Councilor Stewart stated that he wants flexibility for business owners.

Jay stated the reason I bring this up, we are talking about the same 3 lots...not necessary to go to this length to get the OL zoning....Jiffy Lube...not necessary to go to this length to rezone the lot

to OL, simply remove the residential area land use designation, as was proposed last year. Vote it and say yes! Then go to the OL zoning, go from RS-1 to OL, thumbs up, yes.

Jay explained that now we go to the PUD, what do we do there? Applicant sought as modifications 15, 17, 18... after 1.5 hours discussion, language was drafted, and it comes to you as a Planning Commission recommendation, it included use units that could be done through special exceptions, but the applicant was not asking for... Applicant did not ask for but got here via some interpretation of Planning

Commission, anything that can be done through straight zoning has to come back as a major amendment. ...Public notice, signage, and hearing,... endangered species in Bixby, single family residential property owners...that is whose interest I am here tonight to represent... win, win, in this case: 15 withdrawn, 18 withdrawn, 3 particular uses in 17, tune-up place, auto lube, vehicle repair shop. We would like to talk about it, once it is actually proposed. Use Unit 2, 6, 7, 8, 20 be removed, not in PUD... cautious and conservative, place holder.

It has been said, pay no attention to those restrictive covenants; City Attorney is correct in that it should not preclude you from hearing this case tonight. But think about this, if you adopt the language that would allow Lot 11 to be zoned CS or would establish a predicated for such you are going to bake into the cake special exceptions, if you push them off the ledge, what are you going to do? Saddle up ride down to district court... we have protective covenants....land owner wants? Development interest wants? Anyone wants? District Court ... lot 11 stays residential until 7 or more property owners in block 7 say otherwise. If you push this thing too far, you could end up in a place kind of like you were with Addison Creek, who created this situation? Cautious conservative approach, write blank checks and give up protections.

Development Services Director Jason Mohler states that it is a matter of interpretation. Councilor Stewart stated that is there any protection for citizens.

City Planner Marcae' Hilton explained it is a predevelopment process.

Councilor Stewart stated that he would like to see a project.

City Manager Jared Cottle explained the clarification-two tracts, one tract-Zoning and PUD that JR is presenting. Second tract by Jay, do zoning but don't do PUD.

City Planner Marcae' Hilton stated No, Jay said you don't need to change the Comp Plan (Jay-that is not correct either).

City Manager Jared, asked Jay if you are suggesting to change the zoning to OL..., you have a PUD tract and a zoning tract, where we just zone that third lot to OL, I think you said no one has an objection to that.

Jay stated that nobody has an objection that I know, I am unaware of any objection to the lot being zoned OL, the point I was making is... are you doing it in a way that will keep it OL or in a way that will open up the door to rezone it to CS. Today's proposal will open up that door the way it was going to be done last year will not.

City Manager Jared stated that what we are talking about is just zoning the one lot to OL, we have already got 2 lots that are CS, one tract is just simply zone that third lot OL, that is what you are suggesting (Jay) where we are today with a PUD. The PUD is rezoning and changing the comp plan with the PUD...the objection is to the PUD and the ability to move the bulk area requirements and the uses being able to move them around. The Mayor is asking, what is the difference to the seller or buyer? I have a zoning and PUD together vs. I have 3 lots individually zoned and now I have to come back and put those together in a PUD, the only thing that goes in OL, parking, offices, and studio. 2 uses can go in by right.

City Manager asked if the City Planner Marcae is clear.

Jay stated that he is not opposed to rezoning Lot 11, not opposed to rezoning it OL, I am not opposed to a PUD. Let's just not zone Lot 11, let's not change the comprehensive plan land map to allow it to be rezoned to CS zoning. The language from last year would work to get it to OL, then you rezone it OL, then put the PUD on it with the limitations that anything that would be required as a special exception today comes back as a major amendment. I am for the plan amendment as we did it last year, I am for the OL and I am OK with the PUD with the stipulation for anything that requires a special exception.

City Manager Jared Cottle stated that conflict with comp plan and text. Last year the table.

Jay asked are we not using the table today.

City Manager Jared Cottle stated that it is conflict with text.

City Planner Marcae Hilton stated that the table explains on page 36 why there is OL in the low intensity, I can be flexibility.

JR explained that 10 foot UE, minimum of two structures, concerns by church (parking agreement, mutual access agreement) privacy fence... text always trumps exhibits... with regards to hidden agenda, gene green, not hidden agenda, son and family have no hidden agenda.

Councilor Stewart asked how we can have a win, win for residence and client.

JR stated that they no objection to OL zoning, no objection to uses in OL, no objection to uses spelled out in PUD.

Councilor Stewart asked is there a way to zone without PUD?

JR stated that this City Body passed ordinance that requires a PUD, 10 years ago I could have done straight zoning. I cannot do that today.

City Attorney Patrick stated that it is Council discretion, policy prefers PUD.

Councilor Stewart stated that nothing says you can't OL zoning on lot 11.

City Attorney Patrick Boulden stated that it's your discretion.

JR. stated that following direction of staff and planning commission.

Councilor Stewart asked if there is any objection to lot 11 zoned OL.

Speaker in audience-don't want CS

Councilor Stewart stated what about Lots 11 and 12?

City Planner Marcae' Hilton process for any zoning change.

Councilor Stewart asked if 12, 13-CS, citizens fine with 11 being OL.

City Planner Marcae' Hilton explained that the Comp Plan amendment still required with OL zoning.

City Manager Jared Cottle stated that OL zoning with requirement for PUD will be in future.

JR stated that OL lot 11 cannot be changed and that it takes away all the restrictions.

Councilor Stewart stated that I don't think there is an agenda, I know....it just makes so much easier if we know what is going in there.

City Manager Jared Cottle stated that the land owner having a project turned down last time, marketable piece of property. Patrick can council do a rezoning with a requirement that a PUD comes back when there is a project.

City Attorney Patrick Boulden explained that you cannot condition straight zoning, you can rely on a comp plan to guide the council.

JR stated that this is why this body required a PUD that was part of the reasoning it was a requirement.

Citizen asked that they talk to us. Have a forum that we can talk so we would understand.

Citizen, 4th of July traffic, kid run over, major auto accident, not anti-development, just want to see control.

Jay stated that it sounds like contemplating rezoning lot 11 as OL or I mean not having a PUD, I thought PUD has lot of flexibility to it. I am fine with OL on Lot 11, everybody is! It is a matter how do you do it, if you are not going to have a comprehensive plan land map amendment we are going to do BZ-389, and we know staff wants us to change the land map. But we are going to do it like Jiffy Lube, go ahead and rezone it OL. I am going to be fine with that. Why because it is Low Intensity, residential area on the land map, it doesn't establish a predicate for a subsequent request for CS zoning. I am fine with that; if you want to put a PUD on it OK, as long as anything that requires a special exception comes back as a major amendment.

Jay stated to go ahead and zone it OL, but for the love of God, just rezone the thing. I don't think that legally you are required to have a comprehensive plan amendment. It may be desirable; it may be the preferred proper way of doing things. Don't rezone the lot in a way that would allow it to go to CS in the future that you don't know, we don't know what is going to happen.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion on Item #1. Mayor Easton made motion to approve a straight OL zoning, seconded by Councilor Stewart. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: Easton, Stewart, King, Decatur.
No: None

Mayor Easton asked for a motion for the PUD and Comprehensive Plan change. Mayor Easton made motion. Vote failed for lack of second.

Mayor Easton said on Item #2 on the Regular Agenda is:

Take action on the approval of Ordinance No. 2194, amending Ordinance No. 272, pursuant to application BCPA-15, **PUD 93, BZ-389, rezoning Lot 11, Block 7 of the Amended Plat of Block 7 North Heights Addition, from RS-1 (Residential Single-Family) to OL (Office Low Intensity), in part of Section 35, T17N, R13E, 7749 E. 118th Street S, generally located west of Memorial and one-half mile south of 111th Street.** Action includes separate approval of an Emergency Clause.

Presented by: Marcae Hilton

Mayor Easton asked for a motion on Item #2. Mayor Easton made motion to approve providing only the OL zoning be approve in that Ordinance, seconded by Councilor King. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: Easton, King, Decatur, Stewart.
No: None

Emergency Clause

Mayor Easton asked for a motion on the Emergency Clause. Mayor Easton made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor Stewart. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: Easton, Stewart, King, Decatur.
No: None

Mayor Easton said on Item #3 on the Regular Agenda is:

Discussion and action on the approval on Site Plan (BXSP-16.04.PRIMROSE)-PRIMROSE SCHOOL FRANCHISING COMPANY-Applicant Mark Capron on behalf of Primrose School Franchising Company for approximately 1.41 acres for the purpose of a children's nursery in part of the 101 South Memorial Center Plat, Section 25, T18N, R13E; the property is generally located south of 101st Street and East of Memorial one-quarter mile.

Presented by: Marcae Hilton

City Planner Marcae Hilton stated that this is Primrose School Franchising Company and basically it is an educational center and Staff recommends approval.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion on Item #3. Councilor Stewart made motion to approve, seconded by Mayor Easton. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: Stewart, Easton, King, Decatur.

No: None

Mayor Easton said on Item #4 on the Regular Agenda is:

Discussion and action on the approval of Final Plat-*The Village at Twin Creeks (PUD 91)*- Applicant Alan Betchan of AAB Engineering, LLC; for approximately 6.0 acres for the purpose of a residential development in part of Section 31 T18N, R14E; the property is generally located east of Mingo and ½ mile north of 121st Street.

Presented by: Marcae Hilton

City Planner Marcae Hilton stated that if you drive down Mingo you will see this development is underway and they do have their streets in and fence, Staff recommends approve per the comments.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion on Item #4. Councilor King made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor Decatur. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: King, Decatur, Stewart, Easton

No: None

Mayor Easton said on Item #5 on the Regular Agenda is:

Discussion and action on the approval of Preliminary Plat (*BXPT-16.07 CEDAR CREST*) *Cedar Crest Business Park (PUD 41)*- Applicant Ryan McCarty of Select Design; for approximately 8.316 acres for the purpose of commercial shopping development and mini storage; in part of Section 21, T17N, R13E; the property is generally located south of 151st Street and ½ mile east of Harvard.

Presented by: Marcae Hilton

City Planner Marcae Hilton stated that this project is adjacent to the church on 151st and is an existing PUD that was approved many years ago and they have met all the requirements of staff and recommend approval.

Mayor Easton asked for motion on Item #5. Mayor Easton made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor Decatur. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 3-1

Yes: Easton, Decatur, King.

No: Stewart

Mayor Easton said on Item #6 on the Regular Agenda is:

Discussion and action on the approval of Site Plan (*BXSP-16.06.Cedar Crest*) *Cedar crest Business Park (PUD 41)* - Applicant Ryan McCarty of Select Design; for approximately 8.316

acres with two Lots. Lot 1-no proposed use at this time, Lot 2-proposed Use Unit 16, Mini Storage in part of Section 21, T17N, R13E; the property is generally located south of 151st Street and ½ mile east of Harvard.

Presented by: Marcae Hilton

City Planner Marcae Hilton stated that this is the site plan for the Cedar crest Business Park PUD 41 which was heard at the scheduled Planning Commission meeting on July 18, 2016, the Planning Commission votes unanimously to approve the Site Plan and with conditions. Staff recommends approval.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion on Item #6. Councilor Stewart made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor King. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: Stewart, King, Decatur, Easton.

No: None

Mayor Easton said on Item #7 on the Regular Agenda is:

Consider and/or approve the purchase of a Ford Police Interceptor Utility AWD vehicle to Bob Hurley Ford in the amount of \$27,581.

Presented by: Ike Shirley

Police Chief Ike Shirley stated that we are looking at purchasing one vehicle for our investigative unit, and with two investigators and one vehicle is in operational at this time, and we have funds to make this purchase in the budget.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion. Councilor King made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor Decatur. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: King, Decatur, Stewart, Easton

No: None

Mayor Easton said on Item #8 on the Regular Agenda is:

Discuss and/or take action on Real Estate Purchase Agreement for the 2011 Bond – 131st & Mingo Intersection Widening Project, northeast corner, Michael Witte and Diana Witte.

Presented by: Jared Cottle

City Manager Jared Cottle stated that this agreement is a purchasing agreement for right-of-way that will go in with our STP project for the 2011 bond at 131st and Mingo.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion on Item #8. Councilor King made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor Decatur. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: King, Decatur, Stewart, Easton.
No: None

Mayor Easton said on Item #9 on the Regular Agenda is:

Discuss and/or take action on Real Estate Purchase Agreement for the 2011 Bond – 131st & Mingo Intersection Widening Project, northwest corner, MPR Family LLC.

Presented by: Jared Cottle

City Manager Jared Cottle stated that this is the second of the two proprieties for the right-of-way at 131st and Mingo.

Mayor Easton asked for a motion Item #9. Councilor Decatur made motion to approve, seconded by Councilor King. The vote was taken with the following results:

Carried 4-0

Yes: Decatur, King, Stewart, Easton.
No: None

Mayor Easton said on Item #10 on the Regular Agenda is:

City Manager's Report

1. Reminder of the Town Hall Meeting on August 16th and discussion will be about the 2016 Bond and that is in head of our August 23rd vote. Jared stated that we want to encourage everyone to attend as well as get out and vote on the 23rd.
2. School will be starting on August 18th and officers will be out to make sure our kids get back to school safely.

Mayor Easton said on Item #11 on the Regular Agenda is:

New business

Their being none.

Adjournment was called at 8:05 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST

CITY CLERK