

**STILLWATER PLANNING COMMISSION SUMMARY  
REGULAR MEETING OF December 1, 2020  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE OKLAHOMA OPEN MEETING  
LAW, THE AGENDA WAS POSTED November 24, 2020 IN THE  
MUNICIPAL BUILDING AT 723 SOUTH LEWIS STREET**

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

Dennis McGrath, Assistant City Attorney  
Lanc Gross, Development Review Manager  
Rian Harkins, Senior Planner  
Chelsey Jones, Administrative Assistant

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mike Shanahan, Member

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER.
2. PUBLIC HEARINGS:
  - a. Marie & Thomas Everett, **Map Amendment (MA20-07)**, requesting review and approval to rezone property currently addressed as 4818 N. Washington Street from Residential Single Family Small Lot (RSS) to Agriculture (A) zoning district.

Rian Harkins, Senior Planner presents staff's report, and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone there to speak for the applicant or if the applicant was there to speak.

Kelly Harris, Keystone Engineering 923 S Lowry representing the owner spoke on the following:

- Requesting a less intense zoning classification in order to use his existing building the way that he would like to.
- In an Agriculture zone, building setbacks become larger and property sizes increase.
- This property already meets all of the requirements for the Agriculture zone.
- The uses allowed in RSS are still allowed in Agriculture zone.
- Around Stillwater, Agriculture and RSS are often found next to each other and is one of the most common neighboring classifications.
- Also common to find property zoned Agriculture within the proximatey of the city limits and this property is located just over ½ mile from the city limits.
- Need to rezone in order to ask for the Specific Use Permit for the Medical Marijuana grow facility which are allowed in Agriculture and Industrial zonings with the SUP.
- Agriculture zoning goes better with RSS than Industrial zoning.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak in favor of the item; none respond.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in oposition of the item.

Aaron Ghaemi, 1210 W Stonecrest Ave comes to speak on the following:

- Speaking on behalf of the majority of the Stoncrest Addition
- Concerned about the close proximity to all three of the neighborhoods and the potential danger that might go in this type of agriculture request.
- Also very close promimity to the Richmond Elementary School.
- Concerned about the possible devaluation of homes in the three additions.
- Some research says that the smell is so strong that it can be overwhelming and that farms in California have had to invest hundreds of thousands in filtration systems to try to reduce the smell.
- Worried for the small children and elderly that have respritory issues.

Mr. Ghaemi asked what security requirements would be required for medical marijuana growth of this type of agriculture. Dennis McGrath, Assistant City Attorney responds that the city has no standing policies as far as security, that that is more or less left up to the property owner. Mr. Ghaemi asked if they have to have gates or fencing with barbed wire. Mr. McGrath said no, they don't require any other type of security on any other business so they can't require it on this kind.

Mr. Ghaemi states that the lack of security around the proposed grow facility which sits right off of Washington causes a concern. Mr. Ghaemi asked if these types of facilities are legal, federally or if they were still illegal. Mr. McGrath responds that they are legal in the state. Mr Ghaemi asked if they could use banks and debit cards just like any business can or if it is cash only. Mr. McGrath responds that it is up to them how they want to run their business. Mr. Ghaemi states concern that if it was cash only that might often be a target for potential theft and robberies, so an additional increase in crime in the area. Mr McGrath responds that if they are a grow facility they are not a retail facility so there are no cash transactions on a regular basis.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak.

Barden Kellum, 1321 Falls Dr comes to speak on the following:

- The zoning that they are asking for butts right up to Falls Dr.
- Doesn't think that it is complimentary to the surrounding area.
- Feels like it is spot zoning to put Agriculture right in the middle of Residential.
- Doesn't know if it is compatiable with the long term comprehensive plan for Stillwater to do spot zoning.
- Thinks if they allow it to go to Agriculture zoning it could be one thing tomorrow but could be something completely different a year from then and what the long term effect could be.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak in oposition to the item.

Stephen Veatch, 4700 N Washington St said that he would like to see the commission only approve the detailed area not the 14 acres, just the area that is identified for the grow facility.

Diana Romano, 5024 N Garfield said that she feels like even though it is within a half mile of the city limits that it is still in city limits and that Oklahoma is very vast and if someone would like to have a marajuana grow facility that they can find somewhere outside of city limits.

Lad Hudgins, 1308 Falls Dr comes to speak on the following:

- Here on behalf of the Falls home owners association representing their president that couldn't be here.
- The residents of Falls drive are worried because the graphics they way they interpret them is that there is an entrance off Falls Dr into this property.
- They would be interested in hearing from the people that want to develop this industry and if they would be using the entrance off of their main drive which is Falls Dr.
- There are children in the area and they would be concerned about commercial traffic coming off that drive and whether or not the main entrance to the property would be off Washington or off of Falls Dr.
- There is also concern that it would devalue the property.
- Mr. Hudgins states that he would like to submit a petition and that it is of all the homeowners in their association all requesting the Commission deny their request.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in oposition of the item.

Aaron Means, 1423 Falls Dr and comes to speak on the following:

- Wanted to bring a human connection to the discussion and that on the map that they have, immediately adjacent to the property there is a family that has two small children which is on the southwest side.
- On the southeast side there is another home that has college students in it, both properties are within feet, not hundreds of feet but within feet of the border of the property.
- If there is a security issue, both of these homes are in direct line of any type of problem and it should be in part on the city to insure the safety of these two homes.
- Even though this may be legal in the state of Oklahoma, on the federal level it still is a class one drug therefore there may be individuals that may consider taking advantage of or exploiting the materials there.

Chair Rickelman states that there was one online request to speak tonight and that was Aaron Ghaemi and he just wanted to make sure that he had had the chance to speak. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak on the item.

Michele Magalassi, 1320 Falls Dr states that on their petition that they had 100% participation of their neighborhood in oposition of the rezoning to Agriculture and the subsequent building of a grow facility; and one of their main concerns is that ingress/egress onto Falls Dr and that there are a lot of children in the neighborhood and walkers.

John Jennings, 1509 Falls Dr states that they have a very nice neighborhood and that it is quiet and that usually when a car comes in they know where its going and they feel like the added traffic that is possible if it is rezoned will add to the traffic from their area; and their neighborhood is one way in and one way out and that children do play in the streets and that it wouldn't be advantageous to have this kind of operation going in their neighborhood.

Shelia Means, 1423 Falls Dr states that she agrees with everything eveyone has already said in oposition and that she lives in Falls Drive; has lived there eight years, loves the community and neighborhood and the surrounding neighborhoods; and if she didn't live in Falls Drive and she knew that this would be happening she would not choose to live in Falls Drive therefore she feels like if for some reason she

decided to move and sell the house that it would be hard to sell because there would be a marijuana facility in the neighborhood.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak on the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman closed the public hearing and asked for staff to present 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 of the Commissioners, actions, or discussion.

Vice-Chair Phillips asks that one question would be that of the ingress/egress of Falls Dr into the facility or property.

Chair Rickelman restated the question and asked for the applicant or agent to come to the podium to answer.

Tom Everett, 4818 N Washington St comes to speak on the following:

- Is the one that is wanting to put the facility in and that no, there will not be access off of Falls Drive
- That he currently uses it to put a boat in and out, but that it is a one way drive and dirt.
- As far as the security is concerned it is not up to the city, it is up to the state and that there is more security at that house than most banks have.
- Understands the worries about security and they have kids as well and that they would not want them to wonder into it but that there will be fencing and a lot of stuff by the state that has to go into that facility before he can even get licensed on it.
- This is just the first step on it and he's sure there are a lot of concerns but to let them all know concerning the odor, there is not an odor over there and if there was, someone would have already noticed it.
- They found out that they were not zoned correctly so they shut it down, made sure they were good with the state, and went down this road.
- Knows there are a lot of concerns and questions but whatever he can answer he would be more than happy to.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions from the commissioners.

Commissioner Jerome states that she knows that they say the facility they plan on building is close to Washington St. Mr. Everett responds yes, it is a 30x40 shop that is already existing and it is probably 150 ft from Washington. Commissioner Jerome states that 14 acres is a quite a bit of space and asks if he ever has intention of adding additional buildings. Mr. Everett responds that this is not on their agenda at all as no they have no plans of building anything else out of it.

Chair Rickelman states that only the Commissioners can ask questions at this point. Mr. McGrath responds that the public hearing portion of the presentation is closed and that the only people that can speak now is the commission and that if they have questions they can ask them, but unfortunately it is closed to the public at this point.

Commissioner Allred asked Mr. Everett if there was any conversations or meetings with the neighbors to talk about their concerns privately or individually. Mr. Everett responds that he had not at the Falls, but that he had talked to the neighbors to the north and that they have no opposition to it.

Commissioner Jerome states that she has a few questions for clarification and that Mr. Everett commented that he doesn't plan on using the Falls Dr., that he is currently using that as a dirt road, is there anything to prevent him from doing that in the future; and also he says that he doesn't plan to add any buildings but is there anything stopping him from doing that in the future because 14 acres is a lot of land.

Mr. Harkins responds that yes it is a 14 acre tract; right now OMMA regulates security with regard to fencing and things like that, they also regulate it as a cash business, local control is not a part of that equation. Mr. Harkins further comments on the following:

- With regard to additional buildings, as long as the applicant met setback requirements and building code they could add additional buildings if they chose to later.
- If they sold the property and the grow operation sold to somebody else and the new owner wanted to do that, they could do that as well.
- With Agriculture zoning, with an SUP, in place you can grow medical marijuana indoors or outdoors.

Commissioner Jerome asked if it was Commercial zoning if they would have to do it indoors. Mr. Harkins responds that grow operations are not allowed in Commercial zoning, they are allowed in Industrial zoning in the code and that would be an indoor growing operation only. Mr. Harkins states that with regards to the access back to the west, if they chose to do some improvements to that as long as they met city standards for the curb access and things like that, that is something that would be allowed but with them building this close to Washington they would expect most of the access to be coming off of that; and the SUP can regulate access and that is the next item on the agenda but that is an issue that can be dealt with through that process as well.

Chair Rickelman states that when they giving the zoning comparison chart to them with regard to Agriculture versus RSS, it says conventional single family accessory to principal use and does that mean that single family is allowed in Agriculture or is it only allowed if he was a farmer and he choose to put his house on his land. Mr. Harkins responds that it would be allowed if for instance he were a farmer, put the house on the property that was zoned Agriculture if farming is the principal use; and in this case, if the medical marijuana became the principal use, the house could remain as an accessory structure.

Commissioner Jerome asked if the entrance on Falls Dr. if he decided he wanted to use that entrance does he have the ability to do that since its not a private gated street. Mr. Harkins responds yes, he would and if that is something they would like to restrict they would have to do that through the SUP process.

Chair Rickelman states that it looked like there were no more questions for staff.

Vice-Chair Phillips comments that as far as zoning, it was pointed out earlier and it is quite common to see Agricultural next to RSS, it is a little uncommon to see it going from RSS to Agriculture in the city limits and going down in density like this; given the amount of residential around it, it doesn't seem like Industrial would be a good fit so as far as the options for this endeavor it seems Agriculture would be an appropriate use and doesn't have any reservations about the Agricultural zoning.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other comments or thoughts in regards to the zoning to Agriculture and if not, is there a motion from the alternatives.

Commissioner Allred states that they have a room full of citizens who's concerns they should respect, and that there is an applicant that would like to do something that meets legal standards and meets code; believes there is a disconnect and in his opinion, like it would make sense to send it back to them to have a seat at the table and to hammer some of these issues out and come back in a few weeks and see where they are in an agreement; and tThe homeowner did indicate that he had met with one of the surrounding property owners and that they didn't have an issue with it, so he feels there is a sort of disconnect.

Commissioner Jerome states that as far as it being zoned Agricultural, she doesn't see that that would be a problem, that it will be the SUP that they have to tackle next and that the rezoning would not permit him to do that that they still have the next step to follow.

**Vice-Chair Phillips motioned to accept findings and recommend that City Council approve the proposed map amendment as presented; Commissioner Allred seconded.**

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

**Time: 40 minutes**

- b. Marie & Thomas Everett, **Specific Use Permit (SUP20-08)**, requesting review and approval of a specific use permit to allow a medical marijuana grow facility at property addressed as 4818 N. Washington St in Agriculture (A) zoning district.

Rian Harkins, Senior Planner presents staff's report and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman opened the public hearing and asked for the applicant or agent to speak.

Kelly Harris, Keystone Engineering 923 S Lowry representing the owner spoke on the following:

- Code states the purpose of a SUP are because the uses identified as requiring specific use permits are more intense or have greater impact than those permitted by right, such uses shall be evaluated based upon their ability to be located next to less intense uses.
- The building is already existing and wouldn't cause an impact to surrounding properties.
- Due to the size of the property the existing building is located well beyond the setback requirements.
- A grow facility is required to be located a certain distance from schools and this property does meet that requirement.
- If they would like they can add the requirement that no public traffic or only the land owner could use the private drive from the Falls.
- It is her understanding that SUPs are tied to what they show on the plans, including buildings. If there was a desire to grow they would have to revise this SUP and bring it back to Planning Commission, minor changes can be approved administratively but she doesn't think an additional building would be minor.

- The existing building has been in place for a while, it is a one story metal building and is 200 ft from the south property line and 215 ft from Washington the east property line, and probably 700-800 ft to the back property line.

Chair Rickelman states that even though indoor/outdoor are both allowed by the permit, he is only hearing that they are asking for indoor. Mrs. Harris responds that is correct and that's the only thing they are asking for.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions of the applicant; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the application or item.

The following come to speak:

- Stephen Veatch, 4700 N Washington St
- Chris Lewis, 1202 W Stonecrest Ave
- Barden Kellum, 1321 Falls Dr
- Diana Romano, 5024 N Garfield
- Aaron Means, 1423 Falls Dr

The following concerns are expressed:

- Reviewed the application pursuant to section 23:180 and that there is a checklist that it has to go through in order to submit the permit and it appears that item "g" is missing from the permit, existing use of abutting and adjoining properties was not identified on the permit application.
- The SUP would only be applied to the detailed area in the site plan, not the entire 14 acre property and if they decided to change that they would have to come back to the Commission and request another special use permit.
- Concerns are the potential for robbery since it is a cash only business which is required by the state since federally they can't take that money and put it in a bank they are an easy and common target for theft and he is concerned about bringing that into the neighborhood.
- If they have already approved that this will be an Agriculture zone can this owner or any other owner grow anything they want on there.
- As a homeowner they are worried that not only because of the medical marijuana, but because in the future it can be any other thing, even if it is just produce.
- Can they also have livestock.

Conversation is held regarding the site plan; the SUP could potentially be applied to a specific area; and once zoned agricultural then all uses allowed by right are available to the property owner.

Chair Rickelman states that if the zoning goes through than any use that is allowed by right in Agriculture would go through so if livestock is allowed then yes, and that he doesn't know all the uses but if it is allowed by right then yes.

Mr. Means said that he was wondering based on what he heard prior to this is this petition technically to establish a business or to continue a business; if he understands the conversation earlier, that they had an operation that they are here discussing and that they stopped, so are they discussing them continuing the business and if they had that business, technically was it legal; without permission, or without the correct formalities, and all the various approvals they were growing marijuana whether it be medical or

otherwise was that legal within the city limits of Stillwater and if not, should they be given a second chance to do things right if it wasn't done correctly the first time; and if it is to be established within the city limits of Stillwater are the type of elements to do this type of business still there so all they need to do is just open the door and turn on the lights.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak in opposition to the item; none respond. Chair Rickelman closed the public hearing and asked for staff alternatives.

Mr. Harkins states that at the present time, medical marijuana growing facilities are allowed with a specific use permit in the Agriculture zoning district; SUPs are site address specific; if the ownership were to change they would go through their own licensing process all over again; right now as long as they have the license from OMMA and an approved SUP they can operate; if they were operating illegally and then stopped because they realized they were missing something or their license wasn't complete that's not something they would necessarily know unless it was identified and brought to their attention either by the owner or by other entities; in the case of this specific property and this SUP application, they do meet the requirements if the rezoning is approved and the SUP is approved and they have the pertinent license; the way OMMA operates is in many cases is they ask for new applications to go through the local approval process first; the way that OMMA also structures the process is that municipalities have to have an avenue for them to operate and a process in place, the cities land development code identifies the SUP as that process within particular zoning districts; that is how each dispensary and grow facility come through the Planning Commission and ultimately the Council if the SUP is approved and they have the actual license then they can operate.

Mr. Harkins went over the alternatives and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any additional questions for staff.

Chair Rickelman states that there were at least two things that seem to have been resolved, being the access to Falls Dr as well as that they can't add multiple buildings because of the site plan; and the Planning Commission can add restrictions but must give a reason for such.

Commissioner Jerome states that they have approved many of these, most of which were in Industrial, knows of people who have done them outside of city limits; it just doesn't seem like it's a fit for the area and seems like there could be a better place for it.

Commissioner Jerome moved that they find that it is not appropriate use for the property based on the impacts to the surrounding vicinity and that they do not recommend that the City Council approve the SUP.

Chair Rickelman stated that for not hearing a second, the motion dies for lack of a second at this point.

Vice-Chair Phillips agreed with Chair Rickelman about the things that had been resolved but that Commissioner Allred had made a comment on their being some conversation that needed to be had and did he have any other comment on that.

Commissioner Allred stated that he would very much be in favor of sending this back to the neighbors, applicant, and agent and seeing if they could work out some of the issues. Chair Rickelman asked what particular information would he want to table it as normally they table for a specific reason.

Commissioner Allred stated that they had taken a vote in the neighborhood and that everyone said that they were not in favor of it, he asked Mr. Everett if he had had any conversation with the neighborhood and his answer was no, so he has hopes that since after conversations with other home owners they were ok with it that maybe they could work something out as well.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked if he would be ok with tabling this item until the applicant has had an opportunity to have those conversations with the neighborhoods. Commissioner Allred said 100%

Conversation was held about the upcoming meeting dates and when an appropriate amount of time would be.

Commissioner Allred also mentioned that it has happened in the past that when groups have needed to have such conversations that they have asked for a city staff member to be present as well.

**Commissioner Allred motioned to table the request to January 5, 2021; Vice-Chair Phillips seconded the motion.**

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

**Time: 28 minutes**

- c. 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. Tabled from November 3rd, 2020 Meeting

Rian Harkins, Senior Planner presents staff's report and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Chair Rickelman states that when they had previously brought this up it didn't seem like they had addressed any of the issues, however, this time they have gotten to many if not all. Mr. Harkins responds that would be correct, they still are having some discussion with them about some easements and a few details that they felt could be worked out and would have those worked out before it was taken to City Council.

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

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

Vice-Chair Phillips asked about the issues that they thought could be worked through with the applicant and if the traffic impact study was one of the issues. Mr. Harkins responds that is one of the issues that and that city engineering has reviewed the TIA and that there are some changes believed needing to be made and that they will not be cheap improvements.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked about the right of way that is in the plat and does it allow for a wider road along Western. Mr. Harkins said that city engineering feels that they have 100ft right now along Western and that would be adequate to do that. If they have to add additional lane width or spacing for any reason beyond that they would need to take out lots along Western or 26<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Rickelman asked if there were any other questions of staff; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was any discussion of the commissioners.

Chair Rickelman states that when this item was tabled before, it was because they had had three different representatives and that each said they were only there because the other wasn't and that they tabled it to give them time and it does look like they have made substantial progress to the list and that he would be amendable to accepting the final plat.

Vice-Chair Phillips states that she was a little disappointed that the engineer didn't come back to speak to the issues but is glad to see the headway that has been made. Chair Rickelman states that they still have to come back for the other piece of it which is not yet to final plat. Vice-Chair Phillips commented on not having a more robust traffic study, but said that she is happy to hear that they have enough right-of-way to do some improvements so she would be fine approving the final plat.

**Commissioner Jerome moved to accept findings and approve the proposed final plat as presented; Vice-Chair Phillips seconded.**

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

**Time: 15 minutes**

- d. Mike Loftis, PRELIMINARY PLAT (SUB20-18), requesting review and approval to create 14 residential lots and 2 commercial lots at property addressed 3524 W 19th Ave in CG (Commercial General) zoning district.

Rian Harkins, Senior Planner presents staff's report and asked if there were any questions of staff.

Vice-Chair Phillips asked about the the location of two commercial lots next to the residential. Mr. Harkins responds that the applicant was there and could speak more to it, but that they were looking more along 19<sup>th</sup>. Vice-Chair Phillips asked if there would be any required fencing between what would be commercial and what would be residential. Mr. Harkins responds that the aspect of the PUD has stayed the same, what has changed is some of the lots classification being residential versus commercial.

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

Stephen Gose, Gose and Associates 113 E 8<sup>th</sup> and comments on the following:

- Mr. Harkins had covered it pretty well
- That it was originally envisioned as more commercial and just a little residential but that a new owner has come in and has bought a portion of it to develop as residential
- With a limited number of lots, the street coming off of 19<sup>th</sup> with a "T" Turn-around serves those 10 residential lots.

- At the west end of Cypress Mill there are four lots envisioned there with a wide turn-around to meet fire code that would be maintained by the property owners adjacent to that.
- Have worked with staff on the water, sewer, and electric layouts.
- There are two commercial lots that would remain, one on 19<sup>th</sup> and one on Sangre.
- The notchout is owned by somebody else.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the item.

Mike Loftis, 3341 W Charleston Ct and states that he is the property owner of this residential tract; are HOA members of Berry Creek and very sensitive to the aesthetics to the neighborhood as well as the quality; the way it was drawn out was to have like kind and quality of construction in that area and to prevent another through street on Cyprus Mill going out to another major artery which they felt would be negative to the neighborhood; and the four lots at the end of Cyprus Mill are something that they may or may not develop but the other 10 lots they plan on going ahead with permission to develop as residential.

Commissioner Jerome asked if he was going to have a minimum size for the homes or would they be comparable as well to the Berry Creek homes. Mr. Loftis responds that they would be comparable and that the lot sizes would accommodate at least ground level between 2300 and 2400 and more if you go up.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the item.

Jodi Deer, 3313 W Charleston Ct states that she was there representing many of the neighbors that couldn't be there; said that she had some concern that Cyprus Mill would connect to Berry Creek. Chair Rickelman said that as presented the plat doesn't show that.

Mrs. Deer states that some of the neighbors had drainage concerns and they wanted to make sure that a drainage issue is addressed; they also have concerns about the commercial area but will take that to the owner; and also concerned about whether or not they will have a green belt between Berry Creek and the new subdivision.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone else there to speak in favor; none respond. Chair Rickelman asked if there was anyone there to speak in opposition; 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; none respond.

Chair Rickelman asked if there was any discussion and or a motion.

**Commissioner Jerome moved to accept findings and approve the proposed preliminary plat as presented; Commissioner Allred seconded.**

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

**Time: 13 minutes**

3. MEETING SUMMARY FOR REVIEW AND POSSIBLE ACTION:

a. Special Meeting Summary of October 6, 2020

**Commissioner Allred moved to approve; Vice-Chair Phillips seconded.**

<b>Roll call:</b>	<b>Rickelman</b>	<b>Phillips</b>	<b>Shanahan</b>	<b>Jerome</b>	<b>Allred</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>

***Time: 1 minute***

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

a. Next Planning Commission meeting December 15, 2020.

5. ADJOURN.

This special meeting of the Stillwater Planning Commission was called for adjournment by Commissioner Jerome, seconded by Commissioner Allred at approximately 7:08 p.m. on December 1, 2020 with all members present in agreement, the next regularly scheduled meeting will be held December 15, 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 - [Approved by Planning Commission at the 03.02.2021 virtual meeting.](#)  
Stillwater Planning Commission