



City of Broken Arrow

Minutes

Planning Commission

City of Broken Arrow
220 South 1st Street
Broken Arrow, OK
74012

Robert Goranson Chairman
Jason Coan Vice Chairman
Jaylee Klempa Commissioner
Jonathan Townsend Commissioner
Mindy Payne Commissioner

Thursday, January 8, 2026

5:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chairman Robert Goranson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: 5 - Mindy Payne, Jonathan Townsend, Jaylee Klempa, Jason Coan, Robert Goranson

3. Old Business - NONE

4. Consideration of Consent Agenda

A. 26-134 **Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of December 18, 2025**
B. 26-135 **Approval of PT-002580-2025|PR-000809-2025, Preliminary Plat, Harvest Church BA, approximately 4.56 acres, 1 Lot, AG (Agricultural) to CG (Commercial General) via BAZ-002238-2025, and SP-002459-2025, located at the northwest corner of New Orleans Street (101st Street) and 9th Street (177th E. Avenue/Lynn Lane Road)**

MOTION: A motion was made by Jaylee Klempa, seconded by Mindy Payne
Move to Approve Consent Agenda minus Item 26-134

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mindy Payne, Jonathan Townsend, Jaylee Klempa, Jason Coan, Robert Goranson

5. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

A. 26-134 **Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of December 18, 2025**

The commissioners clarify that written minutes are required under the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act and serve as the official record, while audio and video recordings are supplemental. If a matter ever went to court, the video would be transcribed word-for-word rather than relying solely on the written minutes, and neither record inherently takes precedence over the other.

MOTION: A motion was made by Robert Goranson, seconded by Jason Coan

Move to approve the December 18, 2025 meeting minutes

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mindy Payne, Jonathan Townsend, Jaylee Klempa, Jason Coan, Robert Goranson

6. Public Hearings

A. 26-133 **Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-002565-2025 (Rezoning), Oneta 71, LLC, approximately 16.875 acres, AG (Agricultural) to CG (Commercial General) located approximately one-tenth mile north of the northwest corner of E. Kenosha Street (71st Street) and Oneta Road (241st E. Avenue).**

Rebecca Blaine, Planning Section Manager, presented Item 26-133. The request seeks to rezone property from Agricultural to Commercial General to allow a commercial development, following a related comprehensive plan amendment that would align part of the site with existing Level Four designations. Public opposition raised concerns about traffic, safety, noise, lighting, property values, litter, competition, and quality of life. At the same time, the applicant stated the project would meet all city standards, include sidewalks, and rely on a completed traffic impact analysis showing no degradation in peak-hour service levels. Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the comprehensive plan amendment, which is scheduled for City Council consideration before the rezone, and staff notes that traffic,

lighting, litter, and pedestrian safety are addressed through existing ordinances and requirements. Based on the comprehensive plan, surrounding land uses, and supporting studies, staff recommends approval of the rezone, subject to the property being platted.

The discussion clarifies that the City does not currently control all of the right-of-way along Oneida or Kenosha Streets, though it may own a portion of it. If the project is approved, additional right-of-way could be required and obtained through the platting and site review process, particularly if future roadway expansion is planned, with any new right-of-way likely coming from the project's west side.

Lou Reynolds, of Eller & Deitrich, explains that the Planning Commission previously approved a more intensive PUD for the nearby Iron Buck site and argues that the proposed grocery store represents a less impactful use consistent with the recommended comprehensive plan level. They address past concerns by stating that stormwater, litter, and other impacts will be handled under existing ordinances, that traffic studies show no adverse effects, and that the development would improve quality of life and property values, citing positive outcomes from similar commercial projects in other parts of the city.

Mr. Reynolds explains that the traffic impact analysis was voluntarily commissioned rather than required at the zoning stage to address concerns about traffic and pedestrian safety proactively. They note that sidewalks will be installed on both sides of the property, lighting will comply with city standards to prevent spillover onto neighboring properties, and the grocery store is not expected to create noise issues. The applicant characterizes the project as a positive development for the area and asks the commission to approve the request as recommended by staff.

MOTION: A motion was made by Jason Coan, seconded by Jaylee Klempa

Move to Approve Item 26-133 BAZ-002565-202 (Rezoning), Oneta71, LLC, approximately 16.875 acres, AG (Agricultural) to CG (Commercial General) located approximately one-tenth mile north of the northwest corner of E. Kenosha Street (71st Street) and Oneta Road (241st E. Avenue).

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 -

Mindy Payne, Jonathan Townsend, Jaylee Klempa, Jason Coan, Robert Goranson

B. 26-145

Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-002514-2025 (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-002575-2025 (Rezoning), Pediatrics Plus, 14.55 acres, RS (Residential Single-Family) and RM (Residential Multi-Family) to AG (Agricultural) and CG (Commercial General), located just south of Washington St (91st Street) and just east of Aspen Ave (145th E Avenue)

Jose Jimenez, Planner II, presented Item 26-145. The request involves a public hearing on a planned unit development and rezone for a 14.55-acre site to allow a therapeutic farm associated with Pediatrics Plus, with the property proposed to be split between Commercial General and Agricultural zoning. The PUD would accommodate the farm use on the rear portion of the site and includes a request to adjust the landscaping requirements for the internal buffer yard. Staff reviewed surrounding land uses, comprehensive plan designations, available utilities, and the presence of a portion of the site within the 100-year floodplain, and recommends approval of both the PUD and rezoning, subject to floodplain considerations.

The discussion focuses on buffer yard requirements within the proposed PUD, clarifying that because the different zoning areas are under single ownership and part of one planned unit development, interior buffer yards are not required where the zones meet. Staff explains that this treatment is tied to the PUD and remains with the property regardless of ownership, meaning the same PUD regulations would bind any future owner unless they returned to the Planning Commission to amend or remove the PUD. This process would likely be necessary for a substantially different use.

David Tapp, the applicant, explains that the project would be a weekday, non-overnight therapeutic farm for children with autism, operating Monday through Friday and designed to feel residential rather than commercial. The development would include a farmhouse with therapy spaces, gyms, and kitchens, along with agricultural elements such as a barn, greenhouse, garden, and animals to support hands-on therapy and life-skills training. The goal is to help children develop practical skills for future employment, and the applicant emphasizes maintaining a natural, low-impact setting with minimal lighting while meeting all city standards, expressing enthusiasm about locating the project in Broken Arrow.

The discussion highlights strong support for the proposed therapeutic farm, with commissioners praising its mission, community benefit, and fit for Broken Arrow. Mr. Tapp described the scale and operations of similar facilities, including weekday, non-overnight therapy for children ages five to eighteen, supervised farm activities, limited monthly community farmers markets, and extensive safety protocols such as cameras, staffing ratios,

and behavioral safeguards. Questions addressed staffing levels, parking, animal care, child and staff safety history, and the organization's long track record of operating pediatric therapy facilities without significant incidents. Mr. Tapp outlined a tentative timeline to begin construction in May, following approvals, with an estimated ten-month build. He expressed enthusiasm about serving the community and meeting the growing need for autism services.

Further discussion addresses concerns about animal limits within city limits, with staff explaining that city ordinances primarily regulate the placement of animal enclosures rather than the number of typical farm animals, and that agricultural zoning within the PUD was intentionally included to accommodate barnyard animals appropriately. Commissioners noted that the PUD would remain tied to the property and that any future issues could be addressed through existing processes, such as variances or City Council review. Mr. Tapp confirmed that roosters would not be kept, minimizing potential noise impacts. He emphasized the preservation of tree lines and buffers to maintain a quiet, rural character and provide a smooth transition between commercial and residential areas.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mindy Payne, seconded by Jonathan Townsend **Move to Approve Item 26-145 PUD-002514-2025 (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-002575-2025 (Rezoning), Pediatrics Plus, 14.55 acres, RS (Residential Single-Family) and RM (Residential Multi-Family) to AG (Agricultural) and CG (Commercial General), located just south of Washington St (91st Street) and just east of Aspen Ave (145th E Avenue)**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 -

Mindy Payne, Jonathan Townsend, Jaylee Klempa, Jason Coan, Robert Goranson

C. 26-150

Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-002550-2025 (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-002374-2025 (Rezoning), D&B Processing, 9.15 acres, AG (Agricultural) to IL (Industrial Light)/PUD-002550-2025, abrogation of PUD-193, located one-half mile south of Washington Street (91st Street), one-half mile east of the Creek Turnpike

Mackenzie Hackett, Staff Planner, presented Item 26-150. The request involves a public hearing on a planned unit development and rezoning of a 9.15-acre unplatte tract from Agricultural to Industrial Light to allow a storage yard serving an existing DMV processing facility located south of the site. The property was initially included in a 2008 PUD that limited its use to indoor RV storage. Still, that second phase never developed, and the applicant is seeking to abrogate the prior PUD to pursue a new storage-yard concept. The proposed PUD would allow phased development with no buildings, access from East Gary Street, and compliance with Level Six comprehensive plan criteria, with utilities available and no floodplain impacts. Based on the comprehensive plan, site conditions, and surrounding industrial uses, the staff recommends approval of the new PUD and rezoning and abrogation of the previous PUD on the property.

The discussion centers on clarifying procedural questions and addressing design concerns related to the proposed PUD and rezoning, with Commissioner Mindy Payne expressing concern about the proposed fencing requirements. Commissioner Jason Coan ensured that the wetland area is explicitly protected in the PUD, particularly with respect to fencing, landscaping, and long-term aesthetics, given the nearby amphitheater and potential future traffic. Commissioners expressed concern that existing and proposed metal fencing, especially along Gary Street and the west property line, could negatively affect the area's appearance if vegetation were to be lost. They emphasized a desire for enhanced or replacement fencing tied to landscaping conditions. The applicant, Rob Coday, of Rob Coday Architect LLC, acknowledged these concerns, noted plans to relocate fencing and add landscaping buffers, and agreed to work with staff on improved designs. To keep the project on schedule for City Council consideration on February 3, the Planning Commission decided to continue the item to the January 22 meeting so revised fence and landscape concepts could be reviewed, while also confirming that protections for the on-site stream and wetlands are already embedded in the PUD and would remain binding on future owners.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mindy Payne, seconded by Jason Coan **Move to Continue Item 26-150 to the January 22, 2026, meeting**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 -

Mindy Payne, Jonathan Townsend, Jaylee Klempa, Jason Coan, Robert Goranson

7. Appeals - NONE

8. General Commission Business – NONE

9. Remarks, Inquiries, and Comments by Planning Commission and Staff (No Action)

The commission uses closing remarks to clarify process and authority: City Council can

“remand” any item that comes before it back to Planning Commission with specific instructions, often to take additional evidence or reopen public comment, and related items (like a rezone following a comprehensive plan amendment) can be left in limbo unless Council also sends them back. They also discuss when traffic studies can be requested, concluding that the Planning Commission or City Council can ask them at any stage if traffic is a concern, even though applicants often wait until later in the development process to avoid spending money before approvals. The group then reviews why zoning and conditional use permits are sometimes handled as separate motions—especially on controversial items—to allow City Council to make distinct decisions and preserve flexibility. Finally, staff explains a significant code change: Broken Arrow no longer requires rezonings to be “subject to platting” as a condition the way it did from 1984 to 2025; zoning now takes effect when Council approves the ordinance, while platting remains a required later step before development to address rights-of-way, easements, access, grades/elevations, and other site constraints. They also clarify how PUDs relate to platting and timing: historically, PUDs could have time limits tied to platting, and once the property is platted, the PUD is considered in effect for phased development unless changed by Council.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:47 p.m.

MOTION: A motion was made by Robert Goranson, seconded by Mindy Payne

Move to Adjourn

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Mindy Payne, Jonathan Townsend, Jaylee Klempa, Jason Coan, Robert Goranson