



City of Broken Arrow

Minutes Planning Commission

City Hall
220 S 1st Street
Broken Arrow OK
74012

*Chairperson Robert Goranson
Vice Chair Jason Coan
Member Jaylee Klempa
Member Jonathan Townsend
Member Mindy Payne*

Thursday, July 11, 2024

Time 5:30 p.m.

Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

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

3. Old Business

There was no Old Business.

4. Consideration of Consent Agenda

A. 24-928 **Approval of PT-001571-2024|PR-000510-2023, Conditional Final Plat, Antler Falls, approximately 46 acres, 149 Lots, A-1 (Agricultural) to RS-4 (Single-Family Residential)/PUD-001242-2023 (Planned Unit Development), located south and east of the southeast corner of Houston Street (81st Street) and 257th Street (Midway Road)**

Chairperson Goranson asked if there were any Items to be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Mindy Payne asked to pull Item 4A.

5. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

Planning and Development Manager Amanda Yamaguchi reported Item 4A was PT-001571-2024, the conditional final plat for Antler Falls proposed to have 149 lots on approximately 46 acres. She stated the property, which was located south and east of the southeast corner of Houston Street (81st Street) and 257th Street (Midway Road), was approved for rezoning from A-1 (Agricultural) to PUD-001242-2023 (Planned Unit Development) with underlying RS-4 (Single-Family Residential) zoning, subject to the property being platted.

Commissioner Payne asked if the applicant was present.

Ms. Yamaguchi responded in the negative.

Commissioner Payne noted her questions were regarding the covenants and a couple of other questions. She asked if this Item could be tabled until the applicant could be present.

Ms. Yamaguchi responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Payne asked Staff to reach out to the applicant and request the applicant to be present at the next Planning Commission meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mindy Payne, seconded by Jason Coan.

Move to table Item 4A until the Planning Commission meeting on July 25, 2024

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

6. Public Hearings

A. 24-869 **Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding the proposed modifications to Section 4.1.B (Table 4.1-2: Dimensional and Density Standards- Residential Districts), of the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance**

Ms. Yamaguchi reported modifications to the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance were proposed in regard to reducing the minimum front setback in the RE (Residential Estate) and RS-1 (Single-Family Residential) zoning districts. She stated the proposed modifications were to Section 4.1.B (Table 4.1-2: Dimensional and Density Standards- Residential Districts), of the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance. She stated the Zoning Ordinance currently required a minimum front setback of 35-feet from the front property line in the RE district and a 30-foot minimum setback from the front property line in the RS-1 district. She

explained it had come to the attention of Staff that some existing structures did not meet this requirement and therefore created an inconsistency when new structures were required to meet the 35-foot or 30-foot setback. She explained to bring existing structures into compliance and preserve the character of areas seeing new construction, Staff was recommending reducing the minimum front setback from 35-feet and 30-feet to 25-feet in both the RE and RS-1 district. She explained with the new Zoning Ordinance coming up for approval soon, Staff was trying to bring as many properties into compliance as possible. She stated Staff had not found any RS-1 properties which did not meet these criteria, but it felt funny having a smaller front setback on RE than RS-1, so Staff amended both.

Chair Goranson asked how many properties were in noncompliance right now.

Ms. Yamaguchi indicated it was not a large number of properties. She noted there was one property in particular which was built with improper setbacks which would cause mortgage issues with the home. She explained Staff looked at different options, going through the Board of Adjustment versus amending the Zoning Ordinance, and considering that this was a change the City was planning to make with the approval of the new Zoning Ordinance already, Staff felt it was appropriate to go ahead and make the change to the Zoning Ordinance itself. She noted this also would put the burden on the City to get the change done as opposed to the property owner who found the mistake. She noted it was not the property owner's issue, so if the City could fix the problem without the property owner having to pay and go through the Board of Adjustment while also fixing a bigger issue, Staff felt it was the better choice.

Chair Goranson stated he wondered if it would create a bigger issue. He asked what would keep people from wanting to add on to the front of a home if the City changed the Zoning Ordinance for all RE and RE-1 homes.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated this was a possibility.

Chair Goranson asked if the City really wanted this to happen. He stated it felt more appropriate to change the homes which were noncompliant through the Board of Adjustment than to globally change the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted Chair Goranson had a good point, but the way Staff was viewing this was a global change was going to happen in a few months anyway, and this would prevent putting the burden on the individual property owners, as it was not just a financial burden, it was time sensitive as well when you were dealing with mortgage companies and sale of property and such. She stated it would not stop someone from adding onto the front of their home, and as long as it met building codes and setback requirements the City would have no issue. She noted the neighbors might not like it, but then the neighbors might choose to do a similar add on.

Chair Goranson stated he did not remember the decreased required setback being in the new Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Yamaguchi explained everything existing would change to the new district, so RS-1 would be absorbed into the new RS category; RE would remain RE, but it did have a reduced setback compared to the current setback. She said basically RS-1 would become RS.

Mr. Bibelheimer stated RS had a 25-foot front setback in the proposed update which was not yet approved or implemented.

Chair Goranson asked if the maps would still say R-1.

Ms. Yamaguchi responded in the negative; once the new Zoning Ordinance was approved and the map was updated, everything which said R-1 or RS-1 right now would change to RS.

Chair Goranson stated upon approval residents, if they looked into it, would discover they had an extra five feet to build onto the front of their homes unless the HOA had a covenant to prevent adding onto the front of a home.

Ms. Yamaguchi agreed.

Commissioner Jonathan Townsend stated approving Item 6A would put less burden on the property owner and with the new Zoning Ordinance the setback decrease was happening regardless, so he felt pretty comfortable with Staff's recommendation.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated from Staff's perspective, if approved, the setback requirement was simply being changed a little bit ahead of the full Zoning Ordinance update; it was not out of line with what Planning Commission would see coming forward with the Zoning Ordinance update, it was just moving ahead a little bit to help some citizens who were stuck in a

conundrum right now.

Vice Chair Coan asked if this would go before City Council.

Ms. Yamaguchi responded in the affirmative.

Vice Chair Coan asked if there was a date set to consider and approve the new Zoning Ordinance update.

Ms. Yamaguchi responded in the negative. She stated a special meeting was held to review the new Zoning Ordinance update, and City Council recommended a Committee to allow the School District with a couple of City Council Members review the Zoning Ordinance update alongside the Housing Study to make sure everything was lined up. She stated once the Committee meetings were completed, if everyone was in agreement, then it would be set for adoption.

Vice Chair Coan asked if the reduced setback was an item of City Council concern which needed review.

Ms. Yamaguchi responded in the negative.

There were no public comments.

MOTION: A motion was made by Jason Coan, seconded by Jonathan Townsend.

Move to approve Item 6A per Staff recommendation

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chairperson Goranson indicated this Item would go before City Council on August 5, 2024 at 6:30 p.m.

B. 24-934

Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-001521-2024 and BAZ-001569-2024, 81st Street Office Storage, 40 acres, A-1 (Agricultural) to IL (Industrial Light)/PUD (Planned Unit Development)-001521-2024, located north of Houston Street (81st Street), one-quarter mile west of 23rd Street (193rd East Avenue/County Line Road)

Staff Planner Henry Bibelheimer reported PUD-001521-2024 and BAZ-001569-2024 were a request to rezone 40 acres from A-1 to IL/PUD-001521-2024. He stated the property was currently un-platted and undeveloped and was located north of Houston Street (81st Street), one-quarter mile west of 23rd Street (193rd East Avenue/County Line Road). He indicated PUD-001521-2024 was on the Planning Commission Agenda on June 13th 2024, where it was continued to July 11th, 2024 per the applicant's and Staff's request. He stated BAZ-001569-2024 proposed to rezone this property to Industrial Light (IL). He stated the property was Comprehensive Plan Level 6, which labeled rezoning to IL as possible; in the Future Development Guide of the Comprehensive Plan (attached) it said IL would be considered in accordance with the comprehensive plan under the following conditions: "1) Done in association with a PUD; 2) Such sites adjoin an existing industrial park; 3) Such sites with high visibility from roadways have the appearance of a quality corporate campus or business park; featuring quality landscaping, masonry building facades and no outdoor storage of materials; and are carefully reviewed as to proposed architectural styles, landscape, location of service areas, and according to the use of the PUD procedure; and 4) Such sites that may adjoin residential areas are thoroughly screened and buffered from such areas by landscaping and/or less intense land uses." He indicated this site met the requirements of number 2 above, as the property abutted existing industrial sites on the west and the south of the proposed site. He stated BAZ-001569-2024 was submitted with PUD-001521-2024, which meant this project met number 1 above. He noted Staff believed the reason the Comprehensive Plan required a PUD for IL to be supported by Comprehensive Plan in Level 6 was to increase the requirements listed above in number 3 and 4. He stated the site had high visibility from Houston Street and per condition number 3 it had requirements to give the property the appearance of a quality corporate campus or business park in order to be developed as IL. He stated some of the ways that the Comprehensive Plan encouraged these businesses to have the appearance of a corporate campus was to increase landscaping requirements, incorporate masonry façade requirements, to increase requirements for architectural styles, service locations, and use. He noted additionally, condition number 4 above pointed out that thorough screening and buffering through landscape areas or less intense uses where the property may adjoin residential uses would be required on the east side property. He stated Staff made recommendations to the applicant multiple times regarding how different requirements could be added to the PUD which would help the proposed PUD to meet these requirements. He stated Staff did not believe that these requirements were met by the Planned Unit Development submitted, and for that reason the Comprehensive Plan did not support rezoning for Industrial Light in this area. He stated PUD-001521-2024 was submitted as a requirement to rezone to Industrial Light in level 6 of the Comprehensive Plan.

He explained the application was being submitted with the intention of developing 12 acres of this site for the storage and distribution of portable buildings. He stated the other 28 acres were proposed to be used as a future industrial light development. He stated the PUD proposed development area 1 and development area 2, which were not clearly shown on an exhibit, but were outlined in the attached legal descriptions. He noted Development area 1 was comprised of the 12 acres to be developed first, as shown in the conceptual site plan and Development area 2 was proposed to be the remaining 28 acres on the eastern side of the parcel. He stated the relevant sections of PUD-001521-2024 were outlined as follows: 1) Landscaping: PUD-001521-2024 proposed development area 1 be developed to incorporate the requirements in the zoning ordinance for “Quality Landscaping” and be consistent with the conceptual site plan included with the PUD application. He noted the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance did not have a standard for “Quality Landscaping”, and the conceptual site plan did not show any landscaping. He indicated with no defined definition of “quality landscaping” the City would not be able to enforce any landscaping requirements for the site. He stated development area 2, which abutted the residential property to the east, was proposed to have only the minimum landscaping required by the Zoning Ordinance for the IL district. 2) Site Characteristics: This section laid out the maximum percentages for the different proposed surfaces within development area 1. He stated development area 2 was not mentioned. 3) Use: Development area 1 was proposed to allow for storage yard as defined in the zoning ordinance: “Any lot or portion of a lot that is used for the sole purposes of the outdoor storage of fully operable motor vehicles, construction equipment, construction materials, or other tangible materials and equipment.” He noted Staff recommended the applicant define storage yard in the PUD, to more clearly allow for the proposed use, but this was not incorporated into the PUD. He stated development area 2 was proposed to be developed within the use regulations of the zoning ordinance. He indicated the surrounding land uses were included in the Staff Report, but to the north was industrial light, unplatte and undeveloped, to the east was single-family residential, to the south was industrial heavy, and to the west was also industrial light. He stated according to Section 6.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD provisions were established for one (1) or more of the following purposes. He stated Staff did not believe PUD-001521-2024 met any of the following criteria: 1) “To permit and encourage innovative land development while maintaining appropriate limitation on the character and intensity of use and assuring compatibility with adjoining and proximate properties.” He said Staff did not believe the proposed PUD incorporated adequate safeguards to the residential neighbor to the east. 2) “To permit greater flexibility within the development to best utilize the physical features of the particular site in exchange for greater public benefits than would otherwise be achieved through development under this Ordinance.” He said Staff did not believe PUD-001521-2024 provided any benefit to the public that would not be achieved through this same project being developed to meet the standards of the zoning ordinance. 3) “To encourage the provision and preservation of meaningful open space.” He noted there was no open space requirement incorporated into the proposed PUD. 4) “To encourage integrated and unified design and function of the various uses comprising the planned unit development.” He indicated no unified design was presented, just one use and potential future uses to align with the zoning ordinance. 5) “To encourage a more productive use of land consistent with the public objectives and standards of accessibility, safety, infra structure and land use compatibility.” He stated Staff did not think this PUD allowed for a more productive use of land, or that it aligned with the public objectives as outlined in the comprehensive plan. He stated according to FEMA maps, none of the property was located in the 100-year floodplain. He indicated water and sanitary sewer were available from the City of Broken Arrow. He stated based on the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended PUD-001521-2024 and BAZ-001569-2024 be denied.

Chair Goranson asked if the applicant just did not want to make the recommended changes suggested by Staff, or if there was some clarification issue.

Mr. Bibelheimer stated comments were sent by Staff to the applicant, comments recommending changes to be incorporated to make it more likely to be passed and to align with the Comprehensive Plan, and very few of the comments were incorporated into the PUD submitted.

Chair Goranson asked if the applicant provided any reasons why the comments were not incorporated.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted the applicant could better answer this question.

Vice Chair Coan stated this was a lot of information. He asked if the information could be broken down into simpler terms. He noted a PUD once established, basically meant “forget all the zoning, we are asking for an exception to do these things.” He stated in this case the applicant was asking for a PUD but was not asking for a zoning change. He asked if this was correct.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated the zoning change and PUD were concurrent applications; there was a

request to change the zoning to IL.

Vice Chair Coan noted Mr. Bibelheimer outlined the five reasons why the application for the PUD did not comply with the criteria to approve a PUD application.

Mr. Bibelheimer concurred.

Chair Goranson explained with a PUD there was give and take; the applicant asked for certain allowances and in return would offer certain improvements not required through regular zoning, such as increased landscaping to beautify the property, and the PUD as it was, did not offer any benefit to the City.

The applicant, Nathan Cross, stated his client was an out-of-town developer who built this particular use throughout the United States. He stated this was not the first time he approached this concept. He displayed and discussed the Comprehensive Plan map of the area including this property. He stated the Comprehensive Plan saw this property as being high density Level 6; even the residential house to the east was in a Level 7 area. He stated if he could, his client would purchase only the 12-acre lot to the west, but the seller would only sell the whole lot. He stated multiple meetings with Staff were held and he discussed the history of the meetings and why a PUD was chosen for this property. He discussed why he felt the PUD was appropriate. He stated 39.4 percent of the lot, the bottom portion of the lot, would be sodded, landscaped, and detention. He noted this would be open space, albeit a portion was drainage. He stated he was willing to make it a condition of approval that the pond out front, a 300-foot barrier from the setback, be a year-round wet pond with a decorative fountain. He noted the issue was raised regarding the request to further limit the use beyond the standard uses listed in code, but the PUD stated, "the applicant proposes a development standard allowing the use of development area 1 for storage yard with such use being limited to the outdoor storage and distribution of completed relocatable buildings." He explained this limited the use to only outdoor storage and distribution of completed relocatable buildings. He said if he needed to be clearer, he would try to be clearer. He said the one thing which became the crux of the issue was landscaping. He noted the applicant was willing to do whatever the City of Broken Arrow wanted, but the City of Broken Arrow kept saying "you need to tell us what you're going to do." He stated he was willing to make the condition whatever the City wanted in regard to landscaping and had proposed "quality landscaping" because this was what was in the Comprehensive Plan: "featuring quality landscaping, masonry building facades and no outdoor storage of materials." He stated he was willing to agree to all of this. He stated he believed this site made sense for the proposed development. He noted he was happy to agree to beef up the landscaping near the one home to the east, but he did not know exactly what Staff wanted to see. He stated he did not have time to continually present landscaping plans and wait for Staff to say yes to the proposed plans. He noted he requested his engineers provide landscaping plans and had been told the plans would be ready yesterday, but there was a delay, so he did not have one in hand; however, he was willing to do whatever the City wished in regard to landscape buffering.

Chair Goranson stated the proposed plan was not bad. He asked if any of the relocatable buildings would be double wide.

Mr. Cross responded he did not believe so; he believed the trailers would all be stand alone, would fit on one trailer, and would move in and out on one truck.

Chair Goranson asked if there would be any Conex trailers.

Mr. Cross responded in the negative. He stated there was a specific type of trailer the applicant worked with, he had one client; these trailers were temporary classrooms and temporary office buildings. He stated Conex trailers were more for storing equipment.

Chair Goranson stated it looked like landscaping was the biggest issue and he understood why Staff was concerned. He stated he read there would be three to six deliveries daily, either leaving or coming in. He asked if the deliveries would be escorted.

Mr. Cross stated he did not know.

Chair Goranson asked if Mr. Cross understood why this might be difficult with this property being off of Houston.

Mr. Cross stated he understood, but the reason this site was attractive for this use was there was a lot of truck traffic in this area already; he was not dropping truck traffic into an area where it did not already exist.

Chair Goranson stated he felt the detention site up front with the fountain was a good idea. He asked how much landscaping the applicant could put into place to ensure the property did not look like a bunch of row houses out in the back. He stated he understood what Mr. Cross

was saying about “quality landscaping,” but there was also “quality corporate campus.” He said he believed Mr. Cross could make it look good. He stated it was probably a benefit that Mr. Cross had 40 acres, not just 12 acres, because this provided the space needed to create a buffer toward the residential.

Mr. Cross stated the reason the applicant did not put any development standards on the adjacent 40 acres was because his client was buying this acreage on speculation; he did not know what would happen on this property, but he believed the area might be ripe for light industrial or office park use. He noted his client had no idea what the property looked like.

Chair Goranson stated there was a lot of treed area on the west side of the property right now. He said it looked like, when he read this, that there was an issue between the applicant and Staff on landscaping, but he felt it was an appropriate use for the property, unless there would be a bunch of ugly Conex trailers out there. He noted this being a PUD it could be made specific regarding what could be done.

Commissioner Klempa stated it sounded like the applicant was willing to put in whatever landscaping items the City deemed appropriate to block the site of the trailers.

Mr. Cross stated his client had not been saying “I’m not doing that,” his client said to do whatever the City wanted. He noted he needed guidance.

Ms. Yamaguchi explained Staff did not write PUDs for the applicant; Staff asked the applicant to come in with a proposal so Staff could talk through the proposal. She stated she was yet to see an actual landscape plan proposed upon which Staff could provide comment.

Mr. Cross stated there was a landscape plan in process and perhaps the Planning Commission could table this Item until next meeting, and he could come back with a landscape plan.

Chair Goranson noted the Comprehensive Plan read IL and there were a lot of things which could be worse than what was proposed for this area. He noted with the PUD there was an opportunity to ensure this looked really nice. He stated there would be almost four football fields of paved area in the back of the property, so it would be really nice to hide it with landscaping. He said the detention pond with a fountain was a good starting point and with the right landscaping it could really beautify the area.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated Staff liked the things Mr. Cross was speaking of, but these were not written in the document, so therefore, they were not enforceable by the City. She stated if the things Mr. Cross was saying were written into the PUD, Staff would have a different opinion.

Vice Chair Coan asked why this was brought before the Planning Commission if the City asked for more information.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted it was up to the applicant when to bring the application forward.

Mr. Cross noted he was working on a deadline because he was being pushed by the seller to get the zoning process moving. He stated he had been under the impression he would have a landscape plan to present this evening but was told at 4:30 p.m. today it would not be ready until tomorrow morning. He stated he immediately called his client and got approval to table this one more meeting to allow the landscape plan to be shared with Staff and come back.

Chair Goranson stated he did not want to see Conex trailers on the property, but if there were construction office trailers, it could look nice, and if there was enough landscaping to hide it, it could be nice. He said there was an opportunity to make this look nice with it being a PUD, and Mr. Cross saying there could be a pond with a fountain and 300 feet of landscaping was an excellent start. He noted there was also an opportunity to work with the rest of the 28 acres understanding how the 12 acres would be developed. He noted no matter what happened with the 28 acres, Staff would want landscaping on the east side too, before the 28 acres.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted in the PUD, development area 2 was per the IL zoning standard, so if this remained Agriculture at the time the 12 acres was developed, they would be required to screen and buffer according to zoning acres. She noted the 28 acres was under the PUD, but the PUD for development area 2 did not change the zoning. She stated development area 1 had its own set of standards, completely separate from development area 2.

Chair Goranson noted development area 2 did not have any information, and he wanted to be sure whatever was decided for development area 1 did not eliminate what should be done with development area 2.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated if approved today, Planning Commission would be approving development area 1, and the “beefed up” requirements would only apply to development area

1. She explained the rest of the 28 acres would be per the IL zoning district, straight zoning.

Chair Goranson asked if the PUD could be approved for only the 12 acres.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted the PUD area could be reduced to 12 acres.

Vice Chair Coan stated this was both a PUD and rezoning. He asked if it would be possible to come back later with the PUD but move forward with approval of the rezoning to IL. He noted he was only saying this because Mr. Cross mentioned the property being under contract.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated in a normal situation this would work; however, the Comprehensive Plan level on this property specifically said IL zoning had to be done in conjunction with a PUD.

Mr. Cross stated his client was willing to add stipulations regarding the 28 acres in the PUD as well, making it subject to a landscape buffer along the east side for residential.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated if the Planning Commission wanted to ensure this was a contiguous development, it was within the Planning Commission's authority to ask the applicant to extend the landscaping for area 1 over into area 2 or require landscaping fencing along the east boundary or other such requirement. She noted these were things Planning Commission could ask for in the PUD and it would be up to the applicant to agree. She noted Staff could work with the applicant regarding revising the requirements of area 2.

Vice Chair Coan asked if this moved forward, what would be the next step in which the applicant would be submitting something for review.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated if Planning Commission were to approve this tonight, it would go before City Council on August 5; City Council would approve or deny and if City Council approved it would be subject to platting and the next step would be for the applicant to bring in a plat. She stated at that point, the applicant would bring in a preliminary plat for Area 1.

Chair Goranson noted for area 1, there was no sewer, so there would have to be septic. He noted area 1 would be restricted specifically to trailer storage use.

Jason Dickeson, Engineering Section Manager, stated it was his understanding there was a meeting between Mr. Cross and Economic Development and they were working on an agreement to have sanitary sewer extended to the site.

Discussion ensued regarding bringing sanitary sewer to this site, how this could be done, and connection to sanitary sewer being required unless it was impossible for several years.

Chair Goranson asked about storage of materials.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted as it was written, it said storage of materials, and although the intent was to do only the trailer type of storage, the PUD and the zoning ordinance did not restrict the use to only trailer type storage.

Chair Goranson asked if lighting was required in the storage area, or just in the parking lot.

Ms. Yamaguchi responded lighting was required in the parking lot and around the building. She noted if the developer wanted to install lighting in the storage area it was allowed.

Mr. Cross stated the proposed limitation on use was for outdoor storage and distribution of completed relocatable buildings, and he could extend that to say "and prohibiting material storage" if it made the City more comfortable.

Vice Chair Coan stated if this were tabled would this still be able to go before City Council on August 5th.

Ms. Yamaguchi stated it was a fast turnaround, but it was possible.

Mr. Cross stated he appreciated Vice Chair Coan's concerns, but he was comfortable with a continuance and the bumps that would go with the continuance, if this was what Planning Commission would like to see.

Planning Commission agreed it would be more comfortable continuing the item and reviewing it again with the landscape plan.

Vice Chair Coan noted he was just trying to help keep Mr. Cross on schedule.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted Staff would work to keep Mr. Cross on schedule and try to place the item on the August 5th Agenda for City Council.

Mr. Cross noted that would be appreciated. He stated if he received the landscape plan tomorrow as he was told, he would immediately send it to City Staff.

Discussion ensued regarding allowing City Staff to set the specifics for landscaping; and City Staff understanding what Planning Commission liked to see in terms of landscaping.

Vice Chair Coan asked City Staff and Mr. Cross to keep in mind area 2 when adjusting the PUD request.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted a meeting could be set with Mr. Cross once he received the landscape plan to workshop the plan.

Mr. Cross agreed.

MOTION: A motion was made by Jason Coan, seconded by Mindy Payne.

Move to table Item 6B until the Planning Commission meeting on July 25, 2024

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

7. Appeals

There were no appeals.

8. General Commission Business

There was no General Commission Business.

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

Commissioner Klempa noted she sent an email regarding obtaining contact information for City Staff.

Ms. Yamaguchi noted Mackenzie was working on this list for Commissioner Klempa, but she was on vacation.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:25 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