

# City of Broken Arrow <br> Meeting Agenda <br> Planning Commission 

Chairperson Lee Whelpley<br>Vice Chair Ricky Jones<br>Member Fred Dorrell<br>Member Jaylee Klempa<br>Member Julea' Merriott (pending City Council appointment)

| Thursday, October 8, 2020 | Council Chambers |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 220 South First Street |
|  | Broken Arrow, OK 74012 |

## 1. Call To Order

## 2. Roll Call

## 3. Old Business

## 4. Consideration of Consent Agenda

A. $\quad \underline{20-1262 ~ A p p r o v a l ~ o f ~ P l a n n i n g ~ C o m m i s s i o n ~ m e e t i n g ~ m i n u t e s ~ o f ~ S e p t e m b e r ~ 24, ~} 2020$

Attachments: 09242020 Planning Commission Minutes
B. 20-1256 Approval of BAL-2099CB (Lot Combination), Primrose School of Broken Arrow, 2 Lots, 2.21 acres, one-quarter mile east of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue), south of Albany Street (61st Street)

Attachments: 2-Case Map
3-Aerial
4-Exhibit
5-The Park at Greenway Plat
C. 20-1255 Approval of PT20-110, Preliminary Plat, Bricktown East, 23.5 acres, 92

Lots, CG and IL to PUD-318/RS-4, one-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th E.
Avenue)

Attachments: 2-CHECKLIST<br>3-PRELIMINARY PLAT AND CONCEPTUAL UTILITY PLAN

D. 20-1259 Approval of PT20-114, Preliminary Plat, Presley Reserve, 40.20 acres, A-1 (Agricultural) to RS-3 (Single-Family Residential), south of Tucson Street (121st Street), one-half mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue)

## Attachments:

2-Checklist
3-Preliminary Plat, Covenants and Conceptual Utilities

## 5. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

## 6. Public Hearings

A. 20-1247 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BACP-172 (Comprehensive Plan Change), Robson North, 69.47 acres, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, and Greenway/Floodplain to Level 2 and Greenway/Floodplain, generally located one-eighth mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile east of 65th Street (241st E. Avenue/Oneta Road)

Attachments: 2-CASE MAP.BACP-172
3-AERIAL.BACP-172
4-COMP PLAN.BACP-172
5-COMP PLAN EXCERPT.FOREST RIDGE AREA TOWN CENTER
B. 20-1248 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-47H (Planned Unit Development), Cloudi Mornings, 0.21 acres, PUD-47/CG/IL to PUD-47H/CG/IL, located one-quarter mile south of Albany Street (61st Street), one-half mile west of Olive Avenue (129th E. Avenue)

Attachments: 2-CASE MAP.PUD-47H
3-AERIAL.PUD-47H
4-COMP PLAN.PUD-47H
5-DESIGN STATEMENT FOR PUD 47H
6-DESIGN STATEMENT FOR PUD-47
7-CASE MAPS FOR BAZ-432 AND BAZ-622
8-NOVEMBER 19, 2019, OKLAHOMA SUPREME COURT RULING
9-SEPTEMBER 1, 2020 EMAIL FROM AUSTIN MILLER
C. $\underline{20-1249}$

Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-94V (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-2066, Aspen Circle, 6.90 acres, PUD-94/CG to PUD-94V/CH and IL, located north of the Broken Arrow Expressway, south of Albany Drive, and east of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue)

Attachments: 2-CASE MAP.PUD 94V \& BAZ 2066
3-AERIAL.PUD 94V \& BAZ 2066
4-COMP PLAN.PUD 94V \& BAZ 2066
5-DESIGN STATEMENT.09-21-2020
D.

Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-276A
(Planned Unit Development Minor Amendment), Timber Ridge Cottages, 8.05 acres, RM/PUD-276, one-quarter mile south of Kenosha Street (71st Street), east of 37th Street (209th E Avenue)

| Attachments: | 2-Case Map |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | 3-Aerial |
|  | 4-PUD-276A DESIGN STATEMENT |
|  | 5-PUD-276A EXHIBIT |

E. 20-1258 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-2068 (Rezoning), Medwise Urgent Care South, 29.18 acres, A-1
(Agricultural)/SP-270 (Specific Use Permit) to CN (Commercial
Neighborhood) and ON (Office Neighborhood), south of the Creek
Turnpike, east of Elm Place (161st East Avenue)
Attachments: 2-CASE MAP
3-AERIAL
4-COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
5-EXHIBIT
7. Appeals

## 8. General Commission Business

A. 20-1207 Consideration and possible approval of the 2021 Planning Commission meeting and calendar schedule

Attachments: 2021 PC MEETING DATES
9. Remarks, Inquiries and Comments by Planning Commission and Staff (No Action)
10. Adjournment

## NOTICE:

1. ALL MATTERS UNDER "CONSENT" ARE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO BE ROUTINE AND WILL BE ENACTED BY ONE MOTION. HOWEVER, ANY CONSENT ITEM CAN BE REMOVED FOR DISCUSSION, UPON REQUEST.
2. IF YOU HAVE A DISABILITY AND NEED ACCOMMODATION IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT AT 918-259-8412, TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS.
3. EXHIBITS, PETITIONS, PICTURES, ETC. PRESENTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY BE RECEIVED
AND DEPOSITED IN CASE FILES TO BE MAINTAINED AT BROKEN ARROW CITY HALL.
4. RINGING/SOUND ON ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS MUST BE TURNED OFF DURING THE PLANNING

COMMISSION MEETING.
POSTED on $\qquad$ , $\qquad$ at $\qquad$ am/pm.

City Clerk.

# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1262, Version: 1

# Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 10-08-2020 

| To: | Chairman and Commission Members <br> Drom: <br> Title: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of September <br> $\mathbf{2 4 , 2 0 2 0}$ |
| Background: | Minutes recorded for the Broken Arrow Planning Commission meeting. |
| Attachments: | 09242020 Planning Commission Minutes |

Recommendation: Approve minutes of Planning Commission meeting held September 24, 2020.
Reviewed By: Jill Ferenc
Approved By: Larry R. Curtis

City of Broken Arrow
City Hall
220 S 1st Street
Minutes
Broken Arrow OK
Planning Commission
74012

Chairperson Lee Whelpley<br>Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones<br>Commission Member Fred Dorrell<br>Commission Member Mark Jones<br>Commission Member Jaylee Klempa

Time 5:00 p.m.
Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Lee Whelpley called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call

Present: 5- Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
3. Old Business

There was no Old Business.
4. Consideration of Consent Agenda

Staff Planner, Amanda Yamaguchi, presented this Item.
A. 20-1169 Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of September 10, 2020
B. 20-1173 Approval of BAL-2096 and BAL-2097CB, Lot 6, Block 1 Wickford at Forest Ridge and Reserve C Wickford at Forest Ridge, $\mathbf{0 . 6 5}$ acres for Lot 6, Block 1 and 0.09 acres for Reserve C, R-1/PUD-66, one-third mile north of Houston Street (81st Street), one-half mile east of 65th Street (Oneta Road)
C. 20-1108 Approval of BAL-2098, Chalmers Auto Mall Lot Split, 2 Lots, 16.66 acres, PUD-44A/CH and CG, southeast corner of Albany Street (61st Street) and Aspen Avenue 145th E. Avenue)
D. 20-1178 Approval of BAL-2100 (Lot Split), Center for the Arts, 1 Lot, 0.07 acres, one-quarter mile north of Houston Street (81st Street), west of Main Street at 320 South Main Street
E. 20-1179 Approval of BAL-2101CB (Lot Combination), Center for the Arts, 1 Lot, 0.07 acres, one-quarter mile north of Houston Street (81st Street), west of Main Street at 320 South Main Street
F. 20-1177 Approval of PT20-111, Preliminary Plat, The Colony at Cedar Ridge, 78.12 acres, A-1 (Agricultural) to RS-3 (Single-Family Residential)/CM (Community Mixed-Use) and (Planned Unit Development) PUD-301, south of New Orleans Street (101st Street), one-quarter mile east of Olive Avenue (129th East Avenue)
G. 20-1187 Approval of PT20-113 preliminary plat, Park Place, 80.23 acres, 259 Lots, A-1 to PUD-304/RS-3, one-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), east of 79th Street (257th E. Avenue/Midway Road)
H. 20-1184 Approval of PT15-117C, Conditional Final Plat, Ninety One - Phase 4, 24.58 acres, 76 lots, A-1 to RS-3, one-half mile east of 9th Street (Lynn Lane/177th E. Avenue), north of Washington Street (91st Street)
Ms. Yamaguchi indicated the applicants were in agreement with the Staff Reports.
Chairperson Whelpley asked if there were any items to be removed from the Consent Agenda. Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones indicated his firm prepared the preliminary plat for the Colony at Cedar Ridge; therefore, he would need to recuse himself from Item 4F. Chairperson Whelpley noted Ms. Yamaguchi requested Item 4C be removed from the Consent Agenda. He asked if there were any other items to be removed from the Consent Agenda; there were none. He explained the Consent Agenda consisted of routine items, minor in nature, and was approved in its entirety with a single motion and a single vote, unless an item was removed for discussion.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ricky Jones, seconded by Jaylee Klempa.
Move to approve the Consent Agenda less Items 4C and 4F per Staff recommendations The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 5- Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
Chairperson Whelpley indicated Item 4H would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.
5. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

Senior Planner Brent Murphey reported Item 4C was a lot split into two lots. He indicated

Staff recommended approval subject to warranty deed submission, landscape plan modification to code, and a mutual access be provided. He stated the applicant was in agreement with Staff. He explained the applicant wished to show Planning Commission what was planned in this location. He noted this was a prime, highly visible property site in Broken Arrow.

The applicant Roman Albert stated his address was at $61^{\text {st }}$ and $145^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. He made a brief presentation regarding the intended development for this property including landscaping with evergreen plants and seasonal color plants, as well as new trees (red buds, crepe myrtles and maple trees). He noted a common area easement would be supplied for the lot split. He noted he hoped his plans would exceed the Broken Arrow landscaping requirements. He intended to make this a beautiful corner.

MOTION: A motion was made by Jaylee Klempa, seconded by Mark Jones.
Move to approve Item 4C per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
$\begin{aligned} & \text { Aye: } \quad 5-\quad \text { Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley } \\ & \text { Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones left the Chamber for discussion and vote on Item 4F. He }\end{aligned}$ returned following the vote.

MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Jaylee Klempa.
Move to approve Item 4F per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 4- Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Lee Whelpley
Recused: 1- Ricky Jones

## 6. Public Hearings

A. 20-1165 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-288A (Planned Unit Development Minor Amendment), Villages at 1Eleven, 8.95 acres, A-1 to CM and PUD-288, located north of the northwest corner of Florence Street (111th Street) and Aspen Avenue (145th E Avenue)
Ms. Amanda Yamaguchi reported Planned Unit Development (PUD)-288A, minor amendment to PUD-288, involved an 8.95-acre undeveloped tract located north of the northwest corner of Florence Street (111th Street) and Aspen Avenue (145th E Avenue). She stated PUD-288 and BAZ-2024 were approved on this property by the City Council on June 17, 2019. She explained with this minor amendment, the applicant was requesting to increase the maximum height of buildings within a portion of Development Area A to three stories, not to exceed 40 -feet. She stated architectural features such as chimneys and cupolas may extend beyond 40 -feet to a maximum height of 50 -feet. She noted in the previously approved PUD, the maximum building height was restricted to 35 -feet with architectural features allowed to extend up to 45 -feet. She reported all other provisions of PUD- 288 would remain as previously approved. She stated based on the Comprehensive Plan, location of the property and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended PUD-288 be approved subject to the property being platted.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones recused himself for this Item, as well as Item 6B. He left the Chambers and returned following the vote for Item 6B.

The applicant, Erik Enyart, with Tanner Consulting, address 5323 S. Lewis Avenue, Tulsa, indicated he was in agreement with Staff recommendations. He noted the site design was changed; buildings were moved further back from the road. He indicated in this particular location this property was the only property limited to 35 -feet in height.

Commissioner Klempa asked if there would be added residential units with the increased height of the building. Mr. Enyart responded in the negative; he was still limited to the number of residential units indicated in the PUD.

Chairperson Whelpley opened the public hearing.
Citizen Greg Genua, address 4329 S. Chestnut Avenue, Broken Arrow, stated he was opposed to PUD-288. He noted there was opposition to this development last year as well. He indicated there were many citizens who would be affected by this development and were in opposition. He noted the previous objections were clearly stated and he felt the objections were ignored. He stated there was a conflict of interest and while Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones recused himself from the discussion he did not have confidence there had not been side discussions amongst the City Council regarding this property, the development, and the plan as stated. He asked for the City to set aside this decision until the citizens directly affected by this project had an opportunity to review and understand exactly what was being proposed. He stated he understood the developer sold off portions of the original 29 acres which caused him to question the developer's financial stability and ability to build according to the original plan submitted and approved by Planning Commission and City Council. He noted
only one sign was set out for this development notifying the public and he felt more time was needed for the public to assess the situation.

Planning and Development Manager Jill Ferenc explained one sign was required to be posted 10 days prior to the public hearing, letters were required to be sent out 20 days prior to the public hearing, and newspaper notice was required 20 days prior to the public hearing.

Chairperson Whelpley asked if letters were sent out to the surrounding residents. Ms. Jill Ferenc responded in the affirmative; minor amendments only required noticed to be mailed to residents within a 100 -foot radius of the property.

Chairperson Whelpley asked if Mr. Genua had been contacted by the applicant regarding the changes. Mr. Genua responded in the negative; to his knowledge there had been no communications from the City or the developer aside from the small sign posted on the property. Chairperson Whelpley asked if Mr. Genua was asking for a continuation. Mr. Genua responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Yamaguchi reported for a minor amendment only abutting property owners were required to be given mailed notice. Ms. Ferenc explained normally with a rezoning case, or a new PUD, or a major amendment to a PUD, the buffer area for mailed notice was 300 feet. She stated only one sign was required along a public street frontage. She indicated all required notice was mailed and posted. She noted the minor amendment was only a height increase request of 5 feet; from 35 feet to 40 feet in building height and an extra 5 feet in height for accessory structures (such as chimneys). She indicated the original design had a maximum of 35 feet in building height; the new design showed a building height of 37.5 feet.

Chairperson Whelpley closed the public hearing.
The applicant, Mr. Enyart, stated this was a very lengthy Planned Unit Development which went through multiple public hearings and the neighborhood was very aware of the project. He indicated many different ideas went into the project and he felt it was excellent. He stated this was a small component of the overall project; this was a development area entitled for multiple family. He noted buildings were being pulled away from the edges as compared with the original design. He indicated the only reason for the small increase in height was for one central building which would have a clubhouse within. He requested approval of the minor amendment.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mark Jones, seconded by Fred Dorrell.

## Move to approve Item 6A per Staff recommendation

The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 4- Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Lee Whelpley
Recused: 1-Ricky Jones
B. 20-1166 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-2063 (Rezoning), 121st Street Rezoning, 40 acres, A-1 (Agricultural) to RS-3 (Single-Family Residential), south of Tucson Street (121st Street), one-half mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue)
Ms. Yamaguchi reported BAZ-2063 was a request to change the zoning designation on a 40acre tract from A-1 (Agricultural) to RS-3 (Single-Family Residential). She stated the unplatted and undeveloped property was located south of Tucson Street (121st Street), onehalf mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue). She noted the developer was interested in developing single-family residential homes on the property. She indicated this property was in Level 2 (Urban Residential) of the Comprehensive Plan and RS-3 was considered to be in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 2. She reported according to the FEMA maps, none of the property was located in a 100-year floodplain area. She stated based on the Comprehensive Plan, the location of the property, and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended BAZ-2063 be approved, subject to the property being platted.

The applicant, Erik Enyart, with Tanner Consulting, address 5323 S. Lewis Avenue, Tulsa, stated he was in agreement with Staff recommendations. He noted this property was surrounded by existing RS-3 zoning or approved RS-3 zoning. He requested approval.

Chairperson Whelpley opened the public hearing.
Citizen Michael Tobler stated his address was 2620 W. Union Place, Broken Arrow. He noted the back of his home bordered the property in question. He stated he was concerned regarding the back of his property which steeply inclined up towards this property. He asked if the development would lower this incline or if the development would be constructed at the higher level. He noted there was much wild growth on the property directly behind his property and it was a problem area. He indicated he was worried this area of overgrowth would become an easement area. He asked who would be responsible for the land if was
considered an easement. He noted there were utilities on the property. He stated he felt this land was not taken care of properly when his neighborhood was developed; the developer dropped sod on top of live poison ivy vines which were never eradicated.

Mr. Ferenc indicated this development was in the first stage (zoning). She noted a preliminary plat had been submitted, however. She stated City Staff would contact Mr. Tobler and share the preliminary plat which would come before Planning Commission in the next phases of development. She indicated the preliminary plat would give Mr. Tobler an idea of what was planned for the property. She stated if there were easements, typically it was the responsibility of the property owner to maintain the easement. She stated reserve areas were typically the responsibility of the subdivision's HOA.

Chairperson Whelpley closed the public hearing.
MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Mark Jones.

## Move to approve Item 6B per Staff recommendation

The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 4- Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Lee Whelpley
Recused: 1- Ricky Jones
Chairperson Whelpley indicated this Item would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at $6: 30 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. He noted if any wished to speak at the City Council Meeting completion of a Request to Speak form was required.
C. 20-1167 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-317 (Planned Unit Development), Tytan Station, R-3 (Single-Family Residential), Downtown Residential Overlay District (DROD) Area 5, located at the southeast corner of Fort Worth Street and 1st Street
Ms. Yamaguchi reported Planned Unit Development (PUD)-317 involved a 0.33 -acre lot located at the southeast corner of Fort Worth Street and 1st Street. She stated the property was platted as Lots 7-10, Block 70, Original Town of Broken Arrow. She noted the applicant proposed to develop the property as four single-family, detached homes; the lots were planned to be reconfigured to allow all proposed structures to face 1st Street. She noted access to lots 1 and 2 were proposed to be from Fort Worth Street and access to lots 3 and 4 would be through a platted alley immediately south of this property. She stated interior lots would be accessible through shared driveway access provided with a mutual access agreement between properties. She reported Tytan Station was proposed to be developed in accordance with the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance and the use and development regulations of the Downtown Residential Overlay District, except as summarized in the Staff Report. She stated the applicant provided an update to the site layout this morning and the only change was lots 3 and 4 now had a minimum size of 3,353 square feet and 3,295 square feet, respectively. She noted this change would be reflected in the City Council Staff Report.

Ms. Yamaguchi indicated according to Section 6.4 of the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD provisions were established for one or more of six purposes and in Staff's opinion, PUD-317 satisfied item 1 of Section 6.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance: 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. She noted the development of this site as single family detached homes was consistent with surrounding properties in the area; the PUD allowed for reconfiguration of lots to allow for better home layout without increasing the number of lots.

She stated based upon the Comprehensive Plan, the location of the property, and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended PUD-317 be approved, subject to the following: 1) Utility easements being provided as needed to provide utility service to all lots. 2) Lot consolidation and lot split applications being approved by the Planning Commission for the reconfiguration of the lots as shown in the PUD exhibits. 3) Document numbers for filed mutual access easements being included on the building permit applications.

The applicant, Nick Parker, address 304 E. Commercial Street, Broken Arrow, indicated he was in agreement with Staff recommendations.

Chairperson Whelpley noted no citizens signed up to speak regarding Item 6C.
MOTION: A motion was made by Ricky Jones, seconded by Jaylee Klempa.
Move to approve Item 6C per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye:
5 - Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
Chairperson Whelpley indicated this Item would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.

Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BACP-131A (Comprehensive Plan Change), Level 1 (Rural Residential) to Level 3 (Transition Area), Oak Pond, 6.1 acres, A-1 (Agricultural), north of Washington Street (91st Street), one-quarter mile west of 9th Street (177th E. Avenue)
Jane Wyrick, Planner II, reported BACP-131A was a request to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from Level 1 (Rural Residential) to Level 3 (Transition Area). She stated the 6.1 -acre property was located north of Washington Street ( 91 st Street), one-quarter mile west of 9th Street (177th E. Avenue); the property, which was unplatted, was currently zoned A-1 (Agricultural). She noted in 1982 this property was rezoned from single family to multifamily at Level 3. She noted later in 2014 a Comprehensive Plan amendment was conditionally approved to change the land use designation for a 6.46 -acre site from Level 3 (Transition Area) to Level 1 (Rural Residential) and a request to rezone the property (BAZ1900) from RM (Residential, Multifamily) to A-1 (Agriculture), as well as a Specific Use Permit (SP-273) for horticultural nursery sales. She stated with BACP-131A, the applicant requested approval to amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from Level 1 (Agricultural) to Level 3 (Transition Area). She noted the property owner planned to sell the property and wished to market the property as Level 3 . She noted while a draft Planned Unit Development document was not submitted with this request, Staff anticipated receiving a rezoning request should the Comprehensive Plan amendment be approved. She noted should these requests be approved, the Specific Use Permit (SP-273) for horticultural nursery sales would need to be abrogated. She reported a blue line stream was located on the site and the area across the street to the south of Washington Street was mapped as 100 -year floodplain. She noted Staff anticipated a study of this project site would result in some areas of floodplain on the site. She noted based on the gross acreage of the site a maximum potential of multifamily dwelling units was 121 units; however, not all of the site was developable; therefore, once the flood plain was mapped and the actual developable area identified, a more accurate amount of potential dwelling units would be determined. She stated based upon the location of the property, the existing and surrounding land uses, surrounding designations in the Comprehensive Plan's future development guide, Staff recommended approval of BACP131 A , subject to the following conditions of approval: 1) Rezoning of the property from A-1 (Agriculture) to RM (Residential, Multifamily. 2) The property shall be platted in accordance with the Land Subdivision Code and the Engineering Design Criteria Manual including dedication of required rights-of-way and utility easements. 3) Applicant to map the limits of the FEMA floodplain. Areas identified as floodplain shall be zoned FD (Floodplain) in conjunction with the future rezoning request. 4) Applicant to abrogate SP-273 in conjunction with a future rezoning request for the property.

The applicant, Heather Caputo, address 524 S. Main Street, Broken Arrow, stated she was in agreement with Staff Report. She noted this request was for the property to be returned to its original Comprehensive Plan Level designation. She noted there were a couple of interested parties who wished to develop high-end single-family homes in this location.

## Chairperson Whelpley opened the public hearing.

Citizen Edna Osborn stated her address was 2301 S. 7th Street, Broken Arrow. She noted she was neither in favor nor opposed to this development as she had not seen anything showing what would be done. She noted her neighborhood had been experiencing flooding from the property located behind her home for over 14 years. She noted she had reported this problem to the City multiple times and provided documentation. She explained why she felt there was flooding. She asked if this potential development would improve her neighborhood flooding. She asked if proper guttering would be provided. She discussed the developer of Meadow Homes and Windsor Homes stating she felt he was a poor builder and should be removed from the list of accepted builders in Broken Arrow. She discussed the individuals she felt were good builders noting good builders installed proper gutters and stormwater drainage.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones explained this Item was consideration of a change in the Comprehensive Plan for this property which was the first step in the development process. He noted assuming the Comprehensive Plan change was approved, an interested developer would be required to submit a rezoning application and possibly a PUD; if this were approved then the developer would enter into the platting and engineering process. He explained during the engineering stage the City stringently reviewed the engineering plans for stormwater drainage. He noted if development did occur on this property the City would review the surrounding area, consider the current drainage condition, and try to improve the situation.

Ms. Osborn asked if the change in the Comprehensive Plan would increase her property taxes. She asked how a Comprehensive Plan change would affect her property.

Ms. Ferenc indicated Ms. Osborn could contact the Assessor's Office as a point of reference for any valuation questions.

Chairperson Whelpley asked if this would be coming back before Planning Commission in
the future. Ms. Wyrick responded in the affirmative; it would come back before Planning Commission for rezoning, PUD, and platting.

Chairperson Whelpley closed the public hearing.
MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Mark Jones.
Move to approve Item 6D per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 5 - Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
Chairperson Whelpley indicated this Item would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.
E. 20-1171 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BACP-171 (Comprehensive Plan Change), Level 3 (Transition Area) and Level 6 (Regional Employment/Commercial) to Level 3 (Transition Area), Bricktown East, 23.5 acres, CG (Commercial General) and IL (Industrial Light), one-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue) Ms. Jane Wyrick reported BACP 171 was a request to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from Level 3 (Transition Area) and Level 6 (Regional Employment/Commercial) to Level 3 for a proposed single-family residential development on 23.5 acres located onequarter mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue); the property, which was vacant and unplatted, was currently zoned CG (Commercial General) and IL (Industrial Light). She reported in 2008, the Planning Commission recommended approval (3-1 vote) of a request to amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation (BACP-94) on this site from Level 3 and Level 6 to Level 3 for a 264 -unit, four-story multifamily housing project. She noted the request was heard by the City Council on April 15, 2008 where it was tabled to allow the applicant to consider a PUD process and to prepare a traffic study after several residents expressed concern about traffic, the size of the proposed four-story, high-density buildings, and the lack of a buffer between single-family and the multi-family development. She indicated the applicant did not move forward with the request. She explained at the time of the amendment request, the property had included 100-year floodplain; however, a draft update of the FEMA map no longer indicated any 100 -year floodplain on the site, and the map was later approved. She stated with BACP-171, the applicant requested approval to amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from Level 3 (Transition Area) and Level 6 (Regional Employment/Commercial) to Level 3 for a single-family residential development. She indicated in conjunction with BACP-171, the applicant submitted a Planned Unit Development (PUD-318) for Bricktown East that included 92 residential lots in a gated community with private streets. She stated a preliminary plat was submitted and was scheduled for the October 8, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. She reported the site included an existing sanitary sewer easement in the northeast, and a gas line easement along the south boundary. She stated a fifty-foot setback was required from pipelines which would be reviewed as part of the PUD and platting process. She noted the adjacent properties to the south had reserve areas for drainage along the south boundary of this site. She stated Table 4.1-5 of the Zoning Ordinance indicated the minimum gross land area per dwelling unit in the RS-4 zoning district was 7,875 square feet; based on this, a potential 130 units could be built on 23.51 acres. She stated based on the location of the property and the existing surrounding land uses, Staff recommended approval of BACP-171 subject to the following conditions of approval: 1) Approval of the rezoning of the property from CG and IL zoning designations to RS-4/PUD318. 2) The property shall be platted in accordance with the Land Subdivision Code and the Engineering Design Criteria Manual including the dedication of required rights-of-way and utility easements.

The applicant, Jim Beach, with Wallace Engineering, address 123 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, stated he was in agreement with Staff recommendations.

Chairperson Whelpley noted no citizens signed up to speak regarding this Item.
MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Jaylee Klempa.
Move to approve Item 6E per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 5- Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
Chairperson Whelpley indicated this Item would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.
F. 20-1172 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-318 (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-2064 (Rezoning), Bricktown East, 23.5 acres, CG (Commercial General) and IL (Industrial Light) to PUD-318/RS-4 (Single-family Residential), located one-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue)

Ms. Wyrick reported Planned Unit Development (PUD)-318 and BAZ-2064 (Rezoning) involved a 23.5 -acre parcel located one-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue); the property, which was vacant and unplatted, was currently zoned CG (Commercial General) and IL (Industrial Light). She noted this was the PUD and rezoning request attached to Item 6E previously discussed. She reported with PUD-318, the applicant was proposing a single-family detached residential development with up to 95 lots. She reported the primary point of access would be from Elder Place with gated access leading to private streets. She noted an exit only access point was proposed on the east side of the site off of Lansing Avenue leading to Aspen Avenue. She indicated two additional stub streets were proposed for future access to the north; one of these were proposed at the intersection of Oakland Place and the other was adjacent to an undeveloped property to the north. She stated a landscape edge was proposed along the Elder Place street frontage as well as a landscaped entry. She noted the applicant proposed a capped wood fence with columns every 60 feet along Elder Place. She reported with BAZ2064, the applicant proposed to rezone the property from CG (Commercial General) and IL (Industrial Light) to RS-4 (Single-family Residential). She noted development proposed a reserve area for on-site stormwater detention along the south boundary that was being reviewed in conjunction with the plat (PT20-110). She stated should the Comprehensive Plan Amendment be approved the property associated with PUD-318 would be designated as Level 3 in the Comprehensive Plan and single family residential as proposed with PUD-318 was considered to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 3.

Ms. Wyrick reported in Staff's opinion, PUD-318 satisfied items 1, 2 and 5 of Section 6.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance: 1) PUD-318 limits the total number of units to 95 , which was less than the 130 units allowed by the Zoning Ordinance, thereby limiting the intensity of use. 2) The landscape edge along Elder Place provided a public benefit, and the landscape buffer adjacent to industrial uses was a benefit to residents who would reside in those homes. The addition of a trail was an amenity for future residents. 5) Sidewalks would be provided throughout the neighborhood in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations making the neighborhood accessible. She noted according to FEMA maps, none of the property was located in the 100 -year floodplain. She indicated the applicant claimed there was no blue line stream traversing the property; however, there were wetlands to the northeast and a flood plain to the southwest and some study would need to be completed to determine how the drainage should be addressed. She stated based on the Comprehensive Plan, location of the property and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended BAZ-2064 and PUD-318 be approved subject to the approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

The applicant, Jim Beach, with Wallace Engineering, address 123 Martin Luther King Jr Blvd, stated he was in agreement with the Staff recommendations.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones stated this looked like an excellent development; he was impressed

Chairperson Whelpley indicated no citizens requested to speak regarding this Item.
MOTION: A motion was made by Ricky Jones, seconded by Jaylee Klempa. Move to approve Item 6F per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: $\quad 5$ - Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
Chairperson Whelpley indicated this Item would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.
G. 20-1182 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-319 (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-2065 (Rezoning), City PUD, approximately 20 acres, one-half mile south of Florence Street (111th Street), east of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue), north of the Creek Turnpike
Ms. Yamaguchi reported PUD-319 and BAZ-2065 was a request to change the zoning designation on an approximately 20-acre tract of land from R-2 to CH (Commercial Heavy) and RM (Residential Multi-Family)/PUD-319. She noted the west approximately 10-acres was proposed to be rezoned to CH and the east approximately 10 -acres was proposed to be rezoned to RM. She noted the undeveloped property was located one-half mile south of Florence Street (111th Street), east of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue), north of the Creek Turnpike. She reported the City currently owned the property through the Broken Arrow Economic Development Authority; in order to make the property more marketable for future mixed-use, residential, and commercial development, a rezoning was necessary to allow for these potential uses. She stated PUD-319 was proposed to be developed in accordance with the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance and the use and development regulations of the CH and RM districts, with the following exceptions: 1) Front setbacks on commercial lots shall be reduced from 50 -feet to 30 -feet; and 2) Within required landscape edges, the number of trees shall be increased from 1 per 50 linear feet to 1 per 30 linear feet, along all frontages which abut the arterial street or frontage road. She stated PUD-319 included requirements for
a frontage road to parallel the Creek Turnpike and a trail connection between Liberty Trail and the existing Windsor Oak Estates neighborhood to the northeast. She stated based on the Comprehensive Plan, Staff recommended PUD-319 and BAZ-2065 be approved subject to the property being platted.

The applicant, Ms. Jill Ferenc (the City of Broken Arrow), stated the PUD took into account long range plans and incorporated planning for the frontage road which would run east to west along the turnpike to the north, as well as trail connections, per the INCOG plan the City adopted, and also allowed for blended development between commercial and residential.

Chairperson Whelpley indicated no citizens signed up to speak regarding this Item.
MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Jaylee Klempa.
Move to approve Item 6G per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: $\quad 5$ - Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
Chairperson Whelpley indicated this Item would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.. (Under Item 9:Remarkes, Inquiries and Comments by Planning Commission and Staff, Jill Ferenc updated and clarified that this Item will go before the City Council on the October 6, 2020 Meeting.)
H. 20-1170 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BACP-170
(Comprehensive Plan Change), Level 2 (Urban Residential), Level 3 (Transition Area) and Level 4 (Commercial/Employment Nodes) to an increased amount of Level 2 and Level 3 and decreased amount of Level 4, Honey Springs at Battle Creek, 75.276 acres, PUD-94Q/A-CG (Annexed-Commercial General), A-RD (Annexed-Residential Duplex) and A-R-3 (Annexed-Single-family Residential), southeast corner of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue) and Dearborn Street (41st Street)
Ms. Wyrick reported BACP-170 was a request to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from Level 2 (Urban Residential), Level 3 (Transition Area) and Level 4 (Commercial/Employment Nodes) to an increased amount of Level 2 and Level 3 and a decreased amount of Level 4 (Commercial/ Employment Nodes) for 75.276 acres located at the southeast corner of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue) and Dearborn Street (41st Street). She reported this project site was part of a larger tract of land which was annexed into Broken Arrow from Tulsa in 1994 as part of the 786.5-acre Battle Creek PUD. She stated along with this PUD was a rezoning subject to platting; some portions of Battle Creek were platted, but this far northern portion had not been platted as of yet. She noted once the platting took place the zoning would be codified. She noted with this request the boundaries for each use area was being changed with the Comprehensive Plan and with the forthcoming rezoning and PUD which would come before Planning Commission in October. She explained as a part of the approval of PUD-94, density limits were established for different types of housing within the development. She noted PUD-94 allowed for translocation of densities and land use areas within the project boundaries. She noted this project site was part of another Comprehensive Plan amendment in 2010 which transferred villas or multifamily housing to a different site north of the Broken Arrow Expressway and east of Aspen Avenue. She noted PUD-94Q was approved in 2010 to decrease the area designated for commercial from 23 acres to 10 acres, for apartments from 23 acres to 6 acres and it amended the use of this area for patio homes; it also increased the area for executive home sites from 28 acres to 60 acres. She noted this approval was subject to the property being platted and with this approval, the density for the property at Aspen Avenue and Dearborn Street was decreased. She explained with BACP-170, the applicant requested approval to modify the configuration of the areas of Levels 2,3 and 4 due to the topography of the site and the location of existing ponds and blue line streams. She noted in conjunction with BACP-170, the applicant submitted a draft major amendment to PUD-94 and PUD- 94Q (PUD-94W). She indicated the forthcoming PUD amendment and plat would address any required right-of-way and utility easement dedications. She noted all major utilities were available in other phases of the Battle Creek subdivision and would be extended to serve this area. She indicated the topography sloped downhill to the north posing a challenge to serve this area of the site; thus, a sewer lift station would likely be needed to serve this area. She noted Staff had determined with the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the density would be decreased in this area. She explained since publishing the Staff Report a revised draft PUD was submitted which would bring the number of single-family units from 190 down to 175 and the number of patio home units from 50 down to 44 . She stated based on the location of the property and the existing and surrounding land uses, Staff recommended BAZ-170 be approved subject to the following conditions of approval: 1) Approval of the rezoning of the property from "Annexed" zoning designations to those that are in conformance with the current Zoning Ordinance, and approval of a major amendment to PUD-94 and PUD-94Q. 2) The property shall be platted in accordance with the Land Subdivision Code and the Engineering Design Criteria Manual including the dedication of required rights-of-way and utility easements.
a decrease in density in the number of units. Ms. Wyrick concurred; when Battle Creek was first approved there was a maximum number of units approved for different types of housing. She noted this number was decreased in 2010, and this application reduced the number once again.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones noted this piece of property had come before Planning Commission several times.

The applicant Nathan Cross, address 2 West 2nd Street, Suite 700, Tulsa, stated he was in agreement with Staff recommendations. He noted Tim Terrel was also a planner for this project. He explained this was simply a reconfiguration of the layout of the Comprehensive Plan which included a reduction of the commercial development area and replaced the commercial area with single family homes. He explained this was necessary as there was a jurisdictional waterway which ran through this portion of the property which could not be disturbed; therefore, it made sense to reconfigure the property to include a greenbelt and wetlands.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones indicated he could understand why this area needed to be reconfigured at this time to accommodate the wetlands.

Chairperson Whelpley asked if Mr. Cross had spoken to any of the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Cross responded in the negative; he noted he was happy to discuss the concept with the neighbors. He indicated to his knowledge four phone calls were received regarding this development; there may have been more received. He stated he understood the desire to hear more about the development. He noted this was simply the Comprehensive Plan discussion; the development PUD was not being discussed today.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones noted if this Comprehensive Plan amendment were approved there would be new notice given for the rezoning and PUD public hearings.

Chairperson Whelpley opened the public hearing. He stated there was one individual in favor and four opposed who did not wish to speak: in favor was Danny Reed 1933 W. Xenia Street; in opposition were James Sikkema 4600 N. Walnut Street, Blaine Schaaf, 4621 N. Redbud Avenue, Brenda Dutkosky 1713 W. Zillah Street, and Rob Dutkosky 1713 W. Zillah Street.

Chairperson Whelpley asked for speeches to be tailored so as not to repeat the same concerns and objections expressed by others.

Citizen Dave Price, address 2025 W. Woodberry Street, Broken Arrow, stated he was concerned regarding how this would affect his property value, and regarding the affect this development would have on traffic (he discussed high traffic areas near this property). He asked what the price range would be for the new homes and what would be done on $145^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to alleviate the traffic concerns. He noted he did not feel more apartments were needed in the area; this would only increase traffic difficulties. He indicated he was in opposition to this Item.

Citizen Deborah Sikkema, address 4600 N. Walnut Ave, Broken Arrow, stated she was in opposition to development of this land. She noted the land was behind her home and she was concerned about losing the well-developed habitat in the area. She indicated the greenspace was home to many animals, was an excellent ecosystem, was home to dozens of types of birds, and home to deer, rabbit, coyote, beavers, and bobcats. She asked if a wildlife management expert been consulted regarding this property. She stated she was also concerned about the air quality during construction. She noted she and her husband had breathing issues, she was a cancer survivor, and there would be volatile toxic compounds in the air which could cause health issues. She asked why there was no greenspace buffer planned for this property. She indicated the development would begin 35 feet from her backporch. She asked if she would be required to stay indoors during construction, spray water to reduce dust, and how construction noises be managed.

Citizen Kent Schaaf, address 4621 N. Redbud Avenue, Broken Arrow, asked why more homeowners did not receive notice. Ms. Jill Ferenc responded State Statute required property owners within 300 feet of the property in question be notified for zoning cases, and Comprehensive Plan amendments required a 300 -foot area of notice. Mr. Schaaf stated he felt everyone in his addition should have been notified as all would be affected by the development of the 75 acres. He stated he lived in Greenbrier which had one street with 90 homes, and he was concerned about traffic increases. He stated he was promised there would never be any cheap apartments or cheap homes developed next door to his home (his property abutted the 75 acres in question). He stated it was impossible to build a home of his quality on a 7,200 square foot lot. He indicated if cheaper homes were built next to his property the roads should not be connected. He noted the new development would still have two entrances if his neighborhood were not connected. He stated this new development would increase traffic, decrease home values, and increase crime in the area.

Vice Chair Ricky Jones asked who guaranteed there would be no cheap houses built on the lot next to his property. Mr. Schaaf responded the builder of his home made this guarantee.

Citizen Jim Basteri, address 2017 W. Xenia, stated he was concerned about increased traffic and the quality of the homes being built. He asked what types of homes were planned to be built. Chairperson Whelpley noted this was not the right meeting to discuss what type of home would be built. Ms. Ferenc noted this meeting was to discuss the Comprehensive Plan change. Mr. Basteri discussed other surrounding developments. He indicated he had been hoping to upgrade when he moved into this new neighborhood and he was upset by this proposed development. He stated the new development would cause additional traffic difficulties.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones asked if $145^{\text {th }}$ Avenue was a prime arterial street. Ms. Ferenc responded in the affirmative. Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones explained $145^{\text {th }}$ Avenue was planned to be improved in the future as a 120 -foot primary arterial road.

Citizen Kristen Robinson, address 4616 N. Sycamore Avenue, Broken Arrow, stated she ran an in-home childcare facility, licensed by DHS and the Air Force. She stated she was concerned about the manholes in her backyard; she asked if the developer would need to go through her backyard to access the manholes to continue the sewer lines as she did not want the children she cared for exposed to this type of situation. She noted the children's playtime would be interrupted. She stated she hoped her yard could be left alone. She asked if it would be possible to completely section off the construction area to ensure the children had no access and the construction site was not visible. She stated she agreed with the other speakers; she would miss her dead-end street and the wildlife on the neighboring property.

Citizen Kurt Arras, address 4612 N. Sycamore Avenue, Broken Arrow, asked where the utility lines were located. He indicated he felt the statement that there were utilities present for access was a falsehood. He asked if the Planning Commission would approve an electronic gate to keep nonresidents out of his neighborhood. He asked about the water pressure. He stated he barely had water pressure and he worried the water pressure would worsen with the new development. He asked if construction vehicles would be driving through his neighborhood to access the construction site. He asked where construction vehicles would park. He asked who would fix the road after it was damaged by construction vehicle traffic.

Citizen John Corn, address 1200 W. Ulysses Street, Broken Arrow, stated the draft PUD amendment redefined the size of the executive lot; he strenuously objected to this. He stated the executive lot standards needed to be maintained. He stated he was concerned about the smaller lot sizes and type of housing planned to be developed. He stated he was concerned about housing standards and fence standards. He stated he was not opposed to the Comprehensive Plan change but was worried about the development. He stated he was concerned about the construction traffic. He noted construction traffic currently traveled down $145^{\text {th }}$ and large trucks should be utilizing $160^{\text {th }}$. He noted there were over 1,000 apartments near this location and another 750 apartments planned. He discussed his concerns about traffic increases.

Citizen Patty Hillman, address 1912 W. Xenia Street, Broken Arrow, stated she agreed with the traffic and ecosystem concerns. She asked if the lot sizes could be increased. Ms. Ferenc responded lot sizes would be addressed at a later date. Ms. Hillman asked what type of commercial businesses would be developed. Ms. Ferenc responded this would be addressed at a later date as well. Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones indicated if commercial zoning were applied for, new notice would be sent out. Ms. Hillman asked how a citizen could know whether to agree or disagree with a Comprehensive Plan change at this stage. Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones explained the Comprehensive Plan had different zoning types which were permitted in each Level of the Comprehensive Plan; changing the Comprehensive Plan changed which types of zoning could be permitted in the area. He noted the Comprehensive Plan was a master plan adopted by the public which planned out how the City should grow.

Ms. Hillman asked if she was correct in her understanding that this was not the correct meeting to air concerns about traffic, lot sizes, etc. Ms. Ferenc responded in the affirmative. Chairperson Whelpley stated there would be another time to address those types of concerns.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones thanked Ms. Hillman for trying to learn about the Comprehensive Plan.

Citizen Carla Rausch, address 1512 W. Zillah Street, Broken Arrow, stated she lived on a bluff and she was concerned about how the development would be separated from her property. She stated she was concerned about the new development's HOA requirements. She stated she was concerned about the wildlife. She stated she was concerned about possible changes in the plan she was unaware of.

Citizen Jim Basteri, address 2017 W Xenia, Broken Arrow asked if Comprehensive Plan Levels were the same as zoning. Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones responded in the negative.

Ms. Jill Ferenc reviewed the tables which went with the Comprehensive Plan. She explained Level 2 of the Comprehensive Plan allowed single family home developments with R-2, RS2, RS-3 and RS-4, and RD was possible; Level 4 allowed Neighborhood Mixed use (NM), Community Mixed use (CM), Office Neighborhood (ON), Commercial Neighborhood (CN) and Commercial General (CG); Level 3 permitted potential Light Commercial (LC) or residential options with possible R-2, RS-2, RS-3, and CM and permitted were RS-4, RD, RM, and RMH, NM. She displayed the map of the Comprehensive Plan change request which illustrated where each of these Levels would now be located.

Mr. Basteri asked if Broken Arrow coordinated with Tulsa when planning developments. Ms. Ferenc stated notification was given about development within certain areas in between Tulsa and Broken Arrow. Mr. Basteri asked about who owned and cared for $145^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. Ms. Ferenc explained $145^{\text {th }}$ was the boundary of Broken Arrow and was maintained by Tulsa County. She noted Tulsa County would be widening $145^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.

Mr. Basteri asked if developers were required to pay for bringing in the necessary utilities. He stated Tulsa was planning to develop apartments across on the other side of $145^{\text {th }}$ which he believed would be problematic. He stated he did not want this area to become too commercial and draw in crime.

Chairperson Whelpley read through the online submittals: 1) David Jankowski (opposed), address 4508 N. Walnut Avenue, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding a decrease in property values and the wildlife habitat. 2) Amy Jankowski (opposed), address 4508 N. Walnut Avenue, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding the value of her property; she wished for a greenspace buffer to be between her home and the development. 3) Bruce Hillman (opposed), address 1912 W. Xenia Street, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding entrances into the new development going through his neighborhood and extra traffic; he recommended a bicycle path/trail as a connector between the two neighborhoods. 4) Steve Jost (undecided), address 4408 N. Walnut Avenue, Broken Arrow, asked about the minimum square foot requirement for Honey Springs development. 5) Patty Hillman (opposed), address 1912 W. Xenia Street, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding traffic on $145^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, water pressure, private retention ponds, and how the new development would be delineated from her own. 6) Kenny Perkins (opposed), address 1516 W. Zillah Street, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding traffic on $145^{\text {th }}$, and additional traffic through existing neighborhoods. 7) Jim Payne (undecided), address 3609 N . Sycamore, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding increased traffic flow, and transition around the Greenbrier flood retention pond. 8) Scott Pfeil (opposed), address 2009 W. Woodbury, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding reduced construction standards, community connector streets, higher density development, and decreased property values. 9) Laura Rollins (undecided), address 1716 W Zillah Street, Broken Arrow, expressed concerns regarding estimated property values for the new development, and traffic increases.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones stated the Planning Commission heard many good comments today. He stated this was the Comprehensive Plan change and he understood why the applicant was wishing to change the Comprehensive Plan to match the wetlands, blue threads, and other topography issues. He explained the next step would be the rezoning and the PUD. He noted there was a draft PUD. He suggested the interested parties and the applicant meet prior to the rezoning/PUD Planning Commission meeting to discuss these issues. He stated he was in support of the Comprehensive Plan change because he understood the logic behind the application. He asked Mr. Cross (the applicant) if he would be willing to meet with the interested residents to discuss the residents' concerns.

Mr. Cross responded in the affirmative. He noted he appreciated the clarification regarding what was being discussed and voted upon today. He noted currently the property owner had the right to build homes on this property; the Comprehensive Plan was simply reconfiguring the land to reorient the more commercial development along $41^{\text {st }}$ Street and reduce the commercial footprint due to the greenbelt requirements. He stated he would be happy to meet and discuss the development with the residents and provide information regarding the PUD and zoning change.

Commissioner Dorrell agreed with Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones. He liked the new Comprehensive Plan layout more than the current layout. He stated after listening to the comments made, he believed the residents would benefit from this Comprehensive Plan change; it would improve the potential development of the area. He noted the residents had legitimate concerns and he appreciated the questions and comments. He agreed a meeting between the applicant/developer and the residents would be highly beneficial to all parties.
educational for the Planning Commission as a whole. He stated he felt it was imperative for the developer/applicant to meet with the local residents and discuss.

Commissioner Klempa explained this Comprehensive Plan change would move the commercial and multifamily portion of the development further away from the existing residents' homes.

Commissioner Mark Jones agreed with his fellow Commissioners. He agreed with residents' concerns; traffic was a legitimate concern but at the same time growth was a good thing and he did not wish to stifle the growth of Broken Arrow. He stated he hoped the traffic situation would be improved sooner rather than later, but currently the Planning Commission was only considering the Comprehensive Plan and what was the best use of the property, and he felt this Comprehensive Plan change would be the best use of the property.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mark Jones, seconded by Jaylee Klempa.
Move to approve Item 6 H per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 5- Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley
Chairperson Whelpley indicated this Item would go before City Council on October 20, 2020 at 6:30 p.m. He recommended the Citizens go before City Council and voice their concerns as well. He noted a Request to Speak form was required to be completed prior to the meeting. Commissioner Mark Jones agreed

Mr. Cross indicated his phone number was 918-591-5252 if any resident wished to contact him to discuss the development.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones thanked Mr. Cross.
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)

Ms. Jill Ferenc updated and clarified that the City PUD Item (Item 6.G.) will go before the City Council on the October 6, 2020 Meeting.

Ms. Jill Ferenc recognized Commissioner Mark Jones for his service to the Planning Commission. She indicated tonight was his final Planning Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Mark Jones stated it had been very rewarding serving on the Planning Commission. He noted he had served for five years, but his new business was time consuming; therefore, he felt it was time for him to step down.

Vice Chairperson Ricky Jones asked for a formal recognition of Commissioner Mark Jones with a commemorative plaque be arranged in the future. It was agreed this would be done.

The Planning Commission thanked Commissioner Mark Jones for his service.

## 10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:06 p.m.
MOTION: A motion was made by Jaylee Klempa, seconded by Mark Jones. Move to adjourn
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 5 - Jaylee Klempa, Fred Dorrell, Mark Jones, Ricky Jones, Lee Whelpley

## Mayor

City Clerk

## City of Broken Arrow

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1256, Version: 1

## Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 10-08-2020

To: Chairman and Commission Members
From: Development Services Department
Title:
Approval of BAL-2099CB (Lot Combination), Primrose School of Broken Arrow, 2 Lots, 2.21 acres, one-quarter mile east of Aspen Avenue (145 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ East Avenue), south of Albany Street ( $61{ }^{\text {st }}$ Street)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Location:

Size of Tract
Number of Lots:
Present Zoning:
Comp Plan:

Wallace Engineering, Jim Beach
Primrose School Franchising Company, LLC
Primrose School Franchising Company, LLC
Wallace Engineering
One-quarter mile east of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue), south of Albany Street (61st Street)
2.21 total acres

2 Lots
CG/PUD-44G
Level 6 (Regional Employment/Commercial)

Lot combination request BAL-2099CB involves two lots totaling 2.21 acres located one-quarter mile east of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue), south of Albany Street (61st Street). This property is platted as Lots 7 and 10, Block 1, The Park at Greenway and is zoned CG (Commercial General), and PUD-44G (Planned Unit Development).

BAL-2099CB is a request to combine Lots 7 and 10, Block 1 into one parcel. This lot consolidation is to facilitate the construction of a new childcare facility on the property.

According to FEMA maps, none of the property is in a 100-year floodplain.
Oklahoma Natural Gas (ONG), Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO), Cox Communications, and Windstream have indicated that they do not have any problems with the proposed lot consolidation.

| Attachments: | Case map |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aerial |  |
|  | Exhibit |
|  | The Park at Greenway Plat |

File \#: 20-1256, Version: 1

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends BAL-2099CB be approved subject to the warranty deed for the new parcel being brought to the Planning and Development Division to be stamped prior to being recorded in Tulsa County.

| Reviewed by: | Larry R. Curtis |
| :--- | :--- |
| Approved by: | Jill Ferenc |
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# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1255, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>10-08-2020

To: Chairman and Commission Members
From:
Development Services Department
Title:

> Approval of PT20-110, Preliminary Plat, Bricktown East, 23.5 acres, 92 Lots, CG and IL to PUD-318/RS-4, one-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street ( $71^{\text {st }}$ Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue $\left(145^{\text {h }}\right.$ E. Avenue)

## Background:

Applicant: Jim Beach, Wallace Engineering
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Villages at Bricktown, LLC
Villages at Bricktown, LLC
Wallace Engineering Structural Consultants, Inc.
Location: One-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue)
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Size of Tract } & 23.5 \text { acres } \\ \text { Number of Lots: } & 92 \\ \text { Present Zoning: } & \text { CG and IL to PUD-318/RS-4 } \\ \text { Comp Plan: } & \text { Level } 3 \text { and Level } 6 \text { to Level } 3 \text { (BACP-171 pending }\end{array}$

PT20-110, the preliminary plat for Bricktown East contains four existing lots of 23.5 acres. This CG (Commercial General) and IL (Industrial Light) zoned property is located one-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street ( $71^{\text {st }}$ Street), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue ( $145^{\text {th }} \mathrm{E}$. Avenue) and has pending zoning cases to accompany the plat.

On September 24, 2020, the Planning Commission recommended that the Comprehensive Plan land use designation for this property be amended from Level 3 and Level 6 to Level 3 (BACP-171). The Planning Commission also recommended approval of PUD-318 (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-2064 (Rezoning) to change the zoning on this property from CG (Commercial General) and IL (Industrial Light) to RS-4 (Singlefamily Residential) for a 92 -lot subdivision. These items are scheduled for the October 20, 2020 City Council meeting.

With PT0-110, applicant proposes to subdivide this site into 92 single-family lots and two reserve areas. Reserve A includes a stormwater detention pond and utility easement and is also designated as a common area. Reserve B includes the gated entry, private streets, sidewalks, decorative fencing, landscaping and utilities. The primary access will be off of Elder Place, and an exit only access point is proposed on the east side of the site at

File \#: 20-1255, Version: 1
Lansing Avenue leading to Aspen Avenue. Two stub streets are proposed to the north. Utilities will be provided by the City of Broken Arrow. None of the property is shown to be located in the 100 -year floodplain. A drainage channel and storm sewer are proposed to convey stormwater within a drainage easement along the south boundary of the site.

## Attachments: Checklist Preliminary Plat and Conceptual Utility Plan

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends PT20-110, preliminary plat for Bricktown East be approved, subject to the attached checklist, and City Council approval of BACP-171, PUD-318 and BAZ-2064.

## Reviewed by: Jill Ferenc

Approved by: Larry R. Curtis
JMW

## BROKEN ARROW PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL SUBDIVISION PLAT REVIEW CHECKLIST

## PLAT INFORMATION

NAME OF PRELIMINARY PLAT: Bricktown East
CASE NUMBER: PT20-110
RELATED CASE NUMBERS: BACP-171, BAZ-2064, PUD-318
COUNTY: Tulsa
SECTION/TOWNSHIP/RANGE: Section 04/T-18-N/R-14-E
GENERAL LOCATION: One-quarter mile north of Kenosha Street ( $71^{\text {st }}$ St.), one-quarter mile west of Aspen Avenue ( $145^{\text {th }}$ E. Ave. )
CURRENT ZONING: CG and IL to RS-4/PUD-318
SANITARY SEWER BASIN: Lynn Lane Haikey Creek (S-20434)
STORM WATER DRAINAGE BASIN: Haikey Creek
ENGINEER:
ENGINEER ADDRESS: 123 North Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd
Tulsa, OK 74103
ENGINEER PHONE NUMBER: 918-806-7328
DEVELOPER:
Villages at Bricktown, LLC
DEVELOPER ADDRESS: 1908 North Willow, Suite \#A
Broken Arrow, OK 74012
DEVELOPER PHONE NUMBER: 918-294-0835

## PRELIMINARY PLAT

APPLICATION MADE: August 17, 2020
TOTAL ACREAGE: 23.5 acres
NUMBER OF LOTS: 92
TAC MEETING DATE: September 22, 2020 and October 6, 2020
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE: October 8, 2020
COMMENTS:
1.
____Include the square footage of each lot on the face of the plat.
2. ___ Please provide document number for closing the MCI Worldcom easement.
3. ___ Section IV. Planned Unit Development Restrictions - modify as necessary as PUD-318 is revised. Change 95 lots to 92 lots.
4. $\quad$ Sh Show the address (as assigned by the City of Broken Arrow) for each lot. Addresses shall be placed on the lot.
5. ___ A utility easement is needed to cover the off-site sanitary sewer to the southwest.
6. Provide a written statement (email is acceptable) that all pie shaped lots meet the minimum lot frontage requirement at the building setback line.
7.

Identify the FEMA firm panel number, the Effective Date, and the Flood Zone Designations
8. ___ Coordinate with US Postal Service regarding type of mail delivery. Should neighborhood distribution cluster box units be required, areas will need to be designated for these units.
9. ____In Incorporate any easements or reserves that arise from engineering plan review comments of the conceptual utilities that relate to the plat. See the last page under the Conceptual Utility Engineering Review section for the Engineering Review Recommendations.

CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT
NAME OF CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT:
APPLICATION MADE:
TOTAL ACREAGE:
NUMBER OF LOTS:
TAC MEETING DATE:
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE:
CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE:
COMMENTS:
10. $\qquad$
11.
12. $\qquad$
13. ____The conditional final plat and the "no exceptions taken" engineering drawing must agree with respect to Limits of Access and No Access, easement both internal and external, reserve area, traffic control medians, street layouts, rights-of-way, etc. Please provide a written statement (e-mail statement is acceptable) that the conditional final plat agrees with the "no exceptions taken" engineering plans.
14. ____Finished floor elevations (FFE) shall be shown for each lot on the Final Plat.
15. Show monuments on plat.
16. ___ Provide a closing statement that shows that the platted boundary meets the Survey Standards for Oklahoma, for accuracy and correctness.
17. $\qquad$

## CONDITIONS TO BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL RELEASE OF PLAT

LETTER OF APPROVAL FROM UTILITY COMPANY SUBMITTED?<br>NATURAL GAS COMPANY APPROVAL<br>ELECTRIC COMPANY APPROVAL<br>_TELEPHONE COMPANY APPROVAL<br>_CABLE COMPANY APPROVAL

## CERTIFICATE OF RECORDS SEARCH FROM OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION SUBMITTED?

OK CORPORATION COMMISSION CERTIFICATE OF RECORDS SEARCH
OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION, 405-521-2271

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES/ENGINEERING APPROVAL

STORMWATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
PAVING PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
WATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
SANITARY SEWER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
SEWAGE DISPOSAL PLANS, SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON:
WATER PLANS SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON:
IS A SIDEWALK PERFORMANCE BOND DUE? $\qquad$ HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED? ARE PERFORMANCE BONDS OR ESCROW AGREEMENT DUE FOR WATER, STORM SEWERS, SANITARY SEWER AND PAVING? (CIRCLE APPLICABLE) $\qquad$ HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED? $\qquad$ PROJECT ENGINEER/DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REVIEW COMPLETE ON:

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

 ADDRESSES REVIEWED AND APPROVED? DETENTION DETERMINATION \# ASSIGNED AND VERIFIED? PLANNING DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMPLETE ON: FINAL PLAT RECEIVED IN PLANNING DEPARTMENT AFTER UTILITY COMPANY SIGN OFF ON: FINAL PLAT SENT TO PROJECT ENGINEER FOR FINAL REVIEW ON:
## FEES

FINAL PLAT PROCESSING FEE (\$150 + (\$5 X___LOTS)
WATER LINE (S) UNDER PAYBACK CONTRACT
EXCESS SEWER CAPACITY FEE (\$700 X $\qquad$ ACRES
(LESS ANY AREA IN 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN ONLY OR AREA IN GOLF COURSE) ACCELERATION/DECELERATION LANES ESCROW WATER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS SEWER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS STREET IMPROVEMENT (WIDENING) ASSESSMENTS DRAINAGE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS PRO RATA COST _REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR WATER LINE CON. REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR SEWER LINE CON. STREET SIGNS, LIGHTS, ETC. (\$150 X $\qquad$ SIGNS) SIDEWALK ESCROW STORM WATER FEE-IN-LIEU OF DETENTION (. 40 X $\qquad$ (SF INCREASED IMPERVIOUS \$
\$
\$
$\$$ $\qquad$
\$
$\$$
\$
\$
\$
\$
\$
\$
\$ \$

FINAL PROCESSING OF PLAT
FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED FOR MAYOR AND CITY CLERK SIGNATURE ON: $\qquad$ FEES PAID ON: $\qquad$ IN THE AMOUNT OF: $\qquad$ FINAL PLAT PICKED UP FOR RECORDATION ON: 2 COPIES OF FILED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT PDF OF RECORDED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

The Conceptual Utility Plans are not a complete set of improvement plans, the applicant is not expected to show how all the improvements are in compliance with all city regulations. As such, there may be additional review items when the final engineering plans are submitted. These conceptual utility plans' review items are intended for guidance toward preparation of the final engineering plans. The following items are not a requirement for approval of the Preliminary Plat or the Conditional Final Plat.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UTILITY REVISIONS PRIOR TO ENGINEERING PLAN SUBMITTALS

Thank you for addressing the conceptual utility comments.
The revised conceptual utility plans were received September 24, 2020.
A couple items for you to look at as you move to final engineering plans:

1. The 15 ' utility easements on both sides of the $30^{\prime}$ reserve areas should be treated as the edge of the right of way as if these were public streets. And this "right of way" should not encroach into the other easements such as next to Lot 1 Block 5.
2. The location of the waterline within the "right of way" should be at least 4' off the street curb. Generally 8 ' off the public street's right of way line.
3. The location of the 4 ' sidewalk should be 7 ' off the street curb, generally 1 ' off the public street's right of way line.
4. Include the newly added utility cross section on the final plans, primarily to show the fire hydrant and it being $9^{\prime}$ off the waterline. The FH is generally in an easement outside the public street's right of way, so you will need to add an easement outside the 15 ' utility easement for FH maintenance.
5. For the waterlines, use fittings to make the waterline bend around the cul de sacs and bends in the street. Try to limit the deflections in the waterline pipe's joints.


## Bricktown East

TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SEL4) OF SECTION FOUR (4), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEE OKLAHOMA

| CURVE TABLE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cuvve \#t |  | $\begin{aligned} & \substack{\begin{subarray}{c}{\text { Rapus } \\ (\mathrm{fT})} }} \end{aligned}$ | delta |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { CHORD } \\ \text { DISTANC } \\ \text { (FT) } \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | 3321 | 25.00 | ${ }^{20}$ |  | ${ }_{35,31}$ |
| 2 | ${ }_{39,3}$ | 25.00 | $9^{90}$ | $546^{2334009}$ | ${ }^{3540}$ |
| 3 | ${ }^{39} 31$ | 25.00 | ${ }_{90}$ | S46 $6^{292} 2^{66^{\prime \prime}}$ | ${ }_{3539}$ |
| 4 | 3923 | 25.00 | ${ }_{90}$ | N43937344E | ${ }_{3532}$ |
| 5 | 39.92 | 23.60 | ${ }^{97^{\circ}}$ | N48937 $344^{\text {E }}$ | ${ }_{35,32}$ |
| 6 | ${ }^{39} 31$ | 25.00 | $9^{\circ}$ | S4692226 $6^{\circ}$ | ${ }_{35,39}$ |
| 7 | 49.57 | 215.00 | ${ }^{13}$ | N7 5544 TW | 49.46 |
| 8 | 30.01 | 21500 | $8^{\circ}$ | N18 $8^{31} 55^{12 \mathrm{~W}}$ | 29.98 |
| 9 | 44.68 | 25.00 | 102 | N28840406EE | 38.97 |
| 10 | 27.99 | 18500 | $9^{\circ}$ |  | ${ }^{27.96}$ |
| 11 | Tused |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | ${ }^{81.10}$ | 20000 | $23^{\circ}$ | S12.56 $22^{2} \mathrm{E}$ | ${ }_{80.54}$ |
| ${ }^{13}$ | ${ }_{66,76}$ | 18500 | $21^{\circ}$ | S11 ${ }^{29} 99^{96 \mathrm{E}}$ | ${ }^{6640}$ |
| 14 | 4340 | 25.00 | ${ }_{90}{ }^{\circ}$ | s71043 $5^{57 \mathrm{E}}$ | ${ }^{38,15}$ |
| 15 | 80.60 | 200.00 | ${ }^{23^{\circ}}$ | N76 $59922{ }^{2} \mathrm{E}$ | ${ }^{80.06}$ |
| 16 | 24.12 | 200.00 | $7^{\circ}$ | N61/ $59.20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ | 24.11 |
| 17 | 29.44 | 215.00 | $8^{\circ}$ | N84*36444E | 2942 |
| ${ }^{18}$ | 46.97 | 215.00 | ${ }^{13}$ | N74 25 [49E | 46.88 |
| 19 | 36.17 | 21500 | $10^{\circ}$ | N63 $3^{210909 E}$ | 36.12 |
| ${ }^{20}$ | ${ }^{3927}$ | 25.00 | ${ }^{90}$ | N1393200 ${ }^{\text {OTE }}$ | ${ }_{35.36}$ |
| 21 | ${ }^{25.56}$ | 25.01 | $59^{\circ}$ | N61950 $3^{2}$ | 24.72 |
| ${ }^{22}$ | ${ }_{67} 65$ | 55.00 | $70^{\circ}$ | N560913433W | ${ }_{6347}$ |
| ${ }^{23}$ | 38.15 | 5500 | $40^{\circ}$ | N1070 04 W | 3739 |
| ${ }^{24}$ | ${ }^{38,18}$ | 55.00 | $40^{\circ}$ |  | 3742 |
| ${ }^{25}$ | 41.54 | 5500 | $43^{\circ}$ | N80 $1011^{11^{12} \mathrm{E}}$ | 40.56 |
| ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }_{3480}$ | 55.00 | $36^{\circ}$ | S60 040 $05^{51 \mathrm{E}}$ | ${ }^{3422}$ |
| ${ }^{27}$ | ${ }^{6276}$ | 55.00 | $6^{6}$ | $59^{1510^{10} \mathrm{E}}$ | 59.41 |
| ${ }^{28}$ | 4.89 | 55.00 | $5^{\circ}$ | S25 59906\% | 4.89 |
| ${ }^{29}$ | 26.18 | 25.00 | $60^{\circ}$ | S1280 $0^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | 25.00 |
| ${ }^{30}$ | 3927 | 25.00 | ${ }^{90}$ | $576^{297595 E}$ | 35.36 |
| ${ }^{31}$ | 3327 | 25.00 | $90^{\circ}$ | N13 3230 OTE | ${ }^{35} 36$ |
| ${ }^{32}$ | ${ }_{3927}$ | 25.00 | ${ }_{90}{ }^{\circ}$ | S76 27 7 $59{ }^{\text {g E }}$ | ${ }_{35,36}$ |


| CURVE TAbLE |  |  |  |  |  | LINE TABLE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curve \# | $\underbrace{\text { at }}_{\substack{\text { Lengoth } \\ \text { (TT) }}}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { Radus } \\(T T)}}{ }$ | delta | $\underset{\substack{\text { cheror } \\ \text { EEARNG }}}{\text { der }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CHORD } \\ \text { DISTANCE } \end{gathered}$ | LINE \# | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Levort } \\ \text { (fT) } \end{gathered}\right.$ | bearng |
| ${ }^{33}$ | 6979 | 185.00 | ${ }^{20}$ | $\mathrm{Na2}^{2} 16$ | 6937 | L | 28.12 | ${ }^{53892909595}$ |
| ${ }^{34}$ | ${ }_{3} 30$ | 185.00 | 10 | $\mathrm{Ns} 3^{23} 3^{2} 27 \mathrm{~W}$ | 3.30 | L2 | 58.72 | $570^{\circ 9390404 E}$ |
| ${ }^{35}$ | 79.01 | 20.00 | ${ }^{23^{\circ}}$ | S42 $2^{477} 0^{3}{ }^{3} \mathrm{E}$ | ${ }^{7.50}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ | 36.96 | $5700^{39} 99^{\circ 4 \mathrm{E}}$ |
| ${ }^{36}$ | ${ }_{4329}$ | 21500 | $12^{2}$ | S48820 007E | ${ }^{4322}$ | ${ }^{1} 4$ | ${ }^{3023}$ | N35925388E |
| ${ }^{37}$ | 41.65 | 215.00 | $1^{10^{\circ}}$ | S37 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{OCO} 57 \mathrm{E}$ | 41.58 | $\stackrel{15}{ }$ | 10.50 | N8883205 $5^{\text {a }}$ |
| ${ }^{38}$ | ${ }^{25.58}$ | 2500 | $5^{50}$ | N839 $0^{1054} 5$ | ${ }^{24,30}$ | ${ }^{\text {L6 }}$ | 4521 |  |
| ${ }^{39}$ | 10.61 | 25.00 | ${ }^{24}$ |  | 10.53 | ${ }^{\text {L7 }}$ | ${ }_{9} 96$ |  |
| 40 | 50.78 | ${ }^{55} 5.0$ | $53^{\circ}$ | 56995238\% | 49.00 | ${ }^{\llcorner 8}$ | 20.00 | N8883205\% |
| ${ }^{41}$ | ${ }^{79.08}$ | 55.00 | ${ }^{82}$ | N42928486\% | ${ }^{72,44}$ | $\stackrel{1}{ }$ | 14.00 | N58932007E |
| ${ }_{4}$ | 7.996 | 55.00 | ${ }^{78}$ |  | 69.2 | 40 | 13.75 | N589380505\% |
| 43 | ${ }^{33.76}$ | 55.00 | $3^{35}$ | S85936 $6^{455}$ | ${ }^{3223}$ | ${ }^{11}$ | 4.29 | N888320505 |
| 44 | ${ }_{4184}$ | 55.00 | $44^{\circ}$ | S46891416 $6^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ | 40.84 | ${ }^{112}$ | 10.11 |  |
| 45 | 12.94 | 25.00 | ${ }^{30}$ | S3991627EE | 12.80 | ${ }^{L 13}$ | 17.48 | N888424545E |
|  | 13.42 | 115.00 | $7{ }^{\circ}$ |  | 13.41 | ${ }^{14}$ | 2.18 | S54.060 0 OTE |
| ${ }^{47}$ | ${ }_{827}$ | 85.00 | $6^{\circ}$ | N6191916 $16{ }^{\text {E }}$ | ${ }_{8} 87$ | 415 | 13.88 | ${ }^{554} 5^{\circ 66076}$ |
| ${ }^{48}$ | 121.79 | 115.00 | $60^{\circ}$ | S84262727E | 116.17 | ${ }^{16}$ | 10.53 |  |
| 49 | ${ }^{117.57}$ | 100.00 | $6^{67}$ |  | 110.92 | 47 | 17.50 | N335 $535355^{\text {E/E }}$ |
| 5 | 99.67 | 85.00 | ${ }^{62}$ | S84 59.949 E | 87.29 | ${ }^{118}$ | 17.50 |  |
| 5 | 100.50 | 15.00 | ${ }^{54}$ | N270427\% | 104.52 | ${ }^{1} 9$ | 10.82 | N35595353E] |
| 52 | 157.08 | 100.00 | $0^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{59} 00^{\circ} 60^{\circ 6}$ | 144.42 | $\stackrel{120}{ }$ | 3244 | S82 $44^{24} 40^{-E}$ |
| ${ }^{53}$ | 133.52 | 85.00 | ${ }^{90}$ | $59^{90} 00^{\circ} 066^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ | ${ }^{120.21}$ | ${ }^{21}$ | 45.95 |  |
|  | ${ }_{64} 68$ | 115.00 | $3^{32}$ | N6609327E | 63.79 | 122 | ${ }_{5}^{5.51}$ |  |
| ${ }_{55}$ | 7.51 | 115.00 | $4^{4}$ |  | ${ }^{7.50}$ | ${ }^{2} 2$ | 22.70 | $560^{3} 3527 \mathrm{FE}$ |
| ${ }_{56}$ | 620 | 115.00 | $3^{\circ}$ | S3427121 | 6.20 | ${ }^{124}$ | 26.07 |  |
| 57 | 7.57 | 115.00 | $3^{35}$ |  | 69.47 | ${ }^{25}$ | 49.17 |  |
| 5 | 10291 | 115.00 | $510^{\circ}$ | $57^{27} 5929^{66}$ | 99.51 | ${ }^{126}$ | ${ }_{0}^{0.38}$ | $50^{\circ 000000 \%}$ |
| 59 | 1.20 | 85.00 | 1. | S35299393W | 1.20 | ${ }^{127}$ | 13.87 | N883 34 32 E E |
| ${ }^{60}$ | 131.61 | 85.00 | ${ }^{89}$ | ${ }^{\text {s9 }} 1166^{\circ} \mathrm{OTE}$ | ${ }^{118,85}$ | ${ }^{128}$ | 21.70 |  |
| ${ }^{61}$ | 12.15 | 100.00 | $7^{\circ}$ | S57\% 6832 E | 12.15 | 129 | 10.13 |  |
| ${ }^{62}$ | ${ }^{11.33}$ | 100.00 | $6^{\circ}$ | S57200474E | ${ }^{11.32}$ | ${ }^{130}$ | 36.56 | S24. $33^{20 \mathrm{O}} \mathrm{E}$ |
| ${ }^{63}$ | 13.71 | 27.00 | $29^{\circ}$ | ${8688^{\circ} 10}^{\circ}$ | 13.56 | ${ }^{131}$ | 4.07 | ${ }^{\text {N53 }}{ }^{3}$ 37 |

## Brickitown plis






## 














 Sctovni. Homeowners assocation

## formation of homeowness ascocation





## MEMBESSHP





## c. Covenant for assessments




D. specal assessment



enforcementr right of fue assocation


Reserve afeas


inveannicationo o owner and


Develiopment restractoons






 NHM use of fano




| USES PERMITTED AS A MATTER OF RIGHT IN THE RS-4 ZONING DISTRICT IN THE CITY OF BROKEN ARROW ZONING CODE, INCLUDING ENTRANCES, RECREATIONAL FACILITIES SUCH AS TRAILS, PICNIC TABLES, AND BENCHES, AND USES CUSTOMARILY ACCESSORY TO PERMITTED USES. <br> 95 LOTS <br> 50 FT <br> 5,600 SF <br> MINIMUM TWO ENCLOSED OFF-STREET <br> PARKING SPACES PER DWELLING UNIT. <br> ,800 SF <br> 20 FT <br> 15 FT <br> 15 FT <br> 0\% FOR INTERIOR LOTS; 60\% FOR CORNE |
| :---: |
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# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1259, Version: 1

## Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 10-08-2020

To: Chairman and Commission Members
From: Development Services Department
Title:

> Approval of PT20-114, Preliminary Plat, Presley Reserve, 40.20 acres, A-1 (Agricultural) to RS-3 (Single-Family Residential), south of Tucson Street $\left(121^{\text {st }}\right.$ Street), one-half mile west of Aspen Avenue $\left(145^{\text {th }}\right.$ East Avenue)

## Background:

Applicant: Tanner Consulting, Erik Enyart
Owner:
Developer: The Robert Lee \& Oma Alice Jones Trust
Engineer: Tanner Consulting
Location: South of Tucson Street (121st Street), one-half mile west of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue)
Size of Tract $\quad 40.20$ acres
Number of Lots: 1 lot (130 proposed)
Present Zoning: A-1 (Agricultural) to RS-3 (Single-Family Residential) via BAZ-2063
Comp Plan: Level 2 (Urban Residential)

PT20-114, the preliminary plat for Presley Reserve proposes 130 lots on 40.20 acres. This property is located south of Tucson Street ( $121^{\text {st }}$ Street), one-half mile west of Aspen Avenue ( $145^{\text {th }}$ East Avenue). BAZ-2063, a request to change the zoning on the property from A-1 to RS-3 was recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on September 24, 2020 and will be considered by the City Council on October 20, 2020.

Access to this site is through one main access point onto Tucson Street. Connections to existing stub streets in abutting developments provide additional access and circulation which meet the Subdivision Regulations and Fire Code. One of the existing stub streets is located on the west side of the development in Riverstone Estates, another is proposed to a future development, Stone Horse V of Broken Arrow, and one is located on the east side of the development in Spring Creek III.

None of this property is shown to be located in the 100-year floodplain. Water and sanitary sewer service to this site are available from the City of Broken Arrow.

Attachments: | Checklist |
| :--- | :--- |
| Preliminary Plat, Covenants and Conceptual Utilities Plan |

File \#: 20-1259, Version: 1

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends PT20-114, preliminary plat for Presley Reserve, be approved subject to the attached checklist and City Council approval of BAZ-2063.

## Reviewed by: Jill Ferenc

Approved by: Larry R. Curtis
ALY

## BROKEN ARROW PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL SUBDIVISION PLAT REVIEW CHECKLIST

## PLAT INFORMATION

NAME OF PRELIMINARY PLAT: Presley Reserve
CASE NUMBER: PT20-114
RELATED CASE NUMBERS: BAZ-2063
COUNTY: Tulsa
SECTION/TOWNSHIP/RANGE: Section 04/T-17-N/R-14-E
GENERAL LOCATION: South of Tucson, $1 / 2$ mile west of Aspen
CURRENT ZONING: A-1 to RS-3 (BAZ-2063)
SANITARY SEWER BASIN: Haikey Creek (S-20434)
STORM WATER DRAINAGE BASIN: Aspen Creek

ENGINEER:
ENGINEER ADDRESS:
ENGINEER PHONE NUMBER:
DEVELOPER:
DEVELOPER ADDRESS: 12214 S. $139^{\text {th }}$ East Avenue
Broken Arrow, OK 74011

DEVELOPER PHONE NUMBER:

## PRELIMINARY PLAT

APPLICATION MADE: 09-25-2020
TOTAL ACREAGE: 40.20 acres
NUMBER OF LOTS: 130
TAC MEETING DATE: October 6, 2020
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE: October 8, 2020
COMMENTS:
1.
___ Show the detention determination number
2.
3.
4.
__Place case number (PT20-114) in lower right corner of plat.
. ___ Show the address (as assigned by the City of Broken Arrow) for each lot. Addresses shall be placed on the lot. The setback from Van Buren Ct. on Lot 26<br>, Block 7 needs to be increased to 20-feet. Per Section 4.1.B, Table 4.1-2 of the Zoning Ordinance, the offset in the front yard between the two lots shall not exceed 5-feet.
5. $\qquad$ Specify if the backyard utility easements are on each side of the rear property lines (Block 4).
6.
7. What is the 21.15 ' measurement in Reserve B referring to?
_Provide a written statement (email is acceptable) that all wedge shaped lots meet the minimum lot frontage requirement at the building setback line.
8. ___ In Incorporate any easements or reserves that arise from engineering plan review comments of the conceptual utilities that relate to the plat. See the last page under the Conceptual Utility Engineering Review section for the Engineering Review Recommendations.

## CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT

NAME OF CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT:
APPLICATION MADE:
TOTAL ACREAGE:
NUMBER OF LOTS:
TAC MEETING DATE:
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE:
CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE:
COMMENTS:
9.
10.
11.
12. $\qquad$ The conditional final plat and the "no exceptions taken" engineering drawing must agree with respect to Limits of Access and No Access, easement both internal and external, reserve area, traffic control medians, street layouts, rights- with the "no exceptions taken" engineering plans.
13. ____Finished floor elevations (FFE) shall be shown for each lot on the Final Plat.
14. $\qquad$ Show monuments on plat.
15. $\qquad$ Provide a closing statement that shows that the platted boundary meets the Survey Standards for Oklahoma, for accuracy and correctness.
16. $\qquad$

## CONDITIONS TO BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL RELEASE OF PLAT

LETTER OF APPROVAL FROM UTILITY COMPANY SUBMITTED? NATURAL GAS COMPANY APPROVAL ELECTRIC COMPANY APPROVAL TELEPHONE COMPANY APPROVAL CABLE COMPANY APPROVAL

CERTIFICATE OF RECORDS SEARCH FROM OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION SUBMITTED?<br>OK CORPORATION COMMISSION CERTIFICATE OF RECORDS SEARCH<br>OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION, 405-521-2271

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES/ENGINEERING APPROVAL

STORMWATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
PAVING PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
WATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
SANITARY SEWER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON: SEWAGE DISPOSAL PLANS, SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON: WATER PLANS SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON: IS A SIDEWALK PERFORMANCE BOND DUE? $\qquad$ HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED? $\qquad$ ARE PERFORMANCE BONDS OR ESCROW AGREEMENT DUE FOR WATER, STORM SEWERS, SANITARY SEWER AND PAVING? (CIRCLE APPLICABLE) $\qquad$ HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED? $\qquad$ _PROJECT ENGINEER/DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REVIEW COMPLETE ON:

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

 ADDRESSES REVIEWED AND APPROVED? DETENTION DETERMINATION \# ASSIGNED AND VERIFIED? PLANNING DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMPLETE ON: FINAL PLAT RECEIVED IN PLANNING DEPARTMENT AFTER UTILITY COMPANY SIGN OFF ON: _FINAL PLAT SENT TO PROJECT ENGINEER FOR FINAL REVIEW ON:
## FEES

FINAL PLAT PROCESSING FEE (\$150 + (\$5 X ___ LOTS)
WATER LINE (S) UNDER PAYBACK CONTRACT
EXCESS SEWER CAPACITY FEE (\$700 X ACRES
(LESS ANY AREA IN 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN ONLY OR AREA IN GOLF COURSE) ACCELERATION/DECELERATION LANES ESCROW
WATER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS
SEWER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS
_STREET IMPROVEMENT (WIDENING) ASSESSMENTS DRAINAGE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS PRO RATA COST REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR WATER LINE CON. REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR SEWER LINE CON. STREET SIGNS, LIGHTS, ETC. (\$150 X__ SIGNS) SIDEWALK ESCROW STORM WATER FEE-IN-LIEU OF DETENTION (. 40 X $\qquad$ (SF INCREASED IMPERVIOUS \$ $\qquad$ AREA) (less any area in Reserve Area of $1 / 2$ acre or more)
$\qquad$
FINAL PROCESSING OF PLAT
FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED FOR MAYOR AND CITY CLERK SIGNATURE ON: $\qquad$ FEES PAID ON: IN THE AMOUNT OF:
FINAL PLAT PICKED UP FOR RECORDATION ON:
2 COPIES OF FILED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PDF OF RECORDED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

The Conceptual Utility Plans are not a complete set of improvement plans, the applicant is not expected to show how all the improvements are in compliance with all city regulations. As such, there may be additional review items when the final engineering plans are submitted. These conceptual utility plans' review items are intended for guidance toward preparation of the final engineering plans. The following items are not a requirement for approval of the Preliminary Plat or the Conditional Final Plat.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UTILITY REVISIONS PRIOR TO ENGINEERING PLAN SUBMITTALS

E-1. $\quad$ The waterline through the development needs to be an 8 -inch line. 8.2.3
E-2. The waterlines into each adjacent development needs to be an 8 -inch line. Match adjacent water.
E-3. The fire hydrant spacing between Gardena and Fir Ave is greater than the 600 feet max. 8.4.8
E-4. $\quad$ The fire hydrant spacing into each cul de sac is greater than the 300 feet max. 8.4.8
E-5. On each cul de sac, install waterline valves on each branch line into the cul de sac and an in-line valve between the two branches. 8.4.9
E-6. Check the grading to verify the runoff is intercepted before it crosses more than four adjacent lots. 10.6.4


## Presley Reserve <br> 
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# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1247, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>10-08-2020

To: Chairman and Commission Members
From: Development Services Department
Title:
Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BACP-172
(Comprehensive Plan Change), Robson North, 69.47 acres, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, and Greenway/Floodplain to Level 2 and Greenway/Floodplain, generally located one-eighth mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile east of $65{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street (241 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ E. Avenue/Oneta Road)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Location: One-eighth mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile east of 65th Street (241st E. Avenue/Oneta Road)
Size of Tract $\quad 69.47$ acres
Number of Lots: 1
Present Zoning: A-1
Comp Plan: Level 2 (Urban Residential), Level 3 (Transitional), Level 4 (Commercial/Employment Nodes) and Greenway/Floodplain to Level 2 and Greenway/Floodplain

BACP-172 is a request to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, and Greenway/Floodplain to Level 2 and Greenway/Floodplain on 69.47 acres located one-eighth mile north of Kenosha Street (71st Street), one-quarter mile east of 65th Street (241st E. Avenue/Oneta Road). The property is unplatted and undeveloped.

The area associated with BACP-172 was designated as Level 2 in the previous Comprehensive Plan. When the 2019 Comprehensive Plan was prepared there were discussions between the property owner and the consultant about creating the "Forest Ridge Area Town Center". As noted in the 2019 Comprehensive Plan, "Today, residents of Forest Ridge do not have many options for nearby retail or entertainment. There a potential to develop retail and commercial along Kenosha near Forest Ridge with a "town center" feel. Types of development that might be appropriate include small-scale grocery, retail, dining, office, and residential." Along these lines, the area associated with BACP-172 was designated as Level 2, Level 3, Level 4, and Greenway/Floodplain with a Special District Overlay. While the "Forest Ridge Area Town Center" can still occur, the owner of the property associated with BACP-172 wants to develop single-family detach homes in the area that was predominantly designated as Level 3. As a result, they have submitted BACP-172 requesting that

File \#: 20-1247, Version: 1
the Level 3 area, along with a small portion of Level 4 be changed to Level 2. The existing small area of Level 2 would remain. If BACP-172 is approved, they will be applying to change the zoning from A-1 to RS-3.

## SURROUNDING LAND USES/ZONING/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The surrounding properties contain the following uses, along with the following development guide and zoning designations:

| Location | Comprehensive Plan | Zoning | Land Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Level 1 and <br> Greenway/Floodplain | Unincorporated <br> Wagoner County | 100 -year floodplain and large lot <br> single family residential |
| East | Level 1 and <br> Greenway/Floodplain | A-1 | 100 -year floodplain and large lot <br> single family residential |
| South | Level 4 | A-1 | Undeveloped |
| West | Greenway/Floodplain | A-1 | 100 -year floodplain and large lot <br> single family residential |

Attachments: Case Map
Aerial Photo
Comprehensive Plan
Comprehensive Plan excerpt

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends that BACP-172 be approved as requested, subject to the property being platted.

## Reviewed by: Jill Ferenc

## Approved by: Larry R. Curtis

## BDM

A-1



## FOREST RIDGE AREA TOWN CENTER

Forest Ridge is a large neighborhood centered on a private golf course in the very eastern part of the incorporated city limits. Today, residents of Forest Ridge do not have many options for nearby retail or entertainment. There is potential to develop retail and commercial along Kenosha near Forest Ridge with a 'town center' feel. Types of development that might be appropriate include small-scale grocery, retail, dining, office, and residential.

The 2019 Future Development Guide recommends Level 4 - Commercial/ Employment Node for the four corners surrounding the Kenosha and 65th St/Oneta intersection with a special district overlay. In order to inform the desired characteristics, a special area plan could be conducted for the Kenosha corridor near Forest Ridge to develop a vision to guide future development. This would be similar to the Elm and New Orleans small area plan. Elements to consider for a small area plan for the Forest Ridge area include:

- Enhanced streetscape features along Kenosha.
- Walkability within the town center.
- Mixture of retail, office, dining, open space, and residential uses.
- Buffer between the town center and surrounding residential uses.


## FOUR CORNER RETAIL AREAS

Originally established with the introduction of the Land Use Intensity Model set forth in the 1997 plan, the Future Development Guide features retail at each corner of major intersections, surrounded by 'transition' areas. In parts of the City where these four corner retail areas are developed, some are starting to show their age. The intersection of Elm and New Orleans is a good example, as well as New Orleans and Aspen. As properties start to turn over at these intersections, opportunities for redevelopment arise.
Considerations for enhancing or redeveloping existing four corner retail intersections include:

- Improving streetscape features leading up to the intersection.
- Incorporating updated signage.
- Establishing a unique 'brand'for the corner.



# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1248, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>10-08-2020

To: Chairman and Commission Members
From: Development Services Department
Title:
Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-47H (Planned Unit Development), Cloudi Mornings, 0.21 acres, PUD-47/CG/IL to PUD47H/CG/IL, located one-quarter mile south of Albany Street (61st Street), one-half mile west of Olive Avenue (129th E. Avenue)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Location:

Size of Tract 0.24 acres
Present Zoning: PUD-47/CG/IL
Proposed Zoning: PUD-47H/CG/IL
Comp Plan: Level 6
Planned Unit Development (PUD)-47H involves a 0.24 -acre parcel located one-quarter mile south of Albany Street ( $61^{\text {st }}$ Street), one-half mile west of Olive Avenue ( $129^{\text {th }}$ E. Avenue). Applicant is requesting a major amendment to PUD-47 to allow a medical marijuana growing/cultivation facility to be located on the property. The property, which is located at 2201 N. Yellowood Avenue, (South 55 feet of Lot 21, Block 3, 6100 Center), is presently zoned PUD-47/CG/IL.

When the public notice for this PUD amendment was provided, it had referenced PUD-35C and PUD-47H. Upon further examination, it was discovered that this property is not located in PUD-35 and only PUD-47H is applicable.

PUD-35, which contained 79.04 acres, was approved by the City Council on May 16, 1983. Previously, in September 1973, the City Council had approved BAZ-432 to change the zoning on the property associated with PUD-35 from R-1 to 61.22 acres of I-1, 14.87 acres of R-5, and 3.91 acres of O-2. PUD-35 proposed a mixture of land uses including multifamily, commercial, and industrial. While the property where PUD-47H is located contained an underlying zoning as R-5 and I-1, the property was designated as "industrial" in PUD-35. PUD35 did not place any limitations on the uses permitted. Therefore, the industrial uses permitted are those that

File \#: 20-1248, Version: 1
were allowed in 1983 when PUD-35 was approved.
On April 16, 1984, the City Council approved PUD-47 and BAZ-962, a request to change the R-5 zoning associated with the multifamily area of PUD-35 to I-1, light industrial. With the approval of BAZ-962, the underlying zoning on the property associated with PUD-47H became O-2 and I-1. However, PUD-47 stated that the uses permitted on the property were those allowed in the I-1 district. In 2008, the City of Broken Arrow updated its Zoning Ordinance, and the area that had been designated as O-2 when BAZ-962 was approved was changed to CG. As a result, the zoning map now shows the zoning on the property to be PUD47/CG/IL.

At the time PUD-47 was approved, the growing of medical marijuana was not recognized as a permitted use in the I-1 district.

On September 18, 2018, the City Council approved Ordinance 3540 that established regulations for retail medical marijuana dispensaries and medical marijuana commercial growing/cultivating facilities. Medical marijuana growing/cultivating facilities were recognized as a permitted use in the IL (Industrial Light) zoning district. On September 25, 2018, a lawsuit was filed asking the court to make a legal determination whether the City of Broken Arrow had any authority to zone or otherwise regulate medical marijuana businesses within city limits. The trial court agreed with the plaintiff and on October 17, 2018, issued a declaratory judgement finding, as a matter of law, that Oklahoma cities were precluded from adopting regulations, zoning overlays, fees, or other restriction relating to medical marijuana business activities. This decision was appealed by the City of Broken Arrow. The Oklahoma Legislature enacted laws that became effective August 30, 2019, that stated, "Municipalities may follow their standard planning and zoning procedures to determine if certain zones or districts would be appropriate for locating marijuana-licensed premises, medical marijuana businesses or any other premises where marijuana or its by-products are cultivated, grown, processed, stored or manufactured." The plaintiff's lawsuit was dismissed by the Oklahoma Supreme Court on November 19, 2019. A complete copy of the Supreme Court ruling is attached with this Staff report.

Today, the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance recognizes that medical marijuana growing/cultivating is a permitted use in the IL district. For the applicant to be able to renew their medical marijuana license, they must receive acknowledgement from the local jurisdiction that the growing/cultivation facility is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, for Staff to acknowledge that the zoning is in compliance, medical marijuana growing/cultivation has to be recognized as a permitted use. Since PUD-47 did not acknowledge medical marijuana growing/cultivation as a permitted use, the PUD must be modified. According to the Zoning Ordinance, to change the list of permitted uses in a PUD requires a major amendment to the PUD. As a result, applicant has submitted a request for a major amendment to PUD-47 to allow medical marijuana growing/cultivation to be a permitted use. This is the only change being requested to PUD-47.

According to the applicant, they have contacted the Board for the 6100 Center Property Owners Association about their requested modification to PUD-47 and was informed that the Board had no issues with the request.

## SURROUNDING LAND USES/ZONING/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The surrounding properties contain the following uses, along with the following development guide and zoning designations:

File \#: 20-1248, Version: 1

| Location | Development <br> Guide | Zoning | Land Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Level 6 | PUD-47/CG/IL | Light Industrial |
| East | Level 6 | PUD-35/IL | Light Industrial |
| South | Level 6 | PUD-47/IL | Light Industrial |
| West | Level 6 | PUD-47/CG | Light Industrial |

The property associated with PUD-47H is designated as Level 6 in the Comprehensive Plan. The existing light industrial designation in PUD 47 is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 6.

According to Section 6.4 of the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD provisions are established for one (1) or more of the following purposes:

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.
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.
3. To encourage the provision and preservation of meaningful open space.
4. To encourage integrated and unified design and function of the various uses comprising the planned unit development.
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.

In Staff's opinion, PUD-47 continues to satisfy item 1 of Section 6.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance. When PUD47 was approved by the City Council in 1984, a height limitation of one story was placed on buildings within 150 feet of the Melinda Park addition to the west. In addition, buildings were required to setback at least 75 feet from the property line abutting the Melinda Park addition, along with a 40 -foot wide landscape buffer. All these conditions remain. The only change being made is to allow the growing/cultivation of medical marijuana inside an enclosed building on the east side of Yellowood Avenue.

According to the Zoning Ordinance, no schools are allowed within a 1,000 feet of a medical marijuana growing/facility. A detailed survey will be conducted as part of any application for a medical marijuana license from the City of Broken Arrow. Staff did review aerial photographs, and there were no schools found within 1,000 feet of the proposed growing/cultivation facility.

According to FEMA maps, none of the property is located in a 100-year floodplain area.

## Attachments: Case map

Aerial photo

File \#: 20-1248, Version: 1
Comp Plan
Design Statement for PUD-47H
Design Statement for PUD-47
Case maps for BAZ-432 and BAZ-962
November 19, 2019, Oklahoma Supreme Court ruling
September 1, 2020, email from Austin Miller

## Recommendation:

On September 18, 2018, the City of Broken Arrow adopted regulations pertaining to medical marijuana facilities. Medical marijuana growing/cultivation is recognized as a permitted use in the IL (Industrial Light) district. When PUD 47 was approved in 1984, medical marijuana growing/cultivation was not recognized as a legal use and was not included as a permitted use in PUD-47. To change any permitted uses in a PUD requires a major amendment to the PUD. PUD-47H addresses this unique situation and requests that medical marijuana growing/cultivation be allowed as a permitted use on the property.

Based upon the Comprehensive Plan, the location of the property, the existing PUD, the unique condition associated with the request, and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommends that PUD-47H be approved as requested. Since the property has already been platted, Staff recommends that platting be waived.

## Reviewed by: Jill Ferenc

Approved by: Larry R. Curtis
BDM




## Cloudi Mornings LLC

2201 N Yellowood
Broken Arrow Ok 74012

Brent,
Cloudi Mornings LLC is requesting an amendment to PUD to add to the permitted (intended) use list to be revised to include Medical Marijuana Growing.

Thank you,
Cloudi Mornings LLC

# PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT 

## A Planned Industrial Community

for the<br>West $1 / 2$ of the Northeast $1 / 4$ of Section 5,<br>T-18-N, R-14-E, City of Broken Arrow

FEB 1984

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT
6100 South East Park Amended is a development for light industrial uses. Within the light industrial development, adjacent to the single family subdivision, it is important to maintain a buffer between residential subdivisions and industrial uses.

In this P.U.D. there are three ways to maintain this buffer from the residential subdivision. lst a $40^{\prime}$ landscaped buffer will be used; 2 nd a $75^{\circ}$ building setback line, rather than $50^{\prime}$ as required by the zoning ordinance, will be enforced. The 3 rd method to maintain a buffer is a height restriction of one floor within 150' of Melinda Park.
dev concpt
dÉvelopment standards

| Permitted Uses: | As Allowed in the Il, Light Industrial District |
| :---: | :---: |
| Maximum Floor Area | As governed in Section 20.5, City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance $\$ 302$ |
| Maximum Building Height | -Within 150' of the Melinda Park Subdivision no building shall be more than one story in height. Any structure or building further that 150 from Melinda Park shall conform to section 20.7 in the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance 302 . |
| Parking Ratio | 1 space per 1,000 square feet of floor area. |
| Minimum Landscaped Open Space | 40' wide landscape buffer between industrial and residential areas. |
| Building Setback | Within $75^{\prime}$ of Melinda Park, there shall be no building. The remainder of the tract shall be governed by Section 20.6, City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance 302. |

## ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

## TOPOGRAPHY


#### Abstract

The site has an elevation change of 33 feet from the northwest property corner to the southeast property corner. The land slopes gently to the outheast into a drainage system that exita at the southeast corner. Several ponds exist in the drainage way but are not expected to be a part of the development.


SLOPES

The site is well suited to any type of development. Slopes, from west to east, average 3 percent. The most severe slopes are along the drainage ways. Maximum slopes never exceed 10 percent.

## DRAINAGE-EXHIBIT E

Drainage in and through the property is practically self-contained. Ridge lines along the west, north and east edges of the development limit offsite storm water to less than 5 acres. Most of the storm water collecting on the development exits near the southeast corner. The development is in the upper reaches of the Haikey Creek drainage system. 100 year flood areas do not encroach on the property.

## IREED AREAS

Several trees of significant size are located along the drainage way at the east property line. A majority of the trees are south of the quarter section line and will not significantly affect the development layout or design.


## ABUTTING DEVELOPMENT

SCALE: NONE


## utilities

All utilities will be available from the 6100 Center Industrial Park which is east and south of the 11.4 acre tract. 6100 Center is under construction, the utilities will be in place, ready for connection within 8 months.

## SOILS

## Denis Silt Loam

Depth to bedrock is greater than 60 inches. Slopes are generally 1 to 3 percent. Denis silt loam is a gently sloping, moderately will drained, slowly permeable soil on uplands. The main concern for development are the slow permeability and high shrink-swell potential.


SOIL CLASSIFICATIONS


## EXPECTED SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT

The project is expected to comence within twelve (12) months and would be completed within twenty-four (24) months thereafter.



# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA 

FRETH<br>SUPRENE COURT STATE OF OKIAHOMA

NOV 192019
JOHN D. HADDEN CIERK

No. 117,500
FOR PUBLICATION

THE CITY OF BROKEN ARROW, Defendant/Appellant.

)

## APPEAL FROM THE TULSA COUNTY DISTRICT COURT

Honorable Patrick Pickerill, Trial Judge

T0 The voters of the State of Oklahoma passed State Question 788, codified at 63 O.S. Supp. 2018 §420A et seq., on June 26, 2018, legalizing medical marijuana. Subsequently, the City of Broken Arrow enacted local zoning ordinances No. 3540 and 3542 in an attempt to incorporate the introduction of medical marijuana businesses into their community. On September 25, 2018, the plaintiffs/appellees, filed a Petition for Declaratory Judgment and Injunctive Relief in the Tulsa County District Court asking the court to make a legal determination that the City of Broken Arrow had no authority whatsoever to zone or otherwise regulate medical marijuana businesses within city limits. The trial court agreed with the plaintiffs, and on October 17, 2018, issued a declaratory judgment finding, as a matter of law, that Oklahoma cities were precluded from adopting regulations, zoning overlays, fees or other restrictions relating to medical marijuana business activities. The City appealed. The Oklahoma Legislature enacted 63 O.S. Supp. $2019 \S 425(\mathrm{f})$, as amended by SB 1030 (effective August 30, 2019) in an apparent attempt to clarify the voter approved enactment and to provide further direction for municipalities to incorporate marijuana businesses within their city limits. On June 24, 2019, we remanded the cause back to the Tulsa County District Court to enter Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law specifically
addressing: 1) whether Broken Arrow, though enactment of it ordinances, has "unduly change[d] or restrict[ed] zoning laws so as to prevent the opening of a retail marijuana establishment; and 2) the impact of the statutory amendment on the validity of the City ordinances. On October 18, 2019, the trial court entered an order answering our questions and making express findings of fact and conclusions of law. We now dismiss the appeal for lack of case or controversy.

## APPEAL DISMISSED.

Trevor A. Dennis, Acting City Attorney, City of Broken Arrow,

Charles S. Plumb, Michael F. Smith, Jacob S. Crawford, Tulsa, Oklahoma,

John E. Rooney, Jr., Ronald E. Durbin, Tulsa, Oklahoma,

Attorneys for Appellant.

Attorney for Plaintiffs/Appellees.

## KAUGER, J.:

\$1 We retained this cause to address the authority of a city, such as the City of Broken Arrow, to zone/regulate a medical marijuana establishment within city limits. However, because the cause lacks any case or controversy as to these plaintiffs, and is merely a request for an advisory opinion, we must dismiss the appeal. ${ }^{1}$

[^0]
## FACTS/PROCEDURAL POSTURE

-[2 On September 25, 2018, the plaintiffs/appellees, Cloudi Mornings and Austin Miller (collectively Cloudi Mornings) filed a Petition for Declaratory Judgment and Injunctive Relief in the District Court of Tulsa County. In the petition, Cloudi Mornings stated that it is an L.L.C. with its primary business activities located within the City of Broken Arrow and that Austin Miller was a resident of Broken Arrow.

【3 They contend that as a "business within city limits," they have a vested interest in City enacted medical marijuana rules related to the voter approved June 26, 2018, Initiative Petition 788 which legalized medical marijuana in the State of Oklahoma. The Initiative Petition became codified as 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S \$ 420$ et seq. (The Act). ${ }^{2}$
unnecessary and the applications are hereby denied.
${ }^{2}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \$ 420$ as enacted provided:
A. A person in possession of a state issued medical marijuana license shall be able to:

1. Consume marijuana legally;
2. Legally possess up to three (3) ounces of marijuana on their person;
3. Legally possess six (6) mature marijuana plants;
4. Legally possess six (6) scedling plants;
5. Legally possess one (1) ounce of concentrated marijuana;
6. Legally possess seventy-two (72) ounces of edible marijuana; and
7. Legally possess up to eight (8) ounces of marijuana in their residence.
B. Possession of up to one and one-half (1.5) ounces of marijuana by persons who can state a medical condition, but not in possession of a state issued medical marijuana license, shall constitute a misdemeanor offense with a fine not to exceed Four Hundred Dollars ( $\$ 400.00$ ).
C. A regulatory office shall be established under the Oklahoma State Department of Health which will receive applications for medical license recipients, dispensaries, growers, and packagers within sixty ( 60 ) days of the passage of this initiative.
D. The Oklahoma State Department of Health shall within thirty (30) days of passage of this initiative, make available, on their website, in an easy to find location, an application for a medical marijuana license. The license will be good for two (2) years, and the application fee will be One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00), or Twenty Dollars ( $\$ 20.00$ ) for individuals on Medicaid, Medicare, or SoonerCare. The methods of payment will be provided on the website.
E. A temporary license application will also be available on the Oklahoma Department of Health website. A temporary medical marijuana license will be granted to any medical marijuana license holder from other states, provided that the state has a state regulated medical marijuana program, and the applicant can prove they are a member of such. Temporary licenses will be issued for thirty (30) days. The cost for a temporary license shall be One Hundred Dollars ( $\$ 100.00$ ) Renewal will be granted with resubmission of a new application. No additional criteria will be required.
F. Medical marijuana license applicants will submit their application to the Oklahoma State Department of Health for approval and that the applicant must be an Oklahoma state resident and shall prove residency by a valid driver's license, utility bills, or other accepted methods.
G. The Oklahoma State Department of Health shall review the medical marijuana application, approve/reject the application, and mail the applicant's approval or rejection letter (stating reasons for rejection) to the applicant within fourteen (14) days of receipt of the application. Approved applicants will be issued a medical marijuana license which will act as proof of their approved status. Applications may only be rejected based on applicant not meeting stated criteria or improper completion of the application.
H. The Oklahoma State Department of Health will only keep the following records for each approved medical license:
8. a digital photograph of the license holder;
9. the expiration date of the license;
10. the county where the card was issued; and
11. a unique 24 character identification number assigned to the license.
I. The Department of Health will make available, both on its website, and through a telephone verification system, an easy method to validate a medical license holders authenticity by the unique 24 character identifier.
J. The State Department of Health will ensure that all application records and information are sealed to protect the privacy of medical license applicants.
K. A caregiver license will be made available for qualified caregivers of a medical marijuana license holder who is homebound. The caregiver license will give the caregiver the same rights as the medical license holder. Applicants for a caregiver license will submit proof of the medical marijuana license holder's license status and homebound status, that they are the designee of the medical marijuana license holder, must submit proof that the
-4 The original codification governed the legal possession of medical marijuana, caregiver licenses, dispensary licenses, ${ }^{3}$ licensed commercial growers/packagers, ${ }^{4}$ processing licenses, ${ }^{5}$ transportation licenses; ${ }^{6}$ and directed the establishment of a regulatory office under the Oklahoma State Department of Health
(Health Department)..$^{7}$ It also expressly allowed counties and cities to enact medical marijuana guidelines allowing license holders to exceed the state limits regarding legal possession. ${ }^{8}$
-5 The Act included a provision on discrimination towards license holders ${ }^{9}$ and

[^1]and stated that "no city or local municipality may unduly change or restrict zoning laws to prevent the opening of a retail marijuana establishment. ${ }^{10}$ It did not define "retail marijuana establishment." Cloudi Mornings argued that the statutes restricted cities from imposing regulations of activities authorized under the Act and that only the Health Department was entitled to impose any regulations.

96 The Health Department created regulations to govern activities under the
Act. The regulations are found in the Oklahoma Administrative Code, Title 310, Oklahoma State Department of Health, Ch. 681 and were adopted August 1, 2018, and made effective on August 25, 2018. ${ }^{11}$ The rules generally cover the application processes of the various licenses, renewals, inspections, inventory, audits, taxes, commercial facilities, packaging, and labeling. Nothing in the rules addressed zoning or location of establishments, but the rules did require premises to meet state and local electrical, fire, plumbing, waste and building codes.
-77 According to Cloudi Mornings, the City of Broken Arrow met on September 18, 2018, and adopted Ordinance 3540 and 3542 , as well as an Amended City of

[^2]Broken Arrow Manual of Fees. ${ }^{12}$ The ordinances purport to zone and restrict marijuana operations within the City, much like any other retail establishment. They address parking, building codes, require City permits and application fees, etc.

T8 Cloudi Mornings did not assert that it was denied any permits, required to pay a particular fee or was prohibited from locating in a chosen location within the City limits in their Petition. Nor do they allege that the ordinances conflict with Health Department regulations and rules. They did attach to the Petition, an affidavit of plaintiff, Austin Miller, who identifies himself as the Manager of Cloudi Mornings. He states that: the company intends to conduct business in the City of Broken Arrow; the ordinances and fees completely frustrate their commercial purposes; and the ordinances will cause substantial and irreparable harm to the company and other individual residents of Broken Arrow.

99 Cloudi Morning argues that the City exceeded its authority by addressing any of these regulation issues all together, and they sought to have the City's efforts declared null and void. They also filed an application for emergency temporary restraining order and temporary injunction along with their Petition for Declaratory Judgment. On September 28, 2018, the City objected. It argued that Oklahoma Legislature expressly acknowledged that Cities would need zoning and regulations

[^3]regarding a new industry which was once illegal, and that the Legislature included the express allowance for municipalities to enact reasonable, common sense ordinances. ${ }^{13}$
\$10 The trial court held a hearing on September 28, 2018. At the hearing, Cloudi Mornings argued that after medical marijuana became legal in the State of Oklahoma, they applied for their license, received it, engaged in business. Subsequently, however, the City of Broken Arrow created zoning which, if applied, would mean that Cloudi Mornings is engaged in growing in an area not properly zoned, and not in compliance with City's rules. They offered no measure of monetary damages they may have suffered, but noted that they already had plants growing and had already signed a lease.

T11 On October 17, 2018, the trial court filed a Final Declaratory Judgment. It held that Oklahoma cities, as a matter of law, were precluded from adopting regulations, zoning overlays, fees or other restrictions to medical marijuana business activities authorized by the Act. Consequently, the City's enactment of the ordinances was not permissible and it enjoined the City from enforcing them.

The City appealed and filed a motion to retain on October 31, 2018. We retained the cause on November 15, 2018, and the briefing cycle was completed on May 15, 2019, with the filing of the City's reply brief.

[^4]-112 In the meantime, the Legislature, in the 2019 Legislative session amended portions of the Act. It enacted a new 63 O.S. Supp. 2019 § 427 concerning licensure revocations. It also amended $\S \S 420$ and 425 with multiple amendments. The amendments to $\S 420$ relate to record keeping and are not applicable to this cause. ${ }^{14}$ The amendments to 63 O.S. Supp. $2019 \S 425$ however are pertinent. The Legislature added to the subsection which originally stated that "[n]o city or local municipality may unduly change or restrict zoning laws to prevent the opening of a retail marijuana establishment." The addition states:
2. For purposes of this subsection, an undue change or restriction of municipal zoning laws means an act which entirely prevents retail marijuana establishments from operating within municipal boundaries as a matter of law. Municipalities may follow their standard planning and zoning procedures to determine if certain zones or districts would be appropriate for locating marijuana-licensed premises, medical marijuana businesses or any other premises where marijuana or its by-products are cultivated, grown, processed, stored or manufactured.
3. For purpose of this section, "retail marijuana establishment" means an entity licensed by the State Department of Health as a medical marijuana dispensary. Retail marijuana establishment does not include those other entities licensed by the Department as marijuana-licensed premises, medical marijuana businesses or other facilities where marijuana or any product containing marijuana or its by-products are cultivated, grown, processed, stored or manufactured.
-13 Because of the legislative amendments, on June 24, 2019, we remanded the cause and ordered the trial court to enter findings of fact and conclusions of law

[^5]addressing: 1) whether the ordinances had unduly changed or restricted zoning law so as to prevent the opening of a retail marijuana establishment and 2 ) the impact of 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S 42$ (f) on the ordinances. We directed the parties to supplement the appellate record with the court's findings within 90 days.

T14 On October 18, 2019, the trial court filed its Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law. ${ }^{15}$ Regarding the facts, it found that:

1) Miller and Cloudi Mornings were actively engaged in the cannabis growing business within the municipality of the City of Broken Arrow;
2) the City ordinances zoned only "Retail Sales businesses," $[\mathrm{a} / \mathrm{k} / \mathrm{a}$ retail marijuana establishments or retail sales establishments], within the City, and such businesses were the only marijuana businesses required by the ordinances to submit an operational and business plan and apply for a City permit and licensing fee;
3) multiple establishments were currently and actively operating dispensaries within City limits; and
4) the Legislature added a subsection to 63 O.S. Supp. 2018 §425(f) which excluded locations where marijuana was grown from the definition of "retail marijuana establishment."

T15 Regarding conclusions of law, the trial court determined that:

1) the plaintiff/appellees were engaged in an active cannabis growing business within the municipality of the City of Broken Arrow;
2) there is no specific statutory protection against undue changes or restrictions in municipal zoning as provided to a business engaged in the growing or

[^6]processing of cannabis;
3) the ordinances did not unduly change or restrict zoning so as to prevent the opening of retail marijuana establishments; and
4) the statutory amendments operate as a subsequent clarification of the phrase "unduly change or restrict zoning laws' and defining the term "retail marijuana establishment."

## APPEAL DISMISSED.

\$16 The City argues that: 1) cities possess the full power of local government and may enact ordinance to protect the public peace, order, health and safety; and 2) reasonable regulations to medical marijuana businesses operating within their jurisdiction fall squarely within the City's purview of authorized regulation. Cloudi Mornings argues that the Act only tasks the Health Department with regulating the marijuana industry and, consequently, cities are powerless to enact marijuana zoning ordinances.

T17 Cities generally have the authority to enact zoning and regulatory
ordinances. ${ }^{16}$ The voter-approved version of the Act, acknowledged such authority
${ }^{16}$ Title 11 O.S. 2011 §43-101 provides:
For the purpose of promoting health, safety, morals, or the general welfare of the community, a municipal governing body may regulate and restrict the height, number of stories, and size of buildings and other structures, the percentage of lot that may be occupied, the size of yards, courts and other open spaces, the density of population, and the location and use of buildings, structures and land for trade, industry, residence or other purposes.

Nuchools v. Board of Adjustment of the City of Tulsa, 1977 OK 3, $\$ 11,560 \mathrm{P} .2 \mathrm{~d} 556$ [The right, power, and authority of the legislative body of cities to enact zoning ordinances arises from the authority of the Oklahoma statutes.]; See also Mid-Continent Life Insurance v. The City of Oklahoma City, 1985 OK 41 99, 701 P. 2 d 421 [Zoning is a legislative function which is due the presumptive validity of any municipal ordinances. Unless zoning decisions of a municipality
when it noted that no city or local municipality may unduly change or restrict zoning to prevent the opening of a retail marijuana establishment. ${ }^{17}$ The acknowledgment being that city zoning and regulation could occur as long as the ordinances enacted were not unduly changed or restricted in such a way that no retail marijuana establishment could open within city limits.

T18 If there was any doubt as to the City's authority, the 63 O.S. Supp. 2019
$\S 425$ legislative amendments expressly state that:

1) an undue change or restriction of municipal zoning laws means an act which entirely prevents retail marijuana establishments from operating within municipal boundaries as a matter of law;
2) a "retail marijuana establishment" means an entity licensed by the State Department of Health as a medical marijuana dispensary but does not include other entities licensed by the Department as marijuana-licensed premises, medical marijuana businesses or other facilities where marijuana or any product containing marijuana or its by-products are cultivated, grown, processed, stored or manufactured; and
3) municipalities may follow their standard planning and zoning procedures to determine if certain zones or districts would be appropriate for locating marijuana-licensed premises, medical marijuana businesses or any other premises where marijuana or its by-products are cultivated, grown, processed, stored or manufactured. ${ }^{18}$

It is well settled that subsequent amendments to an act can be used to ascertain the

[^7]meaning of the prior statute. ${ }^{19}$ Where the meaning of a prior statute is subject to serious doubt and has not been judicially determined, a presumption arises that a subsequent amendment was meant to clarify, as opposed to change, the prior statute. ${ }^{20}$ A subsequent statute clarifying a prior statute can be used to determine the meaning of the prior statute even if the interpretation affects alleged vested rights. ${ }^{21}$

T19 Clearly, the Act authorizes the City to follow standard planning and zoning procedures as to marijuana growers such as Cloudi Mornings. The Act does not even apply the "unduly change or restrict" standard to growers such as Cloudi Mornings. This is a problem for Cloudi Mornings where it was not denied any city permits, required to pay a particular city fee, or prohibited from locating in a chosen location within City limits all together. Nor is there is any indication that the City's ordinances directly conflict with the Health Department regulations and rules.

T20 At the trial court hearing of September 28, 2018, Cloudi Mornings admitted that if the City's zoning applied, then they would not be in compliance with

[^8]the City's rules. They also insisted that City's ordinances and fees "completely frustrate their commercial purposes" and that ordinances will "cause substantial and irreparable financial harm to the company" and other Broken Arrow residents. Nevertheless, it appears the City was acting within its authority under the original enactment as approved by the voters. If the original enactment were unclear, the subsequent amendments certainly clarified the issue.

T21 In short, there is no longer a case or controversy from which the trial court or this Court could declare any relief as to these particular plaintiffs. The rule does not change when a declaratory judgment is involved. ${ }^{22}$ We do not issue advisory opinions. ${ }^{23}$ We recognize that there are exceptions for matters which are of great public importance. While this may have been a matter of great public importance when it was enacted by the voters, the Legislature's subsequent action expressly authorizes City zoning. Here, without any indication that City's ordinances have
${ }^{22}$ Title 12 O.S. 2011 § 1651 provides:
District courts may, in cases of actual controversy, determine rights, status, or other legal relations, including but not limited to a determination of the construction or validity of any foreign judgment or decree, deed, contract, trust, or other instrument or agreement or of any statute, municipal ordinance, or other governmental regulation, whether or not other relief is or could be claimed, except that no declaration shall be made concerning liability or nonliability for damages on account of alleged tortious injuries to persons or to property either before or after judgment or for compensation alleged to be due under workers' compensation laws for injuries to persons. The determination may be made either before or after there has been a breach of any legal duty or obligation, and it may be either affirmative or negative in form and effect; provided however, that a court may refuse to make a determination where the judgment, if rendered, would not terminate the controversy, or some part thereof, giving rise to the proceeding.

Knight v. Miller, 2008 OK 81, $\uparrow \uparrow 18-13,195$ P.3d 372; Gordon v. Followell, 1964 OK 74, $\uparrow 6,391$ P. 2 d 242.
${ }^{23}$ Westinghouse Elec. Corp. v. Grand River Dam Authority, 1986 OK 20, 921,720 P.2d 713.
exceeded what the Legislature authorized by the Act and its subsequent amendments, there is nothing for us to decide. ${ }^{24}$ Furthermore, in so far as this cause is concerned, there is no indication that the City has enforced the zoning ordinances against Cloudi

Mornings. Nor is there indication that Cloudi Mornings has sought and been denied a variance. ${ }^{25}$ Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal.

## CONCLUSION

T22 The root of this cause is timing. The voters approved State Question 788
and the City of Broken Arrow responded with ordinances before the Oklahoma
Legislature could expand and clarify the legislation. In the meantime, Cloudi Mornings sought and obtained a license to legally grow medical marijuana. It set up shop before the City of Broken Arrow could implement State Question 788, and when it tried to implement it, Cloudi Mornings attempted to thwart the City's efforts with a

[^9]declaratory judgment.
T23 However, the Legislature did clarify the legislation with amendments and Cloudi Mornings declaratory judgment arguments were essentially nullified by the Legislative amendments. Because the declaratory relief Cloudi Mornings sought is no longer an issue, Cloudi Mornings has yet to appeared to suffer any loss, and it appears the City was acting within its authority under both the original enactment and its amendments, we must dismiss the appeal.

## APPEAL DISMISSED.

GURICH, C.J., DARBY, V.C.J., KAUGER, WINCHESTER, EDMONDSON, COLBERT, COMBS, KANE, JJ., concur.

| From: | Austin Miller [austin.m.miller@gmail.com](mailto:austin.m.miller@gmail.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Tuesday, September 1, 2020 2:59 PM |
| To: | Murphy, Brent |
| Cc: | Ferenc, Jill |
| Subject: | Re: PUD 47H |
| Attachments: | image001.jpg |

CAUTION! This email originated from outside of the City of Broken Arrow network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. codergiad

## Good Afternoon

I have already done so this time! LoL
They have no issues with it at all!
Thank you!

On Tue, Sep 1, 2020, 2:35 PM Murphy, Brent [BMurphy@brokenarrowok.gov](mailto:BMurphy@brokenarrowok.gov) wrote:

Good afternoon Austin. We are in receipt of your application for PUD 47H. When PUD 47G was submitted earlier this year, we had recommended that they contact the 6100 Center property association and see if they had any concerns with their request for a major amendment to allow the growing of medical marijuana. We would also make the same recommendation to you. Let us know what you find out, and we will share that with the Planning Commission. Also, let me know if you have any questions.

## Brent Murphy, AICP

Senior Planner
City of Broken Arrow
Phone: 918-259-2400 EXT. 5388
Fax: 918-258-4998

Email: bmurphy@brokenarrowok.gov


# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1249, Version: 1

## Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 10-08-2020

To: Chairman and Commission Members
From: Development Services Department
Title:
Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-94V (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-2066, Aspen Circle, 6.90 acres, PUD-94/CG to PUD94V/CH and IL, located north of the Broken Arrow Expressway, south of Albany Drive, and east of Aspen Avenue (145 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ E. Avenue)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Location: North of the Broken Arrow Expressway, south of Albany Drive, and east of Aspen Avenue (145th E. Avenue)

| Size of Tract | 6.90 acres |
| :--- | :--- |
| Present Zoning: | PUD-94/CG |
| Proposed Zoning: | PUD-94V/CH and IL |
| Comp Plan: | Level 6 |

Planned Unit Development (PUD)-94V involves a 6.90 -acre parcel located north of the Broken Arrow Expressway, south of Albany Drive, and east of Aspen Avenue. Applicant is requesting a major amendment to PUD-94 and with BAZ-2066 is asking that the underlying zoning be changed from CG (Commercial General) to CH (Commercial Heavy) and IL (Industrial Light). Some of the potential uses being contemplated on the property include vehicle sales and rental, vehicle service and major repair (collision center), and a convenience store.

PUD-94V divides the 6.90 acres into two development areas, A and B. Development Area A, which contains 2.97 acres adjacent to Aspen Avenue, the Broken Arrow Expressway off-ramp, and Albany Drive, will be developed in accordance with the use and development regulations of the CH district except as modified by the PUD. While a convenience store is being considered conceptually, all uses allowed in the CH district, except sexually oriented businesses, are allowed in Development Area A. In addition, vehicle sales and rental is recognized as a permitted use.

Development Area B, which contains 3.93 acres next to Albany Drive and the Broken Arrow Expressway offramp, will be developed in accordance with the use and development regulations of the CH and IL district,
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except as modified by the PUD. The only permitted uses are limited to:

- Restaurant, drive-in
- Restaurant, drive-thru
- Convenience store with gas sales
- Alcoholic beverages, retail store
- Vehicle sales and rentals
- Vehicle services and repair, major
- Vehicle services and repair, minor

An automobile collision center is illustrated as part of the conceptual site plan.

## PUD 94 HISTORY ON THE PROPERTY

PUD 94, along with BAZ 1236, were initially approved by the City Council on November 16, 1995, subject to the property being platted. PUD-94, known as "Battle Creek" was proposed as a mixed use development consisting of single family detached residences, multifamily residential, office and retail uses along with an 18hole golf course, all located on 786.5 acres. The property associated with PUD 94 V was designated as "Commercial Office" in PUD 94, for retail commercial, office, hotel, and restaurant use. On November 16, 2010, the City Council approved PUD 94-O, a major amendment to PUD-94, subject to the property being platted. In PUD 94-O, the property associated with PUD 94V was designated as "Commercial" and permitted uses were identified as those permitted within a C-2 District as existing on January 31, 2008. PUD 94-O was approved subject to platting. The property has not been platted, therefore, the zoning property on the property associated with PUD-94V and BAZ-2066 remains PUD-94/CG. On September 17, 2013, the City Council approved PUD-94S, a major amendment to PUD-94, to allow a new automobile dealership to be constructed on 10.5 acres located on the north side of Albany Drive, north of PUD-94V.

PUD-94V
A summary comparison between what is required by the Zoning Ordinance and what is being proposed with PUD-94V is provided below.

## SUMMARY OF DEVIATION FROM THE BROKEN ARROW ZONING ORDINANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT AREA A

| Item | Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance | PUD-94VRequest |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Building Height | No requirement | 2 stories or 35 feet |
| Landscaping | One tree per 50 feet of street and <br> highway frontage | Along the Broken Arrow Expressway <br> and Aspen Avenue, one tree per 25 feet <br> of highway and street frontage. Along <br> West Albany Drive, one tree per 30 feet <br> of frontage. All trees must be medium <br> or large trees except where there are <br> conflicts with overhead power lines. |
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$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Access } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Access on arterial streets must be } \\ 250 \text { feet apart, centerline to } \\ \text { centerline on the same side of the } \\ \text { street, and 200 feet, centerline to } \\ \text { centerline, on the opposite side of } \\ \text { the street. On collector streets, such } \\ \text { as Albany Drive, access points must } \\ \text { align or be 150 feet apart, centerline } \\ \text { to centerline on both sides of the } \\ \text { street. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { No access allowed to Aspen Avenue. If } \\ \text { the western most access point on the } \\ \text { north side of Albany Drive remains, } \\ \text { only one access point to Albany Drive } \\ \text { is allowed and it must align with the } \\ \text { access point on the north side. If the } \\ \text { western most drive on the north side is } \\ \text { permanently closed and physically } \\ \text { removed, two points of access are } \\ \text { allowed to Albany Drive. The space } \\ \text { between the two drives is reduced from } \\ 150 \text { feet to } 120 \text { feet, centerline to }\end{array} \\ & & \begin{array}{l}\text { 5-feet wide on arterial streets and 4- } \\ \text { centerline. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { feet wide on collector streets. }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Sidewalks will be 5-feet wide along } \\ \text { both Aspen Avenue and Albany Drive. }\end{array}\right\}$

## SUMMARY OF DEVIATION FROM THE BROKEN ARROW ZONING ORDINANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT AREA B

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Item } & \text { Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance } & \text { PUD-94VRequest } \\ \hline \text { Permitted uses } & \begin{array}{ll}\text { As allowed in the CH and IL } \\ \text { districts. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { The only permitted uses are: } \bullet \\ \text { Restaurant, drive-in } \bullet \text { Restaurant, drive } \\ \text {-thru } \bullet \text { Convenience store with gas }\end{array} \\ \text { sales } \bullet \text { Alcoholic beverages, retail store } \\ \bullet \text { Vehicle sales and rental } \bullet \text { Vehicle } \\ \text { services and repair, minor } \bullet \text { Vehicle } \\ \text { services and repair, major }\end{array}\right]$
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| Exterior building materials | Masonry along street frontages | Blue and white metal wall panels allowed on the vehicle service and repair - major building. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Building Setback | 50 feet from all street frontages | 50 feet from all street frontages. However, overhead doors used for service and repair and oriented towards a street shall setback at least 150 feet. |
| Screening Fence | Only required adjacent to residential and around dumpsters. | In addition to the Zoning Ordinance requirements, a six-foot high masonry and wood fence will be installed around the area used for storing damaged vehicles. |
| Landscaping | One tree per 50 feet of street and highway frontage | Along the Broken Arrow Expressway and Aspen Avenue, one tree per 25 feet of highway and street frontage. At least 90 percent of the trees shall be evergreen and must be medium to large trees except where there are conflicts with overhead power lines. Along West Albany Drive, one tree per 30 fee of frontage. At least 75 percent of the trees shall be evergreen and must be large trees except where there are conflicts with overhead power lines. |
| Access | Access on collector streets, such as Albany Drive, access points must align on both sides of the street, or be 150 feet apart, centerline to centerline. | Access will meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. |
| Sidewalks | 4-feet wide on collector streets. | Sidewalks will be 5-feet wide along Albany Drive. |
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| Freestanding Signs | Up to 50 feet in height and 500 <br> square feet for a sign with multiple <br> users. | Only one pylon sign is allowed for the <br> entire PUD and it is limited to 25 feet <br> in height. All other freestanding signs <br> must meet the requirements of Section |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $5.7 . D$, which limits signs to 10 feet in |  |  |
| height and 100 square feet. The base |  |  |
| of all freestanding signs will be of |  |  |
| substantially the same material as the |  |  |
| exterior of the principal building on the |  |  |
| lot. |  |  |

## SURROUNDING LAND USES/ZONING/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The surrounding properties contain the following uses, along with the following development guide and zoning designations:

| Location | Development Guide | Zoning | Land Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Level 6 | PUD-94S/CH | Automobile sales and service |
| East | Levels 6 and 3 | PUD-94S-1/CH and <br> PUD-94/CG | Automobile sales and service, <br> undeveloped, and apartments |
| South | Broken Arrow <br> Expressway | PUD-94/CG | Broken Arrow Expressway off <br> ramp |
| West | Level 6 | CH/SP 228 | Automobile sales and service and <br> undeveloped |

The property associated with PUD-94V and BAZ-2066 is designated as Level 6 in the Comprehensive Plan. CH (Commercial Heavy) zoning is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 6. In addition, IL zoning is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 6 when done in association with a PUD.

According to Section 6.4 of the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD provisions are established for one (1) or more of the following purposes:

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.
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.
3. To encourage the provision and preservation of meaningful open space.
4. To encourage integrated and unified design and function of the various uses comprising the

File \#: 20-1249, Version: 1
planned unit development.
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.

In Staff's opinion, PUD-94V satisfies items 1, 2, and 5 of Section 6.4.A of the Zoning Ordinance. (1) The uses permitted, especially in Development Area B are limited, assuring compatibly with adjoining and proximate properties. In addition, building height is limited to 2 stories or 35 feet. (2) Twice as much landscaping will be provided along the Broken Arrow Expressway than what is required by the Zoning Ordinance, thereby providing greater public benefits than would be achieved with just the Zoning Ordinance. No access is allowed to Aspen Avenue, but there is flexibility to allow the spacing to be reduced along Albany Drive if other conditions are met. (5) Aspen Avenue and the Broken Arrow Expressway off-ramp is a major entry way into the City of Broken Arrow. With PUD-94V, twice as much landscaping is provided along the Broken Arrow Expressway and Aspen Avenue than what is required by the Zoning Ordinance. Freestanding signs are limited in height and size. The proposed land uses are compatible with the other surrounding land uses.

According to FEMA maps, none of the property is located in a 100-year floodplain area. Water and sanitary sewer service will be provided by the City of Broken Arrow.

## Attachments: Case map

Aerial photo
Comprehensive Plan Future Development Guide
PUD-94V design statement

## Recommendation:

Based upon the Comprehensive Plan, the PUD submitted with BAZ-2066 and the associated limitations on permitted land uses and vehicular access, the location of the property, features (i.e. landscaping, screening, and sign controls) provided in the PUD, and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommends that PUD-94V and BAZ2066 be approved as presented, subject to the property being platted.

## Reviewed by: Jill Ferenc

## Approved by: Larry R. Curtis

BDM
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# BATTLE CREEK <br> NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE BROKEN ARROW EXPRESSWAY AND ASPEN AVENUE 

ASPEN CIRCLE PUD-94V

Major Amendment of PUD-940

September 2020

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

A.....Illustration Concept Plan
B.....Proposed Zoning and Development Areas
C.....Topography, Floodplain and Existing Vegetation Map
D.....Adjacent Land Use and Zoning
E.....Circulation and Access Plan
F.....Landscape and Open Space Concept Plan
G.....Existing and Proposed Utilities Plan
H.....Aerial Photograph

I ......Screening Fence for Collision Center

## DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

The subject property comprises approximately 6.9 acres (gross) which is South of the Jim Norton Chevrolet Dealership on Lot 1, Block 1, "Ronda Norton Center", located at the Northeast corner of North Aspen Avenue (South 145th East Avenue) and the Broken Arrow Expressway. The 6.9 acre tract lies south of West Albany Drive. The possible uses are an automotive collision center, convenience store with fuel sales, vehicle sales and rental, and other restricted uses permitted in the CH-Commercial Heavy district. The Aspen Circle PUD will require rezoning of the CG zoning to CH and IL zoning.

This PUD is a major amendment to a portion of PUD-94O that was approved by the Broken Arrow City Council on November 16, 2010. The development standards of this PUD are similar to those approved with PUD-94S, with the addition of the Highway Design Overlay (HDO) district standards added since the 2010 approval. The remainder of PUD-94O, and all of PUD-94S, remain unchanged and are not part of this application.

With the filing of the application for the major amendment to PUD-94O, applications for rezoning Development Area A from CG-Commercial General to CH-Commercial Heavy and Development Area B from CG-Commercial General to IL-Industrial Light will be filed to run concurrently with the PUD application.

## DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Development Area A shall be developed in accordance with the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance and the use and development regulations of the CH-Commercial Heavy district, except as modified herein. Vehicle sales and rental shall be recognized as a permitted use and not require a Specific Use Permit. Sexually oriented businesses, however, shall not be allowed.

Development Area B shall be developed in accordance with the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance and the use and development regulations of the CH-Commercial Heavy and IL-Industrial Light districts, except as modified herein. It is recognized a vehicle service and major repair facility is proposed to be located in Development Area B.

The Subject Property is located within the City of Broken Arrow Highway Design Overlay (HDO) district. The HDO standards are intended to ensure that development along designated highways within Broken Arrow present an attractive image of the community to city residents and highway drivers, thus contributing to the overall quality of life and economic development in the city.

## RECEIVED

September 21, 2020

## DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Development Area A

## HIGHWAY DESIGN OVERLAY (HDO) DESIGN STANDARDS

Building design orientation, wall articulation, entrances, and fencing shall meet the HDO standards and multiple buildings in commercial centers shall employ a consistent architectural style or theme, be constructed of similar materials, and feature similar colors.

GROSS LAND AREA 129,415 SF / 2.9710 AC

NET LAND AREA*
87,120 SF / 2.0000 AC
*The net land area is conceptual and may be modified pursuant to the subdivision platting process.

## PERMITTED USES

As allowed in the CH-Commercial Heavy district except vehicle sales and rental shall be recognized as a permitted use. Sexually oriented businesses, however, shall not be allowed.

MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO
Not Applicable
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT
2 Stories
(35 feet)

## BUILDING MATERIALS

Building design will be in accordance with the Highway Design Overlay district standards in Section 5.8.I.4. Any poles used to support canopies associated with convenience stores shall be wrapped in brick.

## MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACK

From each boundary fronting a public street, including the Broken Arrow Expressway off ramp, the minimum building setback from the right-of-way shall be fifty (50) feet.

From interior boundaries, the minimum building setback is zero (0) feet, provided that building code requirements are met.

MINIMUM LANDSCAPING PERCENTAGE
$10 \%$ of net lot

## MINIMUM LANDSCAPING EDGE

A landscape edge of at least 10 feet in width shall be provided adjacent to all highway and public street frontages.

As required for the applicable use within the

CH District

## OTHER BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS

As required for the applicable use within the CH District

## LANDSCAPING

Landscaping shall meet the requirements of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance (the "Zoning Ordinance") except as hereinafter modified. In addition to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the following landscaping standards shall be applicable:

In addition to required trees, shrubs shall be provided as set forth within Section 5.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, provided however, shrubs may be evenly spaced or grouped.

Broken Arrow Expressway off ramp and North Aspen Avenue: Not less than one tree shall be planted for each 25 feet of highway and public street frontage. All trees shall be medium to large except where there are conflicts with overhead power lines. The width of the landscape edge shall be as depicted on Exhibit F.

West Albany Drive: Not less than one tree shall be planted for each 30 feet of street frontage. All trees shall be medium to large except where there are conflicts with overhead power lines. The width of the landscape edge shall be as depicted on Exhibit F.

All landscaping within this PUD shall be maintained in accordance with the requirements of Section 5.2 of the Zoning Ordinance. Any landscaping material that fails shall be replaced in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.

## LIGHTING

Exterior lighting shall be in accordance with Section 5.6 of the Zoning Ordinance.

## ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

Principal access is derived from West Albany Drive. Direct access to Aspen Avenue (South 145th East Avenue) and to the Broken Arrow Expressway shall be prohibited. All access points on West Albany Drive shall align with any access points on the north side of the street and shall be spaced at least 150 feet apart, centerline to centerline, on both sides of the street, except as follow:

If the westernmost drive serving the Jim Norton Chevrolet dealership remains as it exists in September 2020, only one access point shall be permitted on West Albany Drive from Development Area A, and it shall align with said westernmost drive;

## RECEIVED

September 21, 2020

If the westernmost drive serving the Jim Norton Chevrolet dealership is permanently closed and physically removed, two access points shall be permitted on West Albany Drive from Development Area A as depicted on Exhibit E. The centerline of the western access point shall be 150 feet from the existing east curb line of Aspen Avenue, and the two drives serving Development Area A shall be separated by 120 feet, centerline to centerline.

Sidewalks, not less than 5 feet in width, shall be constructed along Aspen Avenue (South 145th East Avenue) and West Albany Drive by the developer in accordance with the City Subdivision Regulations.

## SIGNAGE

All freestanding signs within this PUD shall be installed in accordance with Section 5.7.D of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance except as follows:

Only one pylon sign shall be allowed for the overall PUD, and it shall be limited to 25 feet in height. A separate application for a Specific Use Permit is not required.

All freestanding signs shall have a monument type base of substantially the same material as the exterior of the principal building on the lot.

## Directional and Wayfinding Signs

Directional and wayfinding signs are allowed and shall not be considerd as a freestanding sign as long as the sign is less than 25 square feet in size and less than 5 feet in height.

## Wall Signs

Wall signs shall be installed in accordance with Section 5.7 of the Zoning Ordinance and the Highway Design Overlay district, except as hereinafter modified.

## FENCING

The use of chain link, barbed, or razor wire shall be prohibited.

RECEIVED
September 21, 2020
bROKEN ARROW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

## UTILITIES

Utilities are at the site or accessible by customary extension. The drainage system will be designed in accordance with the City of Broken Arrow standard specifications.

## SITE PLAN REVIEW

Development areas may be developed in phases and no building permit shall issue until a detailed site plan (including landscaping) of the proposed improvements has been
submitted to the City and approved as being consistent with the development concept and the development standards. No certificate of occupancy shall be issued for a building until the landscaping of the applicable phase of development has been installed in accordance with a landscaping plan and phasing schedule submitted to and approved by the City.

## PLATTING REQUIREMENT

Development areas may be developed in phases, and no building permit shall be issued until the development phase for which a permit is sought has been included within a subdivision plat submitted to and reviewed by the Broken Arrow Planning Commission and approved by the City Council and duly filed of record. The required subdivision plat shall include covenants of record implementing the development standards of the approved planned unit development and the City shall be a beneficiary thereof. Nothing above set forth shall preclude the exercise of the authority of the City to issue a building permit upon site plan approval, which may include conditions such as a requirement that the applicable phase shall be platted prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit.

## RECEIVED

September 21, 2020 broken arrow COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

## DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

## Development Area B

## HIGHWAY DESIGN OVERLAY (HDO) DESIGN STANDARDS

Building design orientation, wall articulation, entrances, and fencing shall meet the HDO standards and multiple buildings in commercial centers shall employ a consistent architectural style or theme, be constructed of similar materials, and feature similar colors.

GROSS LAND AREA
171,406 SF / 3.9349 AC
NET LAND AREA*
134,989 SF / 3.0989 AC
*The net land area is conceptual and may be modified pursuant to the subdivision platting process.

## PERMITTED USES

The only permitted uses in Development Area B are as follows:

- Restaurant, drive-in
- Restaurant, drive-thru
- Convenience store with gas sales
- Alcoholic beverages, retail store
- Vehicle sales and rental


## RECEIVED

September 21, 2020 BROKEN ARROW
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- Vehicle services and repair, major
- Vehicle services and repair, minor

MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT
2 Stories
(35 feet)

## BUILDING MATERIALS

Building design will be in accordance with the Highway Design Overlay district standards in Section 5.8.I.4.

Blue and white metal wall panels will be used on the vehicle service and repair - major use Collision Center building consistent with the other corporate branded Jim Norton Chevrolet Buildings within PUD-94S located north of West Albany Drive.

## MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACK

From each boundary fronting a public street, including the Broken Arrow Expressway off ramp, the minimum building setback from the right-of-way shall be fifty (50) feet,
provided however; overhead doors used for service and repair and oriented toward a street shall have a minimum setback of 150 feet.

From interior boundaries, the minimum building setback is 0 feet, provided that building code requirements are met.

MINIMUM LANDSCAPING PERCENTAGE
$10 \%$ of net lot

## MINIMUM LANDSCAPING EDGE

A landscape edge of at least 10 feet in width shall be provided adjacent to all highway and public street frontages.

## MINIMUM SCREENING

To screen vehicles awaiting repairs, a six foot high masonry and wood screening fence as depicted on Exhibit I, along with trees as set forth below, shall be installed around the area used for storing damaged vehicles. The use of chain link, barbed wire, or razor wire shall be prohibited.

MINIMUM OFF-STREET PARKING

OTHER BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS

As required for the
applicable use
As required for the applicable use within the

CH and IL Districts

## LANDSCAPING

Landscaping shall meet the requirements of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance (the "Zoning Ordinance") except as hereinafter modified. In addition to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the following landscaping standards shall be applicable:

In addition to required trees, shrubs shall be provided as set forth within Section 5.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, provided however, shrubs may be evenly spaced or grouped.

Broken Arrow Expressway off ramp: Not less than one tree shall be planted for each 25 feet of highway frontage. No less than $90 \%$ of the required trees along the frontage shall be evergreen. The majority of required trees shall be planted along the south side of the collision center as depicted on Exhibit F to screen damaged vehicles. All trees shall be medium to large except where there are conflicts with overhead power lines. The width of the landscape edge shall be as depicted on Exhibit F.

West Albany Drive: Not less than one tree shall be planted for each 30 feet of street frontage. No less than $75 \%$ of the required trees along the frontage shall be evergreen. All trees shall be medium to large except where there are conflicts with overhead power lines. The width of the landscape edge shall be as depicted on Exhibit F.

All landscaping within this PUD shall be maintained in accordance with the requirements of Section 5.2 of the Zoning Ordinance. Any landscaping material that fails shall be replaced in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.

## LIGHTING

Exterior lighting shall be in accordance with Section 5.6 of the Zoning Ordinance.

## ACCESS AND CIRCULATION

Principal access is derived from West Albany Drive. Direct access to the Broken Arrow Expressway shall be prohibited. All access points on West Albany Drive shall align with any access points on the north side of the street and shall be spaced at least 150 feet apart, centerline to centerline, on both sides of the street.

Sidewalks, not less than 5 feet in width, shall be constructed along West Albany Drive by the developer in accordance with the City Subdivision Regulations.

## SIGNAGE

All freestanding signs within this PUD shall be installed in accordance with Section 5.7.D of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance except as follows:

Only one pylon sign shall be allowed for the overall PUD, and it shall be limited to 25 feet in height. A separate application for a Specific Use Permit is not required.

All freestanding signs shall have a monument type base of substantially the same material as the exterior of the principal building on the lot.

## Directional and Wayfinding Signs

Directional and wayfinding signs are allowed and shall not be considerd as a freestanding sign as long as the sign is less than 25 square feet in size and less than 5 feet in height.

## Wall Signs

Wall signs shall be installed in accordance with Section 5.7 of the Zoning Ordinance and the Highway Design Overlay district, except as hereinafter modified.

## OPERATIONAL LIMITATIONS

All damaged vehicles awaiting repairs shall be parked or stored on surfaces paved with asphalt or concrete.

## UTILITIES

## RECEIVED

September 21, 2020 BROKEN ARROW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Utilities are at the site or accessible by customary extension. The drainage system will be designed in accordance with the City of Broken Arrow standard specifications.

## SITE PLAN REVIEW

Development areas may be developed in phases and no building permit shall issue until a detailed site plan (including landscaping) of the proposed improvements has been submitted to the City and approved as being consistent with the development concept and the development standards. No certificate of occupancy shall be issued for a building until the landscaping of the applicable phase of development has been installed in accordance with a landscaping plan and phasing schedule submitted to and approved by the City.

## PLATTING REQUIREMENT

Development areas may be developed in phases, and no building permit shall be issued until the development phase for which a permit is sought has been included within a subdivision plat submitted to and approved by the Broken Arrow Planning Commission and the City Council and duly filed of record. The required subdivision plat shall include covenants of record implementing the development standards of the approved planned unit development and the City shall be a beneficiary thereof. Nothing above set forth shall preclude the exercise of the authority of the City to issue a building permit upon site plan approval, which may include conditions such as a requirement that the applicable phase shall be platted prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit.

## RECEIVED

September 21, 2020

A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION THIRTY-FOUR (34), TOWNSHIP NINETEEN (19) NORTH, RANGE FOURTEEN (14) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 34; THENCE SOUTH $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ WEST ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SECTION 34 FOR 2960.94 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF WEST ALBANY DRIVE SOUTH, SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND; THENCE ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF WEST ALBANY DRIVE SOUTH FOR THE FOLLOWING FIVE (5) DESCRIBED COURSES: THENCE SOUTH $90^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST FOR 341.63 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT WITH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $100^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime}$, A RADIUS OF 350.00 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF SOUTH $39^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A CHORD LENGTH OF 537.66 FEET, FOR AN ARC LENGTH OF 613.08 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $10^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 48{ }^{\prime \prime}$ WEST FOR 50.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTHERLY AND SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT WITH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $40^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 59^{\prime \prime}$, A RADIUS OF 350.00 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF SOUTH 09ํ.48'41" EAST, A CHORD LENGTH OF 241.42 FEET, FOR AN ARC LENGTH OF 246.48 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $29^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime}$ EAST FOR 9.70 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $60^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ WEST FOR 40.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF THE BROKEN ARROW EXPRESSWAY; THENCE ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OFWAY LINE AND NORTHWESTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT, WITH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $28^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$, A RADIUS OF 662.96 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH $44^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A CHORD LENGTH OF 327.95 FEET, FOR AN ARC LENGTH OF 331.39 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $31^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ WEST ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE FOR 10.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 680 $02^{\prime} 57^{\prime \prime}$ WEST ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE FOR 374.62 FEET; THENCE NORTH $90^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ WEST FOR 106.53 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERLY LINE OF SECTION 34; THENCE NORTH $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ALONG SAID WESTERLY LINE FOR 362.24 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION
(GROSS DEVELOPMENT AREA A)
A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION THIRTY-FOUR (34), TOWNSHIP NINETEEN (19) NORTH, RANGE FOURTEEN (14) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 34 ; THENCE SOUTH $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ WEST ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SECTION 34 FOR 2960.94 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF WEST ALBANY DRIVE SOUTH, SAID POINT ALSO BEING THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND; THENCE SOUTH $90^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF WEST ALBANY DRIVE SOUTH FOR 329.58 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00{ }^{\prime \prime}$ WEST AND PARALLEL WITH THE WESTERLY LINE OF SECTION 34 FOR 452.14 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF THE BROKEN ARROW EXPRESSWAY; THENCE NORTH 6802'57" WEST ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE FOR 240.49 FEET; THENCE NORTH 9000'00" WEST FOR 106.53 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERLY LINE OF SECTION 34; THENCE NORTH $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ALONG SAID WESTERLY LINE FOR 362.24 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION<br>(GROSS DEVELOPMENT AREA B)

A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION THIRTY-FOUR (34), TOWNSHIP NINETEEN (19) NORTH, RANGE FOURTEEN (14) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SECTION 34 ; THENCE SOUTH $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ WEST ALONG THE WESTERLY LINE OF SECTION 34 FOR 2960.94 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WESTERLY EXTENSION OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF WEST ALBANY DRIVE SOUTH; THENCE SOUTH $90^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF WEST ALBANY STREET SOUTH FOR 329.58 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND; THENCE ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY CENTERLINE OF WEST ALBANY DRIVE SOUTH FOR THE FOLLOWING FIVE (5) DESCRIBED COURSES: THENCE CONTINUING SOUTH $90^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00{ }^{\prime \prime}$ EAST FOR 12.05 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY AND SOUTHERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT WITH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $100^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime}$, A RADIUS OF 350.00 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF SOUTH $39^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A CHORD LENGTH OF 537.66 FEET, FOR AN ARC LENGTH OF 613.08 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $10^{\circ} 21^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime}$ WEST FOR 50.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTHERLY AND SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT WITH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $40^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 59{ }^{\prime \prime}$, A RADIUS OF 350.00 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF SOUTH $09^{\circ} 48^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A CHORD LENGTH OF 241.42 FEET, FOR AN ARC LENGTH OF 246.48 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 2959'11" EAST FOR 9.70 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $60^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 49$ " WEST FOR 40.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF THE BROKEN ARROW EXPRESSWAY; THENCE ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE AND NORTHWESTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT, WITH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $28^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$, A RADIUS OF 662.96 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH $44^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A CHORD LENGTH OF 327.95 FEET, FOR AN ARC LENGTH OF 331.39 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $31^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ WEST ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE FOR 10.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 6802'57" WEST ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE FOR 134.13 FEET; THENCE NORTH $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ EAST AND PARALLEL WITH THE WESTERLY LINE OF SECTION 34 FOR 452.14 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND.




Planned Unit Development No. 94 V


Adjacent Land Use and Zoning
EXHIBIT ‘D’





Landscape and Open Space Concept Plan
EXHIBIT ' F '
Planned Unit Development No. 94 V



Location Map

## Legend

- PROPOSED DRAINAGE FLOW

■ FH EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT

- w - EXISTING WATERLINE

EXISTING SANITARY SEWER
-SD- EXISTING STORM SEWER
-e - existing overhead power
-UT- EXISTING UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE
—SD- PROPOSED STORM SEWER
-SS— PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER


Existing and Proposed Utility Plan
EXHIBIT 'G'
Planned Unit Development No. 94 V



# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1257, Version: 1

## Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 10-08-2020

To: Chairman and Commission Members
From: Development Services Department
Title:
Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-276A (Planned Unit Development Minor Amendment), Timber Ridge Cottages, 8.05 acres, RM/PUD-276, one-quarter mile south of Kenosha Street ( $71^{\text {st }}$ Street), east of $37^{\text {th }}$ Street (209 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ E Avenue)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Location:
Size of Tract
Present Zoning:
Proposed Zoning:

## Comp Plan:

DHTC Development, LLC
Timber Ridge Cottages Broken Arrow, LP
DHTC Development, LLC
Crockett Engineering Consultants
One-quarter mile south of Kenosha Street, east of 209th E Avenue 8.05 acres

RM (Residential Multi-Family) and PUD-276
RM (Residential Multi-Family) and PUD-276A
Level 3

Planned Unit Development (PUD)-276A, minor amendment to PUD-276, involves an 8.05 acre parcel located one-quarter mile south of Kenosha Street, east of $209^{\text {th }}$ E Avenue. The property is zoned RM (Residential Multi -Family) and PUD-276 and has been platted as Lot 1, Block 1, Timber Ridge Cottages.

BACP-161, a request to change the comprehensive plan designation on this property from Level 4 to Level 3, was approved by the City Council on April 17, 2018. BAZ-1998 and PUD-276 were approved on this property by City Council on May 1, 2018.

Timber Ridge Cottages is a senior multi-family housing with a mix of duplex (6 units), 4 Plex ( 40 units), and apartment style dwellings ( 28 units) for a total of 74 units. With PUD-276A, the applicant is requesting to reduce the landscaping requirements in Section 5.2.B.1.a.iii of the Zoning Ordinance. This section requires that, in the RM district, at least two trees and five shrubs be planted per multi-family housing unit. Due to the compact nature of this development, the applicant is requesting to reduce this requirement to one tree and three shrubs per unit. All other landscaping requirements, perimeter landscaping and parking lot landscaping, will be provided per the Zoning Ordinance. In total, 132 trees and 222 shrubs will be required for this development if PUD-276A is approved. All other provisions of PUD-276 shall remain as approved.

File \#: 20-1257, Version: 1

## SURROUNDING LAND USES/ZONING/COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The surrounding properties contain the following uses, along with the following development guide and zoning designations:

| Location | Development Guide | Zoning | Land Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Level 4 | A-1 | Undeveloped |
| East | Level 4 | CG | Undeveloped/Creek Turnpike |
| South | Level 4 | A-1/SP-164 | Ridge at Broken Arrow (Place of <br> Assembly) |
| West | Level 4 | A-1 | Undeveloped |

None of the property is located in a 100-year floodplain area.
The property associated with PUD-276A is designated as Level 3 of the Comprehensive Plan. The development proposed with PUD-276A is considered to be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 3.

| Attachments: | Case map |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Aerial photo |
|  | PUD-276A Design Statement |
|  | PUD-276A Exhibit |

## Recommendation:

Based on the location of the property, the surrounding land uses, and the nature of the amendment request, Staff recommends that PUD-276A be approved.

## Reviewed By: Jill Ferenc

## Approved By: Larry R. Curtis

## ALY




# CNGDSMETMT <br> ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS <br> 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard Building \#1 <br> Columbia, Missouri 65203 <br> (573) 447-0292 

August 31, 2020

RE: Timber Ridge Cottages - PUD \#276
Proposed Minor Amendment

The current proposed landscape plan is attached.
The requested Minor Amendment would allow:

1. The landscape plan to be revised to show the reduction of trees, from 2 to 1 , and shrubs, from 5 to 3 , which are required to be planted.

All other provisions, previously approved by the City of Broken Arrow, of the PUD shall remain in effect.

Sincerely,
Crockett Engineering Consultants, LLC


Andy Greene, PE


# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1258, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>10-08-2020

To:
Chairman and Commission Members
Development Services Department
Title:
Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-2068 (Rezoning), Medwise Urgent Care South, 29.18 acres, A-1 (Agricultural)/SP-270 (Specific Use Permit) to CN (Commercial Neighborhood) and ON (Office Neighborhood), south of the Creek Turnpike, east of Elm Place (161 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ East Avenue)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Surveyor:
Location:
Size of Tract
Number of Lots:
Present Zoning: A-1/SP-270
Proposed Zoning: ON and CN/SP-270
Comp Plan: Level 4 (Commercial/ Employment Nodes) and Level 2 (Urban Residential)
BAZ-2068 is a request to change the zoning designation on a 29.18-acre tract from A-1 (Agricultural)/SP-270 to CN (Commercial Neighborhood) and ON (Office Neighborhood). The property has been platted as Lot 1, Block 1, Lifechurch.tv Broken Arrow South.

The applicant is proposing to rezone the east 27.97 acres, to ON for the LifeChurch property. The west 1.21 acres is requested to be rezoned to CN for a proposed urgent care facility. With the current A-1 zoning designation, the property is required to have 330 -feet of street frontage. In order to split the property and have both new parcels meet the street frontage requirements, a rezoning in necessary. The proposed ON and CN zoning districts were chosen based on the current and proposed uses of the property.

A Specific Use Permit, SP-270, was approved on this property on August 6, 2013 by the City Council. Section 3.2.B.6 of the Zoning Ordinance states that where an assembly use is originally approved by a specific use or PUD, any subsequent associated development which increases the intensity of the use on the site by more than what has been approved shall require an amendment to the specific use or PUD. In order to allow the proposed urgent care facility, SP-270 needs to be abrogated on the portion of the property being rezoned to CN. The remainder of the property, which is being requested to be rezoned to ON, will retain the provisions of SP-270.

File \#: 20-1258, Version: 1
If any change of use is proposed on this property, the property owner will need to submit an application to amend the specific use permit.

Access to this property is through a private drive located to the south of the Creek Turnpike. The property plat has a limits of no access along the northwest boundary of the property. Any newly created parcel will be required to utilize the existing LifeChurch driveway and obtain a mutual access easement. No future access points shall be allowed onto Elm Place.

Surrounding land uses and zoning classifications include the following:

| North: | A-1 | Creek Turnpike |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| East: | A-1 | Undeveloped |
| South: | R-2 | Single-Family Residential |
| West: | CG | Commercial Development |

This property is in Level 4 (Commercial/Employment Node) and Level 2 (Urban Residential) of the Comprehensive Plan. CN is considered to be in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 4. ON is considered in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 2, provided the site is located adjacent to an arterial street and none of the traffic from the ON area shall utilize roads that pass through a single-family residential neighborhood. According to the FEMA maps, none of the property is located in a 100 -year floodplain area.

Attachments: Case map for BAZ-2063
Aerial photo
Comprehensive Plan
Exhibit A

## Recommendation:

Based on the Comprehensive Plan, the location of the property, and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommends that BAZ-2068 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Access to any future development on the CN property be through a mutual access easement to the existing drive onto Elm Place.
2. The portion of SP-270 in the area being rezoned to CN shall be abrogated.
3. Any change in use of the ON property shall require an update to $\mathrm{SP}-270$.

## Reviewed by: Jill Ferenc

Approved by: Larry R. Curtis

ALY











section i. easements and utilities
A. utlity easements

b. underground service





3. THE SUPPLIER OF ELECTRIC. TELEPHONE CABLETELEVISION SERVICES, THROUGH ITS


 NECESSITATED BY ACT

c. Water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer service


2. WITHINTHE UTLITY EASEMENT AREAS DEPICTED ON THE ACCOMPANYNG PLAT. THE





- gas service

1. The owner of the lot shall be responsible for the protection of the
2. Within the oeplocto utilit easmen areas. the alteration of grade or any







e. stormwater detention





a. the detention easement areas shall be kept free of litter.
b. THE DETENTION EASEMENT AREAS SHALL BE MOWED DURING THE GROWING
c. INTHE EVENT OF THE OWNERDEVELOPER SHOULD FALL TO PROPERLY MAINTAIN

d. IN THE EVENT THE OWNERIDEVELOPER, AFTER COMPLETION OF THE MAINTENANCE




F. Limits of no access

THE UNDERSIGNED OWNERIDEVELOPER HEREBY RELINQUISHES RIGHTS OF VEHICULARINGRESS
OREGRESTROMANPORTON OF THEPROPRTY ADJACENT TO SOUTH ELM PLACE ISOUTH

 be enforceable by the oklahoma turnpike
THE OWNER OF THE LOT AFFECTED SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE EOR THE REPAR OF DAMAGE TO ELEVISION OR ELECTRIC FACILTIES WITHIN THE EASEMENT AREAS DEPICETE N.
 h. overland drainage easement



2. THE OERLANDRANAGE EASEMENT SHAL REMAINASA NATUAL UNMPROVED AREA







action enforcement, ouration, amendment and severablit
A. enforcement





b. duration



City of broken arrow case \#pt 13 -10


```
c. amendment
```



```
    O
    *)
    l
0. Severabllity
N
in mitness whereof, life covenant church, inc, has executed this instrument
THIS 24 DAY OF JANuARY_}201
M, Keorumy_
state of oklahoma { ss.
ounty of oklahoma , ss.,
His instrument was acknowledged beforeme on this 29 day of SAmumay_2014
Mkent penry, vice president operation
    Gimim. Evracts
MY CoMMISSION EXP/IRES S
Ma,
certificate of surver
```




```
*)
EXECUTED THISG DAY OF FEBRUNRY_2014
Br_l, Darle fomeqet 
egistered professional lano subveyor,
klahoma number /556
state of oklahoma
county of tulsa
The foregoing certificate of surverwas acknowLedged before me on
this_l dar of Felloruary__}201
byr. wade bennett, registered professional land surveyor
Clivalcth Zranklin
0zᅧᄂ
\frac{12-1f-16}{MY COMMISSION EXPIRES}
M,
```



## City of Broken Arrow

## Request for Action

File \#: 20-1207, Version: 1

## Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 10-08-2020

To: $\quad$ Chairman and Commission Members
From: Development Services Department
Title:

## Consideration and possible approval of the 2021 Planning Commission meeting and calendar schedule

## Background:

For the past several years, Planning Commission meetings have been scheduled for the second and fourth Thursday of each month, at 5:00 p.m., with exceptions in November and December. Planning Commission meetings have been scheduled for the first and third Thursday of each month during the months of, November and December, at 5:00 p.m.

## Attachments: 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Dates

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the Planning Commission meeting schedule for meetings scheduled on the second and fourth Thursday of each month from January through October, and meetings scheduled for the first and third Thursday of each month during November and December. Meetings shall occur at 5:00 pm in the City Council Chambers.

## Reviewed By: Jill Ferenc

## Approved By: Larry R. Curtis

## ALY

# 2021 CALENDAR YEAR <br> SCHEDULE OF REGULAR MEETINGS <br> Planning Commission 

## CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS <br> 220 SOUTH FIRST STREET <br> BROKEN ARROW, OKLAHOMA

## DATE

January 14, 2021
January 28, 2021
February 11, 2021
February 25, 2021
March 11, 2021
March 25, 2021
April 08, 2021
April 22, 2021
May 13, 2021
May 27, 2021
June 10, 2021
June 24, 2021
July 08, 2021
July 22, 2021
August 12, 2021
August 26, 2021
September 09, 2021
September 23, 2021
October 14, 2021
October 28, 2021
November 04, 2021
November 18, 2021
December 02, 2021
December 16, 2021

TIME
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.
5:00 p.m.

PLACE
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers
Council Chambers

Posted this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2020, at $\qquad$ am/pm

Signed:
City Clerk


[^0]:    'On December 10, 2018, applicants Sooner Green, L.L.C. and Heather Whitsell and The Oklahoma Municipal League filed an application to file an Amicus Curiae Brief without consent by the parties. On December 12, 2018, we deferred consideration of the motion to the decisional stage. Because of our holding, an amicus curiae brief is

[^1]:    caregiver is age eighteen (18) or older, and must submit proof the caregiver is an Oklahoma resident. This will be the only criteria for a caregiver license.
    L. All applicants must be eighteen (18) years or older. A special exception will be granted to an applicant under the age of eighteen (18), however these applications must be signed by two (2) physicians and the applicant's parent or legal guardian.
    M. All applications for a medical license must be signed by an Oklahoma Board certified physician. There are no qualifying conditions. A medical marijuana license must be recommended according to the accepted standards a reasonable and prudent physician would follow when recommending or approving any medication. No physician may be unduly stigmatized or harassed for signing a medical marijuana license application.
    N. Counties and cities may enact medical marijuana guidelines allowing medical marijuana license holders or caregivers to exceed the state limits set forth in subsection A of this section.
    ${ }^{3}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. 2018 §421.
    ${ }^{4}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. 2018 §422.
    ${ }^{5}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S 423$.
    ${ }^{6}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. 2018 §424.
    ${ }^{7}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S 420$, see note 2, supra.
    ${ }^{8}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S 420$, see note 2 , supra.
    ${ }^{9}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S 425$.

[^2]:    ${ }^{10}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S 425(\mathrm{~F})$ provided:
    No city or local municipality may unduly change or restrict zoning laws to prevent the opening of a retail marijuana establishment.
    ${ }^{11}$ The rules were made effective August 25, 2018, or when approved by the Governor, whichever is later. The Governor approved the rules on July $11,2018$.

[^3]:    ${ }^{12}$ Cloudi Mornings attached the Ordinances and the Manual of Fees to its Petition for Declaratory Judgment, but the attachments are unsigned, unfiled copies.

[^4]:    ${ }^{13}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \S 425($ F $)$, see note 10 , supra.

[^5]:    ${ }^{14}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2019 \$ 420$.

[^6]:    ${ }^{15}$ On October 22, 2019, the Tulsa County Court Clerk filed an official, certified supplement to the record which included the trial court's findings.

[^7]:    are found not to have a substantial relation to public health, safety, morals or general welfare or are found to constitute an unreasonable, arbitrary exercise of police power, such judgments will not be overridden by courts.].
    ${ }^{17}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2018 \$ 420$, see note 2, supra.
    ${ }^{18}$ Title 63 O.S. Supp. $2019 \S 425$, see also discussion page 9, supra.

[^8]:    ${ }^{19}$ Quail Creek Golf v. Oklahoma Tax Commission, 1996 OK 35, $\| 10,913$ P.2d 302; See, Texas County Irrigation \& Water Resources Ass'n v. Oklahoma Water Resources Board, 1990 OK 121, 46, 803 P.2d 1119; See also, Board of Education v. Morris, 1982 OK 142, $\{9,656$ P. 2 d 258 ; Magnolia Pipe Line Co., v. Oklahoma Tax Commission, 1946 OK 113, โ11, 167 P.2d 884.
    ${ }^{20}$ Quail Creek Golf v. Oklahoma Tax Commission, see note 20, supra; Texas County Irrigation \& Water Resources Ass'n v. Oklahoma Water Resources Board, see note 20, supra; Magnolia Pipe Line Co., v. Oklahoma Tax Commission, see note 20 , supra.
    ${ }^{21}$ Quail Creek Golf v. Oklahoma Tax Commission, see note 20, supra; Texas County Irrigation \& Water Resources Ass'n v. Oklahoma Water Resources Board, see note 20, supra; Magnolia Pipe Line Co., v. Oklahoma Tax Commission, see note 20, supra. See also, Polymer Fabricating, Inc. v. Employers Worker's Compensation Association, 1998 OK 113, $\$ 15,980$ P.2d 108; Board of Education, Vici Public Schools, v. Morris, 1982 OK 142, 49, 688 P.2d 258.

[^9]:    ${ }^{24}$ Hunsucker v. Fallin, 2017 OK 100, 5,408 P. 3 d 599 [This Court possesses discretion to grant standing to private parties to vindicate the public interest in cases presenting issues of great public importance. This discretion is properly exercised to grant standing where there are "competing policy considerations" and "lively conflict between antagonistic demands."]; Osage Nation v. Bd. of Comm'rs, 2017 OK 34, 961, 394 P. 3 d 1224 [ We have recently explained standing must be predicated on cognizable economic harm when a legislative act is chatlenged as unconstitutional or invalid. A person who seeks to invalidate a statute as unconstitutional must establish standing by showing that the legislation sought to be invalidated detrimentally affects his/her interest in a direct, immediate and substantial manner. Similarly, in some states, standing based upon public nuisance and municipal zoning law is based upon an allegation of injury to the plaintiff which is different in kind from that experienced by the residents in general. Standing to challenge the ordinance itself apart from the construction requires a different analysis, but also must be based upon a legally cognizable interest infringed by the challenged legislation (ordinance)]. Even the Amicus Curie applicants acknowledge in their application that "as framed the issues(s) pending before this Court does not address whether a municipality with its regulatory powers can outright ban or prohibit lawful activity approved by a vote of the citizens of the State of Oklahoma."
    ${ }^{25}$ A comparable situation might be Knight v. Miller, 2008 OK 81, ๆ11, 195 P.3d 372 wherein the injured party was merely seeking a declaration that the insurer would be obligated to pay any judgment that he might recover against the tortfeasor. The Court held that the injured party had no legally cognizable or protective interest in the controversy and would not have one unless and until he succeeded in the negligence action.

