

**MINUTES**  
**JENKS PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**6:00 P.M. THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2020**

The Jenks Planning Commission was called to order at 6:02 p.m. on May 21, 2020 by Chair Carol Minden. A roll call vote of members was taken as follows:

**Present**

Travis Fulkerson - Videoconference  
John Brown - Videoconference  
Scott West - Videoconference  
Leon Davis - Videoconference  
Craig Bowman - Videoconference  
David Randolph - Videoconference  
Chair Carol Minden- Videoconference

**Absent**

Request to approve minutes of May 07, 2020. Scott West made a motion to approve the minutes. Craig Bowman seconded the motion. A roll call vote of members was taken as follows:

**YEA:** Fulkerson, Brown, West, Davis, Bowman, Randolph, Minden

**NAY:** None

Motion carried.

Business

1. TUP 20-45: Request by Jake's Fireworks for a Temporary Use Permit to allow for the retail sale of fireworks. General Location 728 W Main **Withdrawn by applicant**
2. Request to recommend approval of Ordinance No. 1519, removing the zoning fees from the Jenks Zoning Code and replacing language referencing the Master Fee Schedule.

Planning Director Marcaé Hilton introduced Item 2. John Brown made a motion to approve Item 2. David Randolph seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

**YEA:** Fulkerson, Brown, West, Davis, Bowman, Randolph, Minden

**NAY:** None

Motion carried

Old Business

1. PA 20-17: Request by Robert Bell for an amendment to the Jenks Comprehensive Plan. General Location: 813 E B St.

Planning Director Marcaé Hilton presented her staff report and recommended approval. She answered questions after public comments were read by staff. *Public comments listed at end of minutes.* Robert Bell (1011 W G St) addressed the Commission about the application and answered questions. John Brown made a motion to approve Item 3 under the restriction that PUD be brought back at a later date to address all the items that were discussed at this meeting. Leon Davis seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

**YEA:** Fulkerson, Brown, West, Davis, Bowman, Randolph, Minden

**NAY:** None

Motion carried.

2. JZ 20-655: Request by Robert Bell for a zone change to ROC (River Oriented Commercial). **General Location:** 813 E B St

Planning Director Marcaé Hilton requested that all other cases on the agenda related to Old Business Item 1 be tabled to the next meeting. Travis Fulkerson made a motion to table Items 2-5 to the next meeting. Craig Bowman seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken as follows:

**YEA:** Fulkerson, Brown, Davis, Bowman, Randolph, Minden

**NAY:** West

Motion carried; Item tabled to next meeting

3. JZ 20-654 PUD 120: Request by Robert Bell for Planned Unit Development 120 – Fidler Acre. **General Location:** 813 E B St

Item tabled to next meeting

4. ROWUEC 20-74: Request by Robert Bell for a Utility Easement Closure. **General Location:** 813 E B St.

Item tabled to next meeting.

5. Request by Robert Bell for approval of Fidler Acre Preliminary Plat. **General Location:** 813 E B St.

Item tabled to next meeting.

#### Other Business

1. Planning Update

Planning Director Marcaé Hilton gave a Planning Department update.

2. Horizon Jenks – Comprehensive Plan Project Update.

Planning Director Marcaé Hilton gave an update on the Jenks Comprehensive Plan.

Adjournment. Scott West made a motion to adjourn. John Brown seconded the motion. A roll call vote of members was taken as follows:

**YEA:** West, Brown, Fulkerson, Davis, Bowman, Randolph, Minden

**NAY:** None

Motion carried. The Jenks Planning Commission adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Planning Commission | questions from Public as of 2020.05.21



Lloyd Landreth | email 2020.05.07 | 801 E B St

Brandon:

Thank you for taking the time to visit with me regarding the request for a zoning change from OM to ROC on the property adjacent to my law office. I was unaware of the manner in which I could provide these comments given the inability to appear in-person, and such information was not given in the materials associated with the A-frame on the property. I would summarize my comments as follows:

- I am in support of some form of development of the property. In its current condition, it represents a negative and not a beneficial use.
- I oppose any use or development of the property that requires any additional utility ROW, utility structures, or burdens/easements on my property.
- I oppose any use of vibrating compaction in development of the property.
- Due to the likely need for placement of impervious surfaces, all surface water drainage must be properly managed.
- It is unclear from the Application materials how the property is split into two lots? The "Subject Tract" would seem to have to rely on the other tract to support it, as there is not enough land to have two independent uses.
- The project proponent should fully address the question of what conditions have changed since the zoning change from Residential to OM. In other words, what has changed that would justify a departure from the Comprehensive Plan setting of OM use?
- Any use of the property should be required to first demonstrate such use has accounted for ample parking spaces and driveway/road ingress and egress that does not rely or burden my property, or any residential property in the area.
- Ornamental/privacy fencing must be required along the Western boundary of the property, including fencing or some other type of physical barrier along the entirety of the property line shared with my property, so that any users of the subject tract cannot drive on or otherwise cross onto my property in any way.
- Trash dumpsters and any other waste or recyclable receptacles should be placed in a designated area as far to the East and North on the property as possible. In other words, all such waste receptacles should be hidden and as far away from residential use and my office as possible.
- The business hours of any use of the property should be compatible with my office use and residential use.

As noted, I have no expectations this property would remain in an unoccupied condition. The City of Jenks and those of us who live and work in the immediate area can benefit from a well-planned, attractive and compatible use. I appreciate the efforts of the Planning Commission to abide by these criteria in their consideration of this zoning change.

Respectfully,

LL

 Carolyn Morgan | email 2020.05.07 | 404 W B St

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have a couple of questions that I would like to have addressed at the meeting tonight.

Are there current plans to alleviate the traffic congestion going East on 'B' Street at 9th? The already extreme congestion from the Jenks Bridge through the intersection and down B street is already not under control.

Why is the city information mail box A-frame and the real estate sign on the property adjacent to the lot at 813 E. B? The zoning is RS-1 on your map. In the previous hearings the residents thought BOTH properties were zoned OM.

Please read and address these issues during the meeting tonight.

Sincerely,

Aaron M. Morgan II  
Carolyn A. Morgan

 Eric and Melody Castrellon | email 2020.05.04 | 313 N 8<sup>th</sup> St

Dear Brandon,

My Neighbor Aaron Morgan gave me your email address. I did receive notice of a public hearing this week concerning a parcel owned by Rob Bell located against my property at 313 N.8th St. I had a good conversation with Rob Bell concerning the direction he is intending to go with his property. We were promised a fence in the event the city passes and changes the use of his property. I would like to attend said mtg if I can online or physically if needed.

I am asking the city planners to allow for restaurant and said changes only in the event it increases the apperance and adds to the value of our community. I just ask PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW A HIGH RISE APT. OR CONDO OR OFFICE BUILDING that will overlook into our backyard....ANYTHING FUN IS OK, Anything food resturant riverwalk nostalgic would be exciting and valuble to us as a community.

Thank you for your concideration,  
Eric and Melody Castrellon

 Aaron M Morgan II | email 2020.05.03 | 404 W B St

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The history of local concerns about changing zoning code to commercial (of any kind) is on record at City Hall. The objections were confirmed by the City Council and the Planning Commission and an OM zoning was agreed upon.

The problems for the property owners and residents are the same: more congestion, unknown businesses, multi-story structures, noise and pollution. The property is bordered by RS1, RS3 and OM. It is fronted by a two lane residential street that is already at capacity.

Since the last hearing, a short time ago, the OM designation still seems logical, reasonable and appropriate for 813 E. B.

I am opposed to changing zoning to ROC, River Oriented Commercial.

Please read my letter at the hearing on May 7, 2020.

Thank you and Best Regards  
Aaron M. Morgan II



Carolyn Morgan | email 2020.05.03 | 404 W B St  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

As a property owner around the corner from 813 East B, I am greatly concerned about the proposed zoning change to allow river oriented commercial in our neighborhood. Our property backs up to this property and any activity there will directly affect the peace, tranquility and value of our property. . Traffic noise, music, delivery trucks, customer activity - right over the fence from our backyards, will be too close to the homes surrounding that property. We already have to deal with the noise from River Walk and this would be essentially in our backyards. Our property at 317 N. 8th was our home for several years. At the present time we are renting it to friend of the family and do not wish to lose good occupants who may not want to deal with the problems brought on by a river oriented entertainment establishment(s) right on the other side of the fence.

The previous determination made at the last zoning hearing was that an OM zoning was appropriate. The need for protection from improper zoning for our neighborhood remains. We still want our neighborhood to remain a neighborhood and not be adversely affected by noisy, obtrusive businesses.

Sincerely,  
Carolyn A. Morgan



Marie Olsen | email 2020.05.02 | 714 E E St (Ave)

Good evening, members of the Jenks Planning Commission. I am Marie Olsen, and I live at 714 East E St (Ave). I have lived here since 1986, and am now retired. I purchased this home largely because of its location at the end of a cul-de-sac in a quiet neighborhood. With the exception of loud music issues originating from the Riverwalk half of the year, this has remained a peaceful residential neighborhood.

I am very concerned about the proposed zoning change for the property at 813 B St., as this property backs onto our cul-de-sac. Twice before, towards the end of 2018, requests to change the zoning to CS were considered and denied by this commission. The City Council and neighborhood reached a compromise and the zoning was changed to OM at that time. An office building was to be built and the purchaser stated that he could build in such a way as to not invade the backyard privacy of the homes backing onto this property, that traffic would be modest, and that he would install fencing to prevent spillover of foot traffic into our cul-de-sac on E Street. As you know nothing was built, and now we're here again facing this issue.

The property in question is surrounded by residential homes, with the exception of the property next door on B Street which is OM (lawyer's office). The only commercial zoning of any kind is either across the street facing A Street, or way across the levee. My question is, what has changed that would justify changing this property to commercial (ROC) at this time?

Yes, we who live in this neighborhood are very concerned about the negative effects of something like a restaurant or stores being built here. We know that such businesses would of necessity bring traffic noise from patrons and suppliers, and the real possibility of music or entertainment right next door also exists. This zoning change without a doubt will hurt the value of our homes.

I am asking you to please honor the comprehensive plan, and protect the residents in this neighborhood. Thank you.



Marinell Scott-Hall | email 2020.04.29 | 717 E A Ave

My name is Marinell Scott-Hall and I live at 717 East E Ave. in Jenks. I have owned my property since 2002. I am writing as I am unsure if I will be able to attend the meeting on May 7<sup>th</sup> since it is not in person, but online. I have been assured that this letter will be read at the meeting. I am extremely concerned as my neighbors are. I thought this matter was settled once and for all. I am talking about the zoning issue concerning the property 813 East B St. changing the zoning from OM to ROC. I and a number of my neighbors have been to meetings several times in the past. We understood that the original owner had passed away and the relatives wanted to sell and had tried to sell it for a while with no success. They were advised to have the zoning changed and that would sell it. The first prospective buyer wanted to make it commercial and put a strip mall there, we did not feel safe with that idea and voiced that then. We were made aware of the Comprehensive Plan that protected our neighborhood, because it is a residential housing area. It was promised that if anything would be at that location it would fit into that very same category. On the corner on the other side of this property is a Law firm that has done a wonderful job of doing that very thing which I personally appreciate. The next

time we appeared at the commission a second prospective buyer came. This time the owners of this property pleaded that they wanted to sell the property and needed the finances. I told them I appreciated the fact they wanted to sell and I did not have issue with a sale, but the zoning was light office (we thought) needed to become an OM with promises from the buyer. First, our drainage issues would be fixed. Any heavy rain floods our cul-de-sac and drainage is a problem, it comes up in yards and in driveways. This has problem has gone on for years. I believe since the River Walk was built. Second, realizing our concerns for safety and loss of property value, he agreed to build a two story office to look like a large home. When we voiced that our property would not be private, he offered to have no windows in the back of the office. Thirdly, the buyer promised to place a 6 to 8 foot fence or wall for our security. Under those terms we had no problems and felt, finally our neighborhood would be safe and secure. We all watched as the 2 house that were there were leveled. The noise level greatly increased. The property wasn't cleaned up right away and children and adults started cutting through the property coming into the cul-de-sac. It was nearly 4<sup>th</sup> of July and I feared people would get hurt from metal, debris, and a basement hole that was partially covered. I wrote to the city and it was roped off. Afterwards it was cleaned up more and filled in. I waited to see the building progress but there was none. Now we find out the deal we thought we had, obviously has somehow disappeared and we are here yet again about this property. The Comprehensive Plan says and I quote," Prevent the intrusion of inharmonious land uses into residential areas, and also to promote a safe and secure environment." That is all we are asking for, that is what I am asking for. We are residential not Riverfront entertainment. Please protect our Neighborhood.



Judy Catlett | letter 2020.05.06 | 709 E C St

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My name is Judy Catlett. I reside at 709 E C St, now for 47 years.

I am writing in protest to your proposed zoning of said property, general location: 813 E B St her in Jenks. We have fought this zoning change tow other times and we are still against the change. It will decrease property value, and no one at all needs that.

The traffic on B St is bad enough on good days. There have been many near-miss accidents on this intersection. Adding a "Medium Intensity Riverfront Entertainment District Designation" will only add to the existing problem.

We have some noise from Louie's when outside activities are going on. But from the Riverwalk area when they have bands with singers the noise is very loud. You can have a party and hear the music for your party loud and clear.

I also have questions about the "Buffer Zone" required (see attached copy of "Comprehensive Plan")

I believe this proposed change is not wanted or needed in order to make Jenks better for the people who reside in this wonderful little city, and are so very proud to call Jenks home.

We don't want or need more "entertainment" areas near our homes and neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter

-Judy Catlett



Ron & Linda Whitewater | email 2020.05.20 |

Our opposition of said property to change from OM to ROC zoning, the westbound traffic from the bridge into Riverwalk at the 4 way stop will not accommodate another commercial property there is Louies and other restaurants that use this area,B st is a narrow 2 lane road I cannot see expansion of road to widening B st The Jenks High School Kids use B st ,this area is total gridlock for several hours we as homeowners do not not want another property to add more traffic to our neighborhood.

Regards

Ron and Linda Whitewater