

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

WAYNE GILLEY AUDITORIUM
MARCH 26, 2026

Minutes of the City Planning Commission meeting held March 26, 2026, in the Wayne Gilley Auditorium, City Hall, 212 SW 9th Street, Lawton, Oklahoma.

The agenda for the meeting was posted on the bulletin board in City Hall in compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 P.M. by Allen Smith.

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Allen Smith
Melissa Busse
Ron Jarvis
Taylor Williams
Darren Medders
Michael Logan
Dwain Baxter

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Joan Jester (excused)
Dwight Tanner

ALSO PRESENT:

Christine James, Director of Planning
Kameron Good, Senior Planner
Christy Ryans-Huffer, Planner I
Garrett Lam, Assistant City Attorney
Jennifer Wynne, Recording Secretary
Ron Williams, Property Owner
James Walden, Garver

The meeting has established a quorum and was posted according to the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 301-314.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

1. Consider approving minutes from the regular scheduled meeting on March 12, 2026.

Motion by Logan, Second by Medders to approve the minutes from the regular scheduled meeting on March 12, 2026, as written. **Aye:** Busse, Jarvis, Williams, Medders, Logan, Baxter, Smith. **Nay:** None **Motion Passed 7-0**

2. Consider holding a public hearing and consider an ordinance for a change of zoning request from Bowmans Consulting Group on behalf of O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC and Richards Maria J Trustee, Nick J Richards 1992 Trust from the C-4 Tourist Commercial District to the C-3 Planned Community Shopping Center District zoning classification for the property located at 3422 E Gore Blvd, Lawton, Oklahoma 73501 more particularly described as proposed Lot 1, Block 1, O'Reilly-E. Gore and take appropriate action as deemed necessary.

Kameron Good: You're welcome for that long title.

Allen Smith: I was going to say I wish you could help me out some.

Kameron Good: So, you guys have seen the O'Reilly's plat. That was just taken through CPC and taken to Council on Tuesday which was approved. So, that's why that was described as proposed Lot 1, Block 1. When the packet went out it had not been approved yet by Council. This is a proposed rezoning located at the northwest corner of 35th and East Gore Boulevard. Here's an aerial showing where that location is going to be. The tract land is kind of an L shape that wraps around the apartment complex there. It was just platted into two lots to sell off that piece to O'Reilly's. The current zoning is C-4 which does not list that proposed use of auto parts and accessories because that is specifically listed in the C-3 Zoning District. So, that's why the proposed rezoning is here. This was noticed to eighteen property owners within 300 feet on February 27th and posted in the Lawton Constitution on March 3rd. We received no phone calls for or against this item. The surrounding zonings you have C-1 to the east, a little bit of R-4 to the east. C-4 to the north and C-4 to the West, and then R-3 across Gore Boulevard to the south. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have on the rezoning, and we do have representation here if you have any questions for the landowner.

Allen Smith: OK. Anybody have anything before I open it up to the public? We will now open the meeting up to the public. Seeing no one come forward. What's the say so of this board?

Motion by Jarvis, Second by Medders to recommend to City Council to approve an ordinance for a change of zoning request from Bowmans Consulting Group on behalf of O'Reilly Auto Enterprises, LLC and Richards Maria J Trustee, Nick J Richards 1992

Trust from the C-4 Tourist Commercial District to the C-3 Planned Community Shopping Center District zoning classification for the property located at 3422 E Gore Blvd, Lawton, Oklahoma 73501 more particularly described as proposed Lot 1, Block 1, O'Reilly-E. Gore and take appropriate action as deemed necessary. **Aye:** Jarvis, Williams, Medders, Logan, Baxter, Smith, Busse. **Nay:** None **Motion Passed 7-0**

3. Consider approving the construction plans for Willow Ridge, Part 1, subject to conditions.

Christy Ryans-Huffer: Good afternoon, commissioners. These are the construction plans for a new development which is going to be named Willow Ridge. You can see on your screens there is the location for it. It is going to be Willow Ridge, Part 1, and it is located east of NE Flower Mound Road and east of Cache Road. It's going to consist of Part 1, was 100?

Kameron Good: Seventeen.

Christy Ryans-Huffer: 117 residential lots and the development, you can see, is what it's going to consist of. The fourth slide is going to be the red line plat with the conditions that are marked. And the conditions that were handed out today for you are the conditions that were finalized before this packet was sent to you last week. But all your construction documents are in your packet. All the staff have reviewed it now for the water, sewer, streets, and drainage. And if you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

Allen Smith: That does bud up right to Sullivan Village, is that correct? Trailer court?

Christy Ryans-Huffer: No.

Allen Smith: Does it not go that far up?

Christy Ryans-Huffer: No, sir.

Allen Smith: Oh, I see. I see. I got you.

Christy Ryans Huffer: Yes, sir. Trailer Park, yes, It's the old Wicker Farm's property.

Allen Smith: Sure. So, it does but up to it. To the Trailer court?

Christy Ryans-Huffer: Yes, sir. To the trailers, yes.

Allen Smith: Yes. OK, yes. I said Sullivan Village, I meant trailer park.

Christy Ryans-Huffer: Yes, sir.

Allen Smith: Not Sullivan Village School. I did read the packet before.

Christy Ryans-Huffer: No, I'm sorry.

Allen Smith: Anybody got any questions? If not, what say so this council?

Motion by Logan, Second by Medders to recommend to City Council to approve the construction plans for Willow Ridge, Part 1, subject to conditions. **Aye:** Williams, Medders, Logan, Baxter, Smith, Busse, Jarvis. **Nay:** None **Motion Passed 7-0**

4. Consider an appeal filed by Ronald J Williams of the Planning Director's interpretation of the Landscaping Provisions for the property at 214 NW 2nd Street, Lawton, OK 73501.

Kameron Good: I'll be taking this one. So, just a little background information on this, give you a little understanding, we have an appeal filed by Mr. Williams. He's the owner of the property at 2nd Street, 214 NW 2nd. We just had a building permit, and we went to DLARC, also went to the Board of Adjustments, to lower the parking requirements. This is for the Southern Maid Donuts store to go into this building which used to be a garage, an oil change shop. Part of the Building Code is Chapter 6, which is the landscaping provisions, which set out that any permit to be pulled that consists of a new construction, remodel, anything that requires building permits is going to require landscaping provisions to be met. In that code it gives you a calculation of how to calculate the landscape and provisions. This one met the threshold of the minimum requirement. So, it didn't even meet the points, and then so it bumps up to 25 points minimum. Provided in your packet, in the background information just for some context, the Bricktown Brewery was required 468 points. They provided 470. There were 163 points required for the Southern Oklahoma Brewery, which is down on 2nd Street. They provided 179 points. What was required on this building permit was 25 points. Seeing the whole side is concrete, the staff also let them know that there's options for planters. Planters can count as points and the plants inside the planters can count as points. So, 10-gallon planters, 5 points. So, this would have been five planters. But we have an appeal filed with that requirement and the gentlemen's here to answer any questions, or if you'd like to get up and say anything sir.

Ronald Williams: You bet. Yes, thank you commissioners for your time and attention.

Allen Smith: Mr. Williams, how are you?

Ronald Williams: I'm fine, yourself?

Allen Smith: Doing good.

Ronald Williams: My name is Ronald Jim Williams. I own the building at 214 NW 2nd here in Lawton. My tenant is Chinda Eng. Mrs. Eng operates a Southern Maid Donut shop at that location. I am here to appeal the landscaping requirement imposed upon my tenant. Mrs. Eng is being required to install five 5-gallon planters in front of her building. These planters will have to be filled with some type of potting soil and a lot of live plants. These planters will be in an unsecured location. Therefore, she will have to remove those planters

when she closes her business for the day. She'll have to take them inside her building, and she'll probably have to put some type of a drip pan under each one of them to keep from messing up her floor in her building which has been totally remodeled. The reason being is she is in a very high crime district location in Lawton. Those planters will be a subject of constant theft. People will steal them. They'll dump the potting soil and the plant out on her driveway and they'll take the pot. Take it home. These planters are heavy. They'll be heavy with potting soil and water to keep the plants alive. This will be an undue hardship on my tenant. She's a very small lady. I asked her to be here today, but she had an appointment in Anadarko and couldn't make it. Additionally, there are no landlord/tenant landscaping on 2nd Street except for that mentioned earlier by Mr. Good at the brewery. The other locations up and down 2nd Street have no landscaping other than when the landscaping was redone when the 2nd Street was totally widened and there was permanent landscaping put in by the City of Lawton, and I assume the State of Oklahoma. Also, there is a building located exactly one block north of my location at 308 N 2nd. It was purchased and recently remodeled but from a laundromat to an office building. There is no landscaping at that location. None. Other than what was put in when the street was remodeled. I have been advised that the Planning Division was aware of that there was no landscaping at that location, and that the Planning Division approved the building permit and did not require that any landlord/tenant landscaping. There is a precedent set by that decision not to require landscaping at that location. That precedent should apply equally up and down 2nd Street. What is good for one should be good for all. Any questions?

Allen Smith: Did you know about the landscaping when you filed for the permit?

Ronald Williams: Well, I didn't file for the permit Mr. Smith, my tenant did.

Allen Smith: OK.

Ronald Williams: No, I was not aware of it until she received some type of notification, I don't remember what that was, but we became aware of it yes.

Allen Smith: I mean would that have been something she would have known when she filed for the permit.

Darren Medders: Yes.

Allen Smith: OK. My question maybe is, maybe not to you Mr. Williams, but maybe to staff. I mean, what about Dollar General?

Kameron Good: Yeah so, the Family Dollar right there.

Allen Smith: Correct, the Family Dollar. I'm sorry.

Kameron Good: That was built prior to our landscaping provisions going into code.

Allen Smith: OK.

Kameron Good: So yes, that was prior to the landscaping provisions existing code. That building has been there since the early 2000's. Sorry, that's when the codes went into place was in the early 2000's for the landscaping provisions. The buildings been there well before that.

Allen Smith: That buildings that old?

Kameron Good: Yes.

Allen Smith: So, what about Jeff's Key when he took over that building from the car lot? He hasn't been there that long.

Kameron Good: Yes, that one and the one he was talking about prior.

Allen Smith: Now have they finished that one? The one you're talking about Mr. Williams.

Kameron Good: Yes.

Allen Smith: The office building. That is finished.

Ronald Williams: Yes, sir. It's finished and occupied.

Kameron Good: Yes, and that was prior to Planning being responsible for the review. I will say that that was the Building Division's review at that time and that was two years ago or so. And that one was a decrease in occupancy classification. And that was kind of the justification that I received when I went and spoke with the building official who reviewed those plans and who was responsible for landscaping revisions at that time. This one is an increase in classification, but that has nothing to do with what code sets out in place right now. Code just says a remodel, new construction, expansion of parking, all have to meet the landscaping provisions. But that was the justification that the previous building official that did the landscaping review on that building that he's referencing gave on why they didn't require landscaping at that point. But again, that was on them prior to us doing the code review for the building permit review and they didn't really have the authority to do that per code, so.

Allen Smith: So yes. I guess my question, and I'm not saying it was obviously somebody's fault before you, before y'all started handling it. But you know, whether we decrease or increase, we're still from the landscape, we're trying to beautify the front of it. It doesn't matter how many, I guess, the bigger it is the more you have to put in obviously.

Kameron Good: The developed area and the number of parking spaces is how the landscaping points are calculated. And so, like I said, they had...

Allen Smith: But we would never get to a point where it would be zero points needed.

Kameron Good: Correct, no. Anything that's being developed and requires parking spaces is going to require points. So, it's because you base it on the square footage of the developed area plus the required parking spaces. Required parking spaces are two points. Any additional above that's an additional point. So, if you're providing more than you're required parking spaces, in this instance, we actually lowered their parking requirements with the Board of Adjustments variance so that the Southern Maid Donuts could go in there. So, they are less than. You know, the points required were actually less than what code says because they got that variance.

Allen Smith: Got you.

Kameron Good: But again, the landscaping provisions were the minimum. It is 25 points. So, they were below that on points required, but it bumps up to the 25.

Allen Smith: Got you.

Ronald Williams: Well, that still doesn't answer my question concerning the prior approval at 308 NW 2nd, which is exactly one block north of my building. They were not required to have landscaping added by the landowner or the tenant. The only landscaping there is the landscaping installed when 2nd Street was widened and decorated in it. In my opinion, additional landscaping in front of various buildings up and down 2nd Street will be redundant and some of them may look kind of gaudy, in my opinion. What was done by the state and the City of Lawton looks real nice and it's kept up. I don't know a contractor on which one of your landscaping company keeps it up and maintains it. But I see no reason for the additional landscaping period.

Allen Smith: Well, I mean I think we're just trying to beautify 2nd Street, and I don't know that we need to get into whether it, you know, your opinion, my opinion, whether it looks right or looks wrong. Kind of where I come to this at is in my opinion, I guess, is we've got to make it duly noted when they file this permit they have to have a landscaping detail sheet along with it. That way everyone knows from the get-go.

Ronald Williams: I understand. I understand but...

Kameron Good: And if I can comment on that real quick.

Allen Smith: Sure.

Kameron Good: So, a lot of building permits being open for business will be issued with the condition that a landscaping plan be submitted and implemented before a C.O. is issued. Just to keep the permitting process flowing to let them start their construction. And a lot of times the permits already have landscaping in there, but when they don't, we've kept it flowing by issuing a permit with the condition that they submit their landscaping. And then when that condition was on their C.O. that we wouldn't issue our C.O. until they put their landscaping in. And so, that's when they came in, we talked and said hey it's 25 points. We don't have a landscaping plan still, so. That the permit was issued without a landscaping

plan but that was normal practice because we're trying to keep it open for business. Let them continue with their construction. But it was noted on the building permit that a landscaping plan is still needed and that a C.O. would not be issued without the landscaping being implemented.

Ronald Williams: Well, further comment that still doesn't justify allowing the other location north of my building to not have landscaping. I don't care that it was a mistake by whoever made that inspection. That's a precedent. That's a legal precedent.

Allen Smith: So, if you were wanting to continue... What we're trying to do is do the 25 points and the 10 points. I mean, when do you want to start really enforcing this code? When do you suggest that we start this if you were in our shoes? I guess I can ask that.

Ronald Williams: Restate your question.

Allen Smith: Well, if we were really going to go to the code and go all right from now on, we're going to hold true to enforcing this 10-point, or 25-point code of landscape. I mean, if you're in our shoes, when do we? If we let you pass then the next guy passes, the next guy, the next guy. So, when do we start really drawing the line and go this is the line in the sand. And I'm not saying it's going to be with you. I'm not. I'm just...

Ronald Williams: I know.

Allen Smith: I mean I think we're just all trying to make 2nd Street beautiful.

Ronald Williams: I understand. I understand what you're saying there, Mr. Smith. I think that goal, in my opinion, as a landowner, has already been met when it was landscaped by the City of Lawton and the State of Oklahoma. There are in front of every location, there are nice permanent flowerpots and it's the corners that you can see. It's by my building. They landscape that corner, which is on the easement, that the government easement, city easement, that's all been done years ago. In my opinion that code is not appropriate for 2nd Street from Gore to Ferris. I just don't think it's appropriate.

Melissa Busse: I have a question, Mr. Williams.

Ronald Williams: Ma'am, yes ma'am.

Melissa Busse: Just kind of thinking that as — just me thinking out loud and putting a landlord hat on. OK, as a landlord. You're a landlord. I'm a landlord.

Ronald Williams: Yes. Yes, ma'am.

Melissa Busse: Is this going to require in the — Say these tenants only here for two to three years. Your tenants right now, that are in your building, they're only here for two to three years. Is the next person going to be required to have this? Is this going to be the new?

Kameron Good: If a remodel permit was pulled.

Melissa Busse: Yes.

Kameron Good: Yes, landscaping revisions will be required. But existing landscaping points count. So, if at that point you would say I have existing plots that would cover. So, existing landscaping is in code. An existing tree counts a lot more points than a new tree going in. So, if a new person was to go in in two years, they would still have, only if they pulled a remodel permit would they have to comply with the landscape revisions. But like I said, if he already has existing pots those count.

Melissa Busse: Right.

Kameron Good: So, there is no existing landscaping on the property. So that's why, at this point, the remodel permit is what kicked in the landscaping provisions. And, if I may note, on why the existing landscaping out in the street didn't count is it specifically says in code that it has to be within the developed area on their property. And we wouldn't permit somebody to put landscaping out into the city street right-of-way. So, if somebody proposed a new tree on their landscaping plan it would have to be on their property, not in the street right-of-way. So, that's why those weren't counted towards his landscaping is specifically talking about the developed area being his property.

Melissa Busse: Thank you, Kameron. But this is what I would suggest I would get with your tenant, and this tenant is the one that is remodeling the building and running a business.

Ronald Williams: Right, it was at her cost.

Melissa Busse: At her cost.

Ronald Williams: She did. She did all the remodeling, yes ma'am.

Melissa Busse: OK, then I think she should be the one as well, because of what the use of the building is now, is to put the pots in. We're asking for five-gallon...

Kameron Good: Planters.

Melissa Busse: Planters. Five of them.

Ronald Williams: Five 5-gallon pots filled with potting soil. Put her a live plant, and you water it. Then she's going to have to take them in every day around 1:00 o'clock when she closes her donut shop because the pots, they'll be stolen. She's in a high crime area, as you probably know.

Melissa Busse: I see. Well, there's already three pots I'm seeing that's directly in front of the building right now. There're three pots in front of your building.

Ronald Williams: Right, those are installed by the state of Oklahoma and City of Lawton.

Melissa Busse: Right, but they're still there.

Ronald Williams: Those are concrete. They probably weigh 100 pounds or more.

Melissa Busse: Again, I think chairman at the end of the day, this is just my honest opinion, any time I've worked with anybody that has come into the city and it's a remodel, or if it's a new development, we have to meet those codes regardless of how we feel. And before we can even get a C.O. they do come out and do the checking, and, I mean, they're counting the points for all the trees. I've got a project on 67th. It was quite a bit, and they were asking 6 ½ foot to 7-foot trees. And I get that because I have to have a buffer zone, you know. It's just part of the deal.

Kameron Good: 9-to-10-foot trees Melissa, sorry.

Melissa Busse: Yes, 9 to 10 feet. So, you do the math on that. Going across, what is that, 50? Yeah, it's pretty long. But we are all in the same boat with you. I'm not on 2nd Street, but I'm on another street that's on 67th Street and there's points. And when I got that C.O. I knew before they would issue me the certificate of occupancy I had to meet those requirements of the City of Lawton in building permits. And your tenant was aware of this. She was aware that, I mean, she needed to have these.

Ronald Williams: Well, I'm sure she may not have understood a lot of it. But that wasn't related to me. But I guess that was probably my responsibility to follow up on it. I don't know. But my point is and I'll just reiterate it; it was done before to the 308 NW 2nd. They were allowed to open. They were allowed a permit without landscaping. That's a precedent.

Allen Smith: Now were they allowed to permit or a C.O? Really, I mean, I guess what it boils down to is that I've been building for thirty, thirty-five years. You know, and I can drive down the road and look at concrete sidewalks that are too steep for a wheelchair, but that one passed City code and now they're making me rip one out because it's too steep. Well, I can go point to twenty of them in Lawton that are too steep. Well then, we just missed that one. So that's probably where it falls to on this. You know, hey, we just missed this one. I would suggest, I mean, I drove by, I know where your building is. I know exactly where it's at. I mean even if this tenant doesn't do it and you go in and someone else remodels, we're going to be back in the same boat. I would suggest there's your little carport right there where you can drive through, just to the east of that. It's not big enough for a car to drive through there. You know maybe just do a fixed planter right there and then you're done with it.

Ronald Williams: I'll look into that.

Allen Smith: I mean I think you know a landscape guy.

Ronald Williams: I know of one here. You shouldn't have brought that up. And I know Ms. Busse. Anyway, I guess that's about all I've got to say and I hope I didn't come across... I'm sorry.

Allen Smith: You did not. You did not.

Garrett Lam: I was just going to offer one thing. You normally set a precedent, or a legal precedent, at least when it's explicitly allowed. So, by doing that if they were to allow this today, then they would be setting the precedent. Without something that was approved prior, or if it was simply missed by mistake, that normally doesn't set the precedent. So, just something to consider when you're talking about what a precedent is versus what a president is not. So, I would think that if they were to allow it today, then they would be setting that precedent that it's not explicitly, doesn't have to go in right there for the landscaping, but.

Ronald Williams: Well, I don't have the advantage of being a lawyer like you are currently, but I know what a precedent is and because the permit was signed off by apparently whoever it was at the Planning office. In fact, they signed it off.

Garret Lam: And if I understood, Mr. Good right here, I think it was a mistake or missed.

Ronald Williams: Well, what difference does it make? There was a mistake. We are still signed off and approved.

Kameron Good: So, at that time Charlotte Brown was doing the review for the landscaping under Chapter 6 code. That being a site issue; landscaping. Planning does site reviews so that's why we've recently taken that review over. So, that Planning is completely over the site and it's still located in Chapter 6. That's why she was reviewing it at that time. But whether it was a mistake, or just completely missed, I don't know the clarification on that.

Allen Smith: Thank you.

Ronald Williams: I'm not going to belabor the point anymore. I think I've probably voiced most of my opinion and whatever, so. But it still boils down to the fact that it was permitted that that location did not have to have the required extra landscaping and I'll just leave it at that. And I appreciate your time and courtesy. You know I love you.

Allen Smith: Thank you Mr. Williams.

Ronald Williams: Yes, sir. You bet.

Allen Smith: That being said, what is the view of this committee?

Motion by Logan, Second by Medders to recommend to City Council to deny the appeal filed by Ronald J Williams of the Planning Director's interpretation of the

Landscaping Provisions for the property at 214 NW 2nd Street, Lawton, OK 73501. **Aye:** Williams, Medders, Logan, Baxter, Smith, Busse, Jarvis. **Nay:** None **Motion Passed 7-0**

- 5. Consider receiving a presentation from Garver on the One Lawton Comprehensive Plan, otherwise known as the 2050 Land Use Plan, and provide comments as deemed necessary.**

James Walden presented the Garver One Lawton Comprehensive Plan, otherwise known as the 2050 Land Use Plan. This presentation is given for this item and will be filed with the minutes.

Presentation provided for this item is part of these minutes on file in the City Clerk's office.

Commissioner's Reports or Comments

None.

Secretary's Report

Kameron Good: We had the rezoning just went to Council on Tuesday. That was the rezoning off of Lake. That was the recommendation from the Planning Commission was to go R-1 to R-2 with the conditions that six months they'd be brought up to the R-2 zoning regulations. They, Council, did move forward with the y'all's recommendation and approved that ordinance with the condition that they come into compliance with the R-2. So, they'll have six months and then if it doesn't move forward that way then you'll see an administrative rezoning coming back to you guys go back to R-1.

Audience Participation

None.

Adjournment

Motion by Logan, **Second** by Medders to adjourn the meeting **Aye:** Medders, Logan, Baxter, Smith, Busse, Jarvis, Williams. **Nay:** None **Motion Passed 7-0**

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:41 P.M.

These meeting minutes were approved by the CPC members at their meeting on



Allen Smith

Chairman City

Planning Commission