NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

JUNE 14, 2012

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 14th day of June 2012. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chairman Andy Sherrer called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:
ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT	Dave Boeck Jim Gasaway Cynthia Gordon Diana Hartley Tom Knotts Curtis McCarty Roberta Pailes Chris Lewis Andy Sherrer
MEMBERS ABSENT	None

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT	Susan Connors, Director, Planning & Community Development Jane Hudson, Principal Planner Ken Danner, Subdivision Development Manager Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary Kathryn Walker, Asst. City Attorney Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator Scott Sturtz, City Engineer Shawn O'Leary, Director, Public Works Susan Atkinson, Planner I

* * *

Item No. 2, being:
CONSENT DOCKET
Chairman Sherrer announced that the Consent Docket is designed to allow the Planning Commission to approve a number of items by one motion and vote. The Consent Docket consisted of the following items:

Item No. 3, being:
APPROVAL OF THE MAY 10, 2012 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES AND THE MAY 17, 2012 STUDY SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 4, being:
FP-1112-19 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SHAZ INVESTMENT GROUP, INC. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR INDEPENDENCE VALLEY ADDITION, SECTION 1, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF CEDAR LANE ROAD AND APPROXIMATELY ONE-QUARTER MILE WEST OF 12TH AVENUE S.E.

Item No. 5, being:
FP-1112-20 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SASSAN MOGHADAM (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR FOUNTAIN VIEW NORTH ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF 48TH AVENUE N.W. APPROXIMATELY 2,000 FEET SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD.

*

Chairman Sherrer asked if any member of the Commission wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, he asked whether any member of the audience wished to remove any item. There being none, he asked for discussion by the Commission.

Jim Gasaway moved to place approval of Item Nos. 3, 4, and 5 on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to place approval of Item Nos. 3, 4, and 5 on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 3, being:
APPROVAL OF THE MAY 10, 2012 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES AND THE MAY 17, 2012 STUDY SESSION MINUTES

This item was approved as submitted on the Consent Docket by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:
FP-1112-19 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SHAZ INVESTMENT GROUP, INC. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR INDEPENDENCE VALLEY ADDITION, SECTION 1, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF CEDAR LANE ROAD AND APPROXIMATELY ONE-QUARTER MILE WEST OF 12TH AVENUE S.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Final Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Preliminary Plat

The Final Plat for INDEPENDENCE VALLEY ADDITION, SECTION 1 was approved on the Consent Docket by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:
FP-1112-20 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SASSAN MOGHADAM (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR FOUNTAIN VIEW NORTH ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF 48TH AVENUE N.W. APPROXIMATELY 2,000 FEET SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Final Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Request for Deferral of Paving and Drainage Improvements
5. Final Site Development Plan
6. Preliminary Plat

The Final Plat for FOUNTAIN VIEW NORTH ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development was approved on the Consent Docket by a vote of 9-0, with a recommendation for deferral of paving and drainage improvements.

* * *

Item No. 6, being:
CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY COBBLESTONE CREEK ADDITION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF 12TH AVENUE S.E. AT COBBLESTONE CREEK DRIVE.

6A. ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-37 – TIM SHANNON REQUESTS REZONING FROM RE, RESIDENTIAL ESTATES DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF 12TH AVENUE S.E. AT COBBLESTONE CREEK DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative
4. Preliminary Plat
5. Preliminary Site Development Plan

6B. PP-1112-15 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY TIM SHANNON (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR COBBLESTONE CREEK ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF 12TH AVENUE S.E. AND ½ MILE SOUTH OF CEDAR LANE ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Development Plan

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Ms. Hudson – The application requests rezoning from RE to a Planned Unit Development. The proposal consists of eight lots on the south side of Cobblestone Creek Drive and the open space on the north side. The eight lots are about 10 acres; the open space is approximately 1 acre, totalling 11 acres for the PUD. The PUD will be served with private sanitary sewer systems and public water. With the applicant's proposal for one acre plus lots, compatible size with existing single-family homes, the setbacks, fewer drives off Augusta, staff recommends approval of this request for the Planned Unit Development. There was one letter of support (4.3%) and one letter of protest (0.2%).

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:
1. Tom McCaleb, SMC Consulting Engineers, representing the applicant – Dr. Shannon is also here. This preliminary plat was before you before and was approved. It has now expired. So the residual preliminary plat is back for a reapproval, and that consists of the area which is single-family lots and the presentation is almost the same as you had before; all the lots meet City codes. Also part of the prelim is the area of the existing 9-hole golf course; those lots may be sold to individual homeowners if they want those lots. That request has been made and we're making that available. The PUD application is 9 acres. It doesn't have sewer, as Jane indicated. DEQ will allow 1-acre lots with water. The City of Norman allows 2-acre lots. So the only way we have to make this application is through this process of a PUD. If you read the PUD, you see it's going to be nice houses – big houses – large requirements for brick around the facility and it's just eight lots. That, in summary, is this whole application. Eight lots in the PUD. We have open space of 11%; the requirement is 10%. We've met the requirements of the PUD. This is the form that we've chosen to get those eight lots and this is the way we're going to do it. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

2. Ms. Pailes – It seems like a nice plan. There doesn't seem to be a greenbelt enhancement statement with this. I was just curious because, from the development itself, it happens to be a spot where there is a great greenbelt potential because there's a high power

line about a block south of the development and connecting to that as a trail would be easy and require no expense on the part of the developer and it would be quite a large perimeter trail so it would be a place where there is actually some potential for greenbelt connection.

3. Ms. Connors – I apologize. It did go to the Greenbelt Commission. Mr. Danner is going to fill in some of that information.

4. Mr. Danner – The Greenbelt Commission looked at it. Of course, they were looking at other property to the west of this. So the emphasis was put on a sidewalk on the east side of 12th Avenue, and that sidewalk would have connectivity going north.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:
None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Curtis McCarty moved to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-37 and the Preliminary Plat for COBBLESTONE CREEK ADDITION to the City Council. Diana Hartley seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-37 and the Preliminary Plat for COBBLESTONE CREEK ADDITION to the City Council passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:
PP-1112-18 – CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY MIKE AND CINDY MILLIGAN (MORRIS ENGINEERING & SURVEYING) FOR MILLIGAN INDUSTRIAL TRACT ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ROCK CREEK ROAD ON THE EAST SIDE OF THE BNSF RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Request for Variance of the WQPZ
5. Letter from Engineer regarding the WQPZ
6. Request for Road Improvement Deferral
7. Site Plan

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Mr. Danner – I'd like to give a little bit of a background on this. The Planning Commission saw the preliminary plat in March of this year and recommended approval of it to City Council. With that particular preliminary plat, we had a variance in the WQPZ and a recommendation whenever the final plat came forward of a deferral of Rock Creek Road. In between that time, the applicant chose not to pursue the deferral or the WQPZ, so it never did make its way to the City Council. As a result of the changes and his desire to request exemption of the WQPZ and exemption of the street improvements, he has brought forward a revised preliminary plat. That's why you have it before you now. Mr. O'Leary is going to make a presentation regarding those exemptions. As far as the preliminary plat itself, a sidewalk will be required adjacent to Rock Creek Road. A fire hydrant will be used to serve the facility in regards to any structure. It will be a private sanitary sewer system, because there is no public sewer available. Water is existing.

2. Mr. O'Leary – This is an unusual situation and I want to take a few moments to certainly answer your questions if you have them. We have a few slides that we hope will help to clarify what is being requested here. Frankly, we don't think we've ever received these requests for a total exemption from a deferral or the improvement costs for the arterial street. In the one year that we have had the Water Quality Protection Zone ordinance, that has not happened either. There are variances and other ways to approach these things, but, again, what is being requested here is a total exemption. Let me elaborate, if I may. Here's the site plan that you're looking at in your book of the Milligan tract. I think one of the bases of the request from the applicant is the small size of the parcel. It is a parcel under 3 acres in size. We certainly understand and sympathize with that, but, again, neither of these ordinances give any relief to a smaller parcel different than a larger parcel. This is to acclimate you to the location if you haven't been out there. Bordering the BNSF railroad tracts on the west side of the parcel. That is 12th Avenue N.W. running along the east side of the parcel area and, of course, Rock Creek Road on the south side. Just to the east, the first developed parcel is Forest Lumber, and east of there would be Trailwoods Addition. A photo taken yesterday. It's a fairly active parcel; there's quite a bit of activity today on the site. Trucking operation and those trucks were taking access today through a gravel driveway onto 12th Avenue. This parcel does not have adjacent frontage on 12th Avenue, so I wanted to clarify that if you'd seen that. This parcel is the yellow bounded parcel. There is a long linear piece of privately owned property separating this parcel from 12th Avenue so it doesn't have access onto 12th Avenue. This is the site plan overlaid on an aerial photograph just to kind of put it into scale for you. Those red lines illustrate the three different parcels again – the one that we're talking about is the western most, the little flag lot, and the long linear lot are privately owned by another party so the applicant only owns the western most parcel. You can kind of see the location of a proposed building and a lateral septic tank system and then the driveway access onto Rock Creek Road adjacent to the tracks. I'll speak briefly to the two exceptions being requested. First is the Water Quality Protection Zone ordinance – fairly new – about a year old, roughly. This Planning Commission approved that

ordinance and recommended that favorably to the City Council last June, and on June 28, 2011 the City Council approved the ordinance. We've been operating ever since. I think we've had four or five applications that have come forward with the dedicated buffer zone along streams. Two tests. Why would a parcel be subject to the WQPZ ordinance? First, is it a new preliminary plat? This is a new preliminary plat. And second test, does the runoff from this parcel end up in Lake Thunderbird? Yes. The runoff from this parcel, shown on this map – the blue bordered area is what we refer to as the Lake Thunderbird watershed, so all the parcels within that blue boundary, including nearly 50% of the parcels in Moore and Oklahoma City – all of that stormwater runoff ends up in Lake Thunderbird through Little River and Rock Creek channel and Dave Blue Creek and so on and so forth. Believe it or not, the water that runs off this parcel ends up all the way over there in Lake Thunderbird. So the ordinance applies to this parcel. That is why we have recommended that they follow the ordinance. Again, that ordinance, without going into great detail, gives really a number of options. The starting point is where there is a water quality protection zone or a floodplain area – and this parcel has floodplain or a channel along the west boundary and along the north boundary, so there are two full build out floodplains adjacent to this parcel. The general starting point is that you can create a buffer – a 100' buffer from the edge of that full build out floodplain into the property, dedicate that as an easement for water quality protection zone, and you're done and that would come forward on the plat. This applicant had some concerns with that, primarily because of the size of the parcel – very logical and very appropriate concern. So then we went to the variance. This ordinance has a number of variance options. The one that was most practical and the most realistic here is what we call the engineered alternative. In other words, the applicant would work with their engineer to design an alternative system of water quality treatment of the storm water runoff. We've just done a very basic drawing here of the last version that our storm water engineers, working with Morris Engineering for the applicant, finally proposed would fulfill the ordinance. It basically was roughly a 15' wide grass swale with a sand filtering system shown along the east boundary – it could be anywhere on the parcel, but the east boundary was the applicant's preference – and then a storm water detention basin that the applicant is required to build as part of the basic storm water ordinance, so that's not being exempted here. But using that, then, for the water quality purposes, we recommended over-excavating – making it deeper so it was serving as a retention basin, and then installing a series of wetlands plants. We just did this in Brookhaven channel – just finished a project earlier this year. So very achievable, very doable, and we really felt like it certainly would accommodate the improvements on the parcel. So that was the engineered alternative. I think after working through all of that the applicant chose not to do any of it. Don't exactly know why. Obviously, he'll speak to that here tonight. That was where the discussion of the fulfillment of the WQPZ ordinance ended. The other very unusual part of this corridor is Rock Creek Road and the widening thereof. There's a long explanation in your book – I won't bore you with all the details. There is a history here. Naturally, like every corridor, back in the late 70s there was a development along the south side of Rock Creek Road closer to Stubbeman. This was called Toddco, an industrial development job generator – it was a big deal back in the late 70s – and they were successful in getting an industrial roadway grant to improve Rock Creek Road. Unfortunately, when they did that they built it to a lesser width than we require. They built it to 44' wide, instead of 50' wide. Standards were changing at the time. Nevertheless, every plat that has come forward since that time, including all the Trailwoods plats, the Forest Lumber plat on the north, all have agree to pay a deferral for widening their side of the road an additional 4' in the future. Theoretically, we'd like to do it on the south in the future as well. There is a project today that has been generated out of the development process – out of the Trailwoods Addition primarily – that would improve the intersection of 12th Avenue and Rock Creek and the intersection of Trailwoods Drive and Rock Creek with two new traffic signals and the widening of the road. So we have a project in our 5-year plan. We fully intend to use the deferred amounts from Trailwoods Addition and from Forest Lumber, and this is the reason we can't recommend to you a deferral of the roadway widening requirement, which is in the Subdivision Regulations. Certainly, we see a practical use of those

funds, but we see a fairness issue here. We didn't grant that deferral to Ideal Homes and to Forest Lumber; we don't think it's reasonable to grant it here.

3. Chairman Sherrer – Do you have an estimate on what the cost was or would be for doing the engineered solution?

4. Mr. O'Leary – I appreciate that question, Mr. Chairman. We do not. I think that's about the time that the process broke down. I would defer to Mr. Morris. He was doing the real heavy lifting on the design. Our storm water engineer, Bob Hanger, is no longer with us and I don't believe we had an estimate of dollars when that process stopped.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Ross Morris, Morris Engineering, 617 N.W. 27th in Moore – The applicant, Mr. Milligan, and his wife are here as well. When we came through in March for the preliminary plat, and it was approved, we set to work to try to get together our final plat and our plans. As we went through the alternate engineered method – I'm speaking about the WQPZ – it became obvious to Mr. Milligan that this was going to take up more of his land and was going to create more of a burden on him financially in trying to comply with it, because we were going to wind up with 20' of a swale and it was going to encroach upon what he had envisioned for his property. So we had worked with the City – Mr. Hanger – to come up with a series of alternatives that would work and then to see how they would fit on his property and then what that would do to his plans for his property. We tried several different rounds of that. It just became obvious that whatever we did was going to encroach upon his property and hinder his plans for his property, so that's why we respectfully said let's just come back and try to get a deferral of it so that Mr. Milligan can continue on with his project and developing his business there. As well, the street section, in terms of the widening 4' in our little segment – it didn't seem to make sense to us. If we just widened it in our segment, then we would have a dead end right there and our little 100' or so – and Mr. Milligan already had his driveway in, so, again, that's why we had asked for the deferral on that, too. He would be happy to speak to that and answer any questions if you have any.

2. Ms. Gordon – The total area here is about 2-1/4 acres and you talk about it taking up too much of that. Do you have an approximate how much of that it would be taking up?

3. Mike Milligan, 2313 Rockwood Lane – When we looked at the – instead of doing the 100' buffer, it reduced it down to 25 – that was the option we had. But by the time you put in all the wetlands and the swales for the runoff, it makes the property totally worthless. It comes out to be about 20 or 25' of the total east side of the property from the front to the back.

4. Cindy Milligan, 2313 Rockwood Lane – One of the things that I wanted to mention, just to add onto what Mike and Ross said, is that when we look at the WQPZ, it's not only the space that it takes for the land there, but you look at the road widening, the setback for that, and then you look at the setback for the 10' landscape area that we're supposed to have – the buffer. You look at adding all of that up and, quite frankly, it doesn't leave us a lot left to be able to do what we need to do on the land.

5. Ms. Gordon – Well, that's why I'm trying to get a handle on what "not a lot left" means. You know – ballpark.

6. Mr. Morris – Mike could explain what business he's in and how he's using the property, so we can help you get an idea of what we're doing there and how this does affect them. She's wanting to know what kind of property this would take. Did we do any calculations on that at that time?

7. Ms. Gordon – But it would help to understand how you're using it or how you intend to.

8. Mr. Milligan – We own Milligan Trucking. We have a dump truck service here in Norman. We supply sand and gravel to home builders and all the construction that goes on in town. We had another site that was zoned agriculture that we housed our trucks on. It wasn't appropriate. I was told to buy industrial property so we went and done that and here we go. This is 2.4 acres of land. It's kind of a weird shape. What we do is we house our trucks there. We stockpile material there. We've got screened topsoil, regular topsoil, rock, river rock, and we're hoping to open this up for the general public to have a place to purchase these products for their landscaping needs in Norman. It's going to create tax revenue for the City of Norman by all means. But if you take the 10' landscape easement, you take the 25' on the east side of the property, you take the area for the retention pond – it's like Lord have mercy! Where does it stop? You know, I bought a piece of property I'm going to pay taxes on, but I can't use it. And that's certainly not what I was looking for when I purchased the industrial property that I had to have to be able to do this in Norman.

9. Ms. Milligan – We were unaware of the amount of setbacks that would be required for the WQPZ and the landscape boundary, the road widening – it all adds up. It fractions your property down. Dump trucks are big and the area of topsoil that we need is large. So I think that Ross had calculated at one time that it took up – what? Point two acres of it just for the WQPZ, not including the landscape easement, the road widening, and all that.

10. Ms. Gordon – When did you guys buy the property? It may be in here somewhere and I honestly don't remember.

11. Mr. Milligan – It was around the first part of the year.

12. Ms. Milligan – We didn't realize we would run into this. We really look at it as we have a growing business and we're wanting to serve the community. We need a place to park our trucks that's suitable, but we also need a place to be able to service the public because we want to be able to serve the community, not just commercial construction and residential builders. We would like to share our materials with people like you guys who want to do your yard.

13. Mr. Milligan – We're just a small business. We're not multi-millionaires or anything else. When we come up, we had got a permit to cut the driveway 'cause we had no access to the land. So we went to City of Norman and we agreed right-in and right-out. I went ahead and got a permit, got started right away on that 'cause I was just excited to be able to get to the property and do something. Well, then a couple days later it come up that we're going to have to widen the road. It's a brand new driveway. It's about $6,000 already spent. To come up with another additional cost on a small business – it's just been one thing after the next, and that's why we ask you all to give us a variance.

14. Ms. Gordon – I have questions for staff, sort of. I don't know if it's appropriate to ask them now. So when you bought this tract, is this something that – here's your packet of information for your industrial lot, or is it something that it is incumbent upon the applicant to find out all of the restrictions and the regulations and all that – so when you buy this, you should say to someone, a staff member, what are the regulations I need to know before I buy this plot? Is that correct? I'm assuming that's how it works.

15. Ms. Connors – Well, certainly, the purchase of the property happens outside of any City process and, therefore, once someone wants to get a building permit or any sort of change to the land, they need to come through the City processes, which is when they learn what the requirements are. We don't piecemeal the requirements. Whatever they say they want to do, then we try to guide them through that process totally.

16. Ms. Gordon – And the 4' change to the road that needs to happen at some point – you said that was some point down the road. Is that correct? Within 5 years. And so those sections that are privately owned and that kind of thing – I mean, is there any kind of input from them as to having to pay for this? Is there a certain time you're waiting for kind of everybody to be onboard to have this happen, or it's just going to happen when you get the money?

17. Mr. O'Leary – It's really driven by need. The need for the widening of Rock Creek and the two traffic signals – again, one at 12th Avenue N.W. and one at Trailwoods – was generated by this development – not this particular one, but particularly Forest Lumber and Trailwoods Addition. It was that generation of additional development in the last decade or so that has prompted the need for additional improvements and the road widening comes along with those. Then there's an application process for funding, which we've gone through. We believe we'll be successful in getting federal funding for that project. I would offer, too, it's very possible that some of these deferral fees for this one or the other developers would then be partially refunded or fully refunded if we get alternate funding for the project. Very commonly done. We just did a refund to Norman Regional Hospital for the Journey Parkway signal because we got 100% federal funding, but they did pay the deferral until we got that done.

18. Ms. Milligan – When Mike got the permit for the driveway, he actually went and talked to the City Manager, who said nothing – there was no plan that was known about ...

19. Mr. Milligan – We talked to Mr. Lombardo and the only thing that he said – he said that we wouldn't have to – 'cause he was looking at this and they didn't want it off Rock Creek. We came to an agreement that it would be a right-in/right-out only. He made the statement I wouldn't have to worry about widening the road because ODOT done it years ago, but they are going to put a traffic light in that intersection. And that was the only thing that was said at that time. Well, I went to the City Manager because I was denied access to pour the driveway, so I went to the City Manager, Steve Lewis. Steve Lewis finally gave me authorization and supplied the permit to – or he talked to the people that do that, and I finally got the permit to pour my driveway and a couple days later, here we go – you know, we're going to have to widen the road, too. At the time, the only thing that was said about that intersection was they were going to put stop lights there and that's why they wanted the right-in/right-out only. That's what I was told.

20. Ms. Milligan – If I can make another comment about that. Since we are a small business, cash flow is always tight. We're a growing business and it's very painful as far as growing pains. Since road widening can be funded by federal funds, that's one of the reasons why we'd like to know if we could have a variance – even just a partial variance, because I've got people to pay on payroll and putting money out for something that might happen down the road when you actually can keep that money up to ten years – that can really hurt a small business.

21. Mr. Gasaway – You mentioned you had visited with Mr. Lombardo and there was an issue with that that you then approached the City Manager. What was that specific issue?

22. Mr. Milligan – Well, the issue was – see? We were growing at such a rapid pace and we had no place to go with the business. We were kicked off this other property, if you would. So we struggled to find a place to purchase, and then once we purchased that, we couldn't get access – we were denied access to the property. Well, I was pretty persistent about it. I apologize if I made anybody mad – you know me. But I went to Steve Lewis, as well as one of the Council members went with me, and they granted me access. They granted me a permit to pour my drive, on the conditions it was a right-in and right-out only. And we fulfilled that obligation. Here we go. And after that is when the widening of the road came about after all of that. But when we first started talking about it and started doing these plans, I was told the

only thing I'd have to worry about is the right-in and right-out, because they're going to put a signal light in that intersection and they were going to widen 12th Avenue N.W., I believe it was.

23. Ms. Pailes – My sympathies. It's very difficult to sort this all out and I'd love to buy your stuff. In terms of us, we probably do not have the authority to grant you a variance in terms of Rock Creek. I mean, we simply don't have that authority. So that question is kind of moot. In terms of the water problems or the setbacks from the creek – unfortunately your business is exactly the kind that really impacts water systems, because dirt and rock and gravel stored produces sediment, which is the biggest problem in our water systems all the way to Lake Thunderbird – sediment and clouded water. I live near the U-Haul and the stream right below it used to be a living stream full of fish – we used to go fishing there. When U-Haul came in and parked their trucks there, it killed the stream, because the oil from the trucks and the runoff from the driveway kills life in the water. So the requirement for a swale, I understand, seems odd, especially if it's kind of sprung on you. It's actually very important. I would hope there would be some way for you to say, okay, actually, this doesn't cost as much – we can work this one out. I would hope you could do that. But it's actually an important issue. The landscaping – I don't know. It's okay with me. I don't know if we actually even have the authority to forgive a landscaping setback, either – it would be okay with me if you didn't have to do that, but I truly don't know that we actually have much authority in this at all.

24. Mr. Milligan – And I do understand your concerns. However, the entire 12th Avenue N.W. is lined with industrial and commercial business from Short's Concrete to Kudron Concrete to Dolese on the other side. The list is long. And to have topsoil – I don't have compost. I don't have any type of fertilizing product.

25. Ms. Pailes – Even dirt counts. And those folks – it's relatively recent regulation and I completely sympathize that you probably were not aware of it. Technically, your realtor should have told you – technically, I imagine. I'm not sure who should have told you. Somebody should have informed you, or you should have investigated. I truly don't know where the difficulty lies. I'm sorry you got your tail caught in that.

26. Mr. Boeck – Well, that leads to another comment. Being an architect, a lot of time my clients come to me when they're looking at a piece of property and say, okay, we want to do this on this piece of property. Can we do it? So then I go through the research of looking at all of the ordinances and requirements that a community has. Engineers are supposed to be able to do the same thing. But if you don't know the questions to ask, that's where the catching point is, because you're a truck company that sells dirt and rock. You're not a realtor, you're not a builder, you're not an engineer and you're not an architect. That's part of the process is how you can improve that kind of education in the community. You think you're buying a piece of property just to run a business off of, but there's all kinds of other stuff going on. Norman takes a rap for being a hard place to build, but if you go to Edmond, you go to Oklahoma City, most cities are realizing that runoff into their streams and lakes are killing their streams and their lakes. I used to be on the ECAB board. One of the new members is a neighbor across the street from me; he's an engineer, and we were talking about that whole thing with potassium and nitrogen fertilizers – that actually dirt in central Oklahoma holds 60% of the unused phosphorous that doesn't get dissolved until it's move and aerated and water runs through it. So even selling topsoil and stuff like that has phosphorous and nitrogen in it in excess of what you need to grow stuff. So I guess the only comment is we need to figure out some way to improve that process. We can't be responsible for all land owners that are buying land and developers, but this is a tough situation.

27. Ms. Milligan – Well, the thing is, this is such a small piece of land and really there's – when you look at, like Mike said, all the other industrial properties that are around us, I don't feel like our piece of land impacts what flows into Lake Thunderbird greatly. There's no benchmark

testing beforehand to say how much of these things are in the water coming off the land now to say when we do that – when we go through that expense – what we've improved. No testing done.

28. Mr. Boeck – There's been research done on the kind of systems that the City is recommending here. Obviously has been researched in other places. They know what the difference is. The community just to the east of the lumber yard there – Ideal Homes has done two specific storm water runoff plans. One is an alternative bioswale system and one is the standard one to see what kind of sediment runoff they have. That kind of testing is done. People say, well, but why should I be held to a different standard than the industrial people that went in 20 or 30 years before me? Well, we didn't have that knowledge; we didn't have the regulations to regulate things the way they do now, because we know more now. It may seem unfair, but it's a learning process all the way down the line. So I'm not helping you -- it's just part of the issue.

29. Ms. Milligan – Coming from a neighborhood where people fertilize their lawns, I think, is different than runoff from river rock. Do you follow me?

30. Mr. Milligan – Not only that, you've got 12th right there. You've got Rock Creek right there. How many vehicles pass either way all day long every day and that water, when it rains, where does it go? Low and behold, it goes right behind my property where I'm supposed to filter what runs off the rock. It's kind of a catch 22. You've got a major thoroughfare right there with all the traffic.

31. Mr. Boeck – And there's lots of wetlands all along the railroad tracks there.

32. Mr. Milligan – So certainly whatever comes in off Rock Creek Road or off my little bit of rock or my little bit of topsoil will be filtered out by the time it gets to Little River or Lake Thunderbird, for Pete's sake.

33. Mr. Boeck – Well, if this system is put in. That's what it's designed for is to stop it at your property line and filter it out. If you don't do it, then it doesn't. Then it just goes into Little River runoff.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Harold Heiple, 218 E. Eufaula, representing Forest Lumber Company – I was here in March to protest, on behalf of my client, the plat that was before you then because we wanted opaque fences on the east side and the north side of this property to protect from the dust and the noise generated by the operation that was going to be on the property. I didn't know until today, and I read through the staff report, that the thing had been pulled back and the changes that had been made. I'm in a position right now that I've never been in before for 40 years, and let me tell you, this has ramifications that go far beyond this particular piece of ground. You recall how much time we spent on the storm water thing and how much developers fought it because of the onerous burdens of the WQPZ and finally got the exception built in there, which developers said they could live with, but it was going to be very expensive. This demonstrates what that WQPZ does to small properties and absolute inability to use your property for anything with these kind of burdens placed on it. I was interested to hear your comments, Dave, about the phosphorous, because it brought to mind the comment from a DEQ man at a meeting of the ECAB board not long ago when he said that the biggest contributor of phosphorous to topsoil are the falling leaves that are dissolved. They carry more phosphorous than anything else – any other contribution that's there. So what I'm saying now is that – and, of course, if the City Council grants these two variances that are required – when I first read this, I figured this thing is DOA when it gets to the City Council anyway, and I don't need to spend a lot of time looking for a fence because it's not going to go anyplace. But if the City Council

grants these two things, obviously my client, Forest Lumber, will be just like staff expected, will be standing in Mr. Francisco's door the next morning asking for their money back on the money that we've already put up on those improvements. But I think a lot of developers will also be in to demonstrate the fact that that WQPZ is onerous and it ought to be reconsidered and taken into consideration what it is actually doing to the ownership and development of private property in this community far beyond any benefits that it might be for the improvement of the water quality at Lake Thunderbird. There's lots of things that we could have been active upon in this community already, taking advantage of things like promoting phosphorous and nitrogen-free fertilizers, that the City Council hasn't done. But I think what I'm saying to you is I probably would like to see you recommend approval of waiver of both of these problems with, of course, the requirement that they put a couple of fences out there on the west and north side to the benefit of my client. But do that and let the City Council really get a feel for just exactly what's coming home to roost. Because this is about the first time that this has come back – anybody has been aware of it. I know several developers made comments when the storm water plan was adopted that the small land owners out in eastern Norman really had no idea what was going to hit them until they come in and ask for a building permit. It is onerous – we spent months on this thing. You guys spent a lot of time; we spent a lot of time, and all this under the guise that this is going to radically improve Thunderbird. Well, Thunderbird's quality needs to be improved – there is no doubt about that. And there's a sincere belief on the part of the development community that we need to be doing things like that. But the extremely broad provision requirements of the WQPZs in this ordinance is not one that should be a priority. So I would encourage you to give some consideration to say, City Council, why don't you grant both these exemptions – complete waivers and exemptions. And, like I say, it's going to cause a line to form outside the doors of a couple of offices here in City Hall, but it will get the City Council talking about let's consider whether we really did the right for property and for the benefit of the City of Norman with the provisions of the water quality. So don't forget my fences, but give serious consideration to these waivers. Thank you.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Gasaway – I might just say to the applicant, regardless of how this comes out tonight, it sounds like there might be another issue or some more to the story in terms of how the driveway came about, and I certainly would visit with your City Council member before it goes to Council and see what that issue was, why it was resolved that way, and what can be done. I think that may be a separate issue from the whole group tonight. So I would encourage you to visit with your Council member and see just how that came about.

Diana Hartley moved to recommend approval of the Revised Preliminary Plat for MILLIGAN INDUSTRIAL TRACT ADDITION, and recommend approval of the WQPZ exemption and the exemption from paving improvements for Rock Creek Road, to the City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Diana Hartley, Chris Lewis
NAYES	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cindy Gordon, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Andy Sherrer
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of the Revised Preliminary Plat for MILLIGAN INDUSTRIAL TRACT ADDITION, and recommend approval of the WQPZ exemption and the exemption from paving improvements for Rock Creek Road, to the City Council failed by a vote of 2-7.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:
ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-41 – COMMUNITY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A SCHOOL FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED I-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 3106 BROCE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Development Plan
4. CCS Plan
5. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Ms. Hudson – The application before you is for Community Christian School for a special use on property currently zoned I-1. CCS purchased this tract just to the west of their existing school on Broce Drive. It is going to be the high school. They're going to add additional classrooms, and they're adding a parking lot which will cross over into the lot to the east to allow for student and visitor parking. There are two businesses across the street to the north, one a carpet business and the other an office building. There was a letter of protest constituting 4.2% of the notification area. Staff recommends approval of this special use. With the internal parking lot, we don't feel there will be any adverse impacts on adjacent property owners.

2. Mr. Lewis – Was there a traffic study done on this? In looking at the notes, it seems that we're going to increase the number of students immediately by 100 with the high school; eventually it would be 400. It's my understanding right now traffic is an issue in that area, and the protest letter we got from Armstrong Companies – it seems that might be a negative impact. I'm wondering, has there been a traffic study performed?

3. Ms. Hudson – I do not know, but I feel the applicant can answer that.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:
1. Tim Johnson, Johnson & Associates, 1 East Sheridan in Oklahoma City – We are the engineers for Community Christian School and have been for 20+ years. As the staff has reported, the existing school campus was allowed to be a permitted use under the old regulations of I-1. The current regulations of I-1 require the special use permit, which is why we're here. To answer your traffic question, we have not done a specific traffic impact study at this point. You're correct in that eventually there will be more students. The initial plan is to move the high school students out of the existing building into the new building at their current number of students, which is about 100. That's 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade. So that allows more room for the younger students – junior high and below, which, obviously, they don't drive cars, but there will be a little more traffic on the drop-off time. From a personal experience, I've had six kids graduate from this school, so I've done a lot of dropping off and picking up. The school has done a very good job with regard to organizing that. I can tell you 20 years ago it was chaos. We've worked real close with the neighbors to keep from blocking driveways and things like that for the very short period of time – that doesn't occur at the same peak traffic time that you would under a normal traffic impact study is going to happen in the 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. and the 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. would probably dovetail with morning traffic peak. But being an industrial tract, the local traffic is very low. The traffic for the school is about from 10 'til 8:00 to 10 or 15 after 8:00 in the morning. With regard to the new building, we are not anticipating increasing the number of cars that would exit out onto Broce Drive. Our exiting strategy would still continue to take them out to the frontage road out our south driveway – south of the existing building and the farthest east driveway onto Broce, where we control access and exiting there to be right turn only during the exiting hours of the school. So the impact, I think, to the neighborhood would simply be a minor increase in pick-up and drop-off traffic during those periods of time. We do a lot of traffic engineering work and we just have not requested or have not done a study for this.

As mentioned, the new building that has been acquired is looking at a remodel to convert it from what it is today to a classroom setting. The bulk of the addition at the south end of the building would be for a cafeteria, theater room, general gathering places, as well as additional classrooms. We are not increasing the drives onto Broce. We will be providing detention for the increased runoff that we would be creating for both the parking and the building addition. Mr. Armstrong did send a letter to the City; we received a copy of that late yesterday. I was successful in getting hold of Mr. Armstrong this morning and we talked twice today. I also sent him an email with regard to response to his comments. His concern about the special use permit, as he indicated to me, was he didn't want it to negatively impact uses that are permitted on his property. We did some research in the codes and ordinances; we talked to staff and confirmed that we would not diminish any of his current uses that are permitted in the I-1 with the limited C-2 uses that are permitted under that I-1 use. So I conveyed that to him and I'm not sure – I haven't seen him yet tonight, so if he's here, I'd be happy to give him the floor. I think with the site plan you have in front of you, that pretty much explains everything. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

2. Mr. McCarty – Well, my biggest concern reading this is that we've got a start of a 100 person addition to it and eventually 400 and there's been no traffic study. I frequent that area quite often around the 3:00 to 4:00 time when kids are being picked up and it's chaos. It's very dangerous turning out of those areas trying to get onto Broce if you're in that area doing business. So that's a big concern of mine and I'm just curious why there hadn't been one done.

3. Ms. Pailes – I noticed there's spaces for buses. Does the school have buses? That cuts down on traffic.

4. Mr. Johnson – Yes, they do. They keep them parked down on the gymnasium property to the north. They're only here to transport kids to PE on occasion.

5. Mr. Lewis – It looks like in phase 2 the ultimate build-out of parking spaces is going to be 160. Can you give me an estimate of what is there now?

6. Mr. Johnson – I should know that off the top of my head. It's about 120, I believe, counting the lot to the north.

7. Mr. Lewis – So we're just going to increase by about 40 automobiles just for parking there?

8. Mr. Johnson – I'm sorry, no. The increased parking would be about 50 spaces, so our total will be 160 – so about 110.

9. Mr. Danner – By our engineering standards, a traffic study is required with a preliminary plat. This property is already platted. Thereby it could not be required by us.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Gail Armstrong, 1418 Aspen Lane – I did turn in a protest letter not understanding. I talked to Susan a while ago and I talked to Mr. Johnson today. Where I was concerned was school zonings and church zonings change what you can do next door. So I would hate to go down the road a ways and all of a sudden say, oh, you can't have that type of businesses in here because you're next door to a school, next door to a church. The special permissive use, Susan tells me, stays with the land. Right? Not with the use. But if they ever decided to vacate this property, then would it be only for a school?

2. Ms. Connors – Well, the special use doesn't expire, so it stays with the land until somebody requests a different use for the land. Now someone could still redevelop it industrially. The I-1 zoning does not change; the special use is a layer over that, but it doesn't expire.

3. Mr. Armstrong – With the questions I got answered today, I can withdraw my protest. I understood that I'm not going to get zoned out.

4. Mr. Lewis – Being a very large business owner in that area, or land owner in that area, do you have concerns with the amount of traffic that is going to be there? We have concerns that have been vocalized with the traffic study not being done. But I'm wondering if you have concerns with traffic.

5. Mr. Armstrong – We own the next two buildings to the west. It has been worse than it is now – back about five years ago. I don't know what exactly took place. They used to block our driveways and go around the corner, but evidently they've self-disciplined themselves on how to park around the street. I was glad to see it looked like they were going to add some parking, too.

6. Mr. Lewis – So, even though we're going to be increasing parking spaces by about 40 or 50, we're going to have about 160 in phase 2 – about 400 students coming and going, traffic is not going to be an issue for you?

7. Mr. Armstrong – Well, they can only park singly along the road, so if they can't park, they're going to have to find a solution themselves. That's all I can say. They can only park on one side waiting on the students to dismiss about 3:30 or 4:00.

8. Mr. Lewis – So it's not an inconvenience to you?

9. Mr. Armstrong – It hasn't been. We did have a complaint or two probably five or ten years ago and they've handled it pretty well.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. McCarty – I'll just make one other comment, and maybe he can answer this, about the school. But 100 high school students – the majority of them drive a car. We're adding 67 parking spaces and that's it. So if you have 9th graders, they won't drive. Sophomores through seniors will the majority of the time. If it hits 400, I have – where in the world would all these people park, or are they not allowed to drive to school? So this traffic thing is really kind of bothering me and how this is, because I have been in that area quite a bit and the people start lining up all the way down Broce and all the way around to Bart Conner. It's real congested at, like you said, off traffic time, but it's a problem. So I'm just curious how that works with your school.

2. Mr. Johnson – To answer your first question, the number of parking spaces that we're providing on this plan meets or exceeds the design criteria for 400 students. I can tell you that none of the students or staff are permitted to park outside the campus. That's an internal rule. The only time that ever happens is if there's a special event, like they have a fair once a year, sometimes presentation. But usually that's done at the gym. With regard to Mr. Armstrong's comment about why things have gotten better, the City did come out a couple of years ago and have restriped Broce from the intersection of I-35 back about 500 or 600 feet and created a third lane, so that traffic – that street is wide enough for three lanes of vehicles, including trucks. By doing that, because it's not striped anywhere else, that helps direct the through traffic on through and the parked traffic to stay in that far right lane that turn in that driveway. Mr. McCarty is correct that the short period of time before pick-up parents get there a little bit early and they'll park at the curb. They're very courteous about not blocking driveways. There are signs up – don't block the neighbor's driveway, signed by Mrs. O – she's the Gestapo of the school. I think just the parents have learned to run the trap properly. As I've said, they've tried to be good neighbors. They've talked to a lot of the neighbors and my kids have all grown up

there. I've been involved in the school for 20+ years and the good news is it's grown to the better. They're trying to do a very good job and trying to be a good neighbor. Obviously, there's a need for a private Christian school in this part of town, because our waiting list for our elementary is very long.

Chris Lewis moved to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-41 to the City Council. Diana Hartley seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-41 to the City Council passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:
ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-42 – JENNIFER LADD REQUESTS REZONING FROM A-1, GENERAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, FOR 4.344 ACRES OF PROPERTY, AND SPECIAL USE FOR A RIDING ACADEMY AND PUBLIC STABLE ON 19.765 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 8809 ALAMEDA DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Plan
4. Pre-Development Meeting Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Ms. Hudson – The applicant is requesting a special use for a riding stable. She's going to be performing what they consider equine therapy. Currently she has A-1 zoning and A-2 zoning on her property. To be able to do this request for special use, she has to have A-2 for the entire property. Current land use is all residential out there. There is one corral in place and it is my understanding she will be putting a different one in. There is an existing barn. The applicant has requested A-2 for the entire property. She is a licensed social worker and she already owns several horses, which she will be using for the equine therapy with children. The parcel of land and small class size doesn't create any additional impacts on neighbors. The parking on gravel surfaces is appropriate and adequate for the small class sizes that will be going on. Staff recommends approval of this rezoning and special use request. The applicant is here with her representative.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:
1. Benjamin Odom, 2350 McKown Drive, representing the applicant – The applicant is here also. I realize that riding stable conjures up a certain image, but in reality what we're talking about is she's a licensed clinical social worker that uses equine psychotherapy to help traumatized children. It's been advantageous for the children to not necessarily ride the horses, but to take care of the horses. That has a very beneficial impact for the children. The primary purpose here for trying to upgrade the corral area, which is on the eastern side of the property, and 20 acres is not a large tract in terms of what we're discussing here. As you saw, it was heavily forested to the west. I would simply say that what we're trying to do here is make sure that we have the ability to use the area without, oops, we've gone over some magic line of just 3 or 4 acres that's supposed to be where the horses are. The horses are out there now. I don't think we're having any additional impact on anything that's going on, except that we're trying to follow all the rules and procedures. Riding stable is the term of special use that this city has that would allow her to do what she is doing. The primary impact here at the moment is we intend to try to help the traumatized children. I note that there was a letter filed concerning the fencing. We intend to fence on the west side of the property if this use is granted and the rezoning is granted. We indicated at the Pre-Development meeting that, when the times comes for us to build a fence, we're happy to consult with the neighbor to the west as to what type of input they would like to have toward the fencing. If someone has a real concern about the fencing, now, of course, they're not prohibited from putting up a fence on their property now if they wanted to. But we haven't had much of an issue, I think, in terms of our land use with the horses there now, and I would ask that the Commission give us an approval.

2. Mr. Lewis – You said that her horses are currently on the property. So this is really a question for Ms. Ladd. How many horses are on the property now and, basically, will that number increase at any point in time in the future – is that your intention?

3. Jennifer Ladd, the applicant – I have three horses currently. I've had more than that in the past. I sold one not too long ago. It's possible I would get another horse at some time. I don't need one for what I'm going to do.

4. Mr. Lewis – It's not going to be a horse farm any time soon, in other words?

5. Ms. Ladd – Well, it is a horse farm already and has been for many years.

6. Mr. Lewis – And the horses have been there?

7. Ms. Ladd – For that, you don't need special use.

8. Mr. Lewis – Right. Exactly. But the time frame that the horses have already been there?

9. Ms. Ladd – I'd say maybe 8 years.

10. Mr. Lewis – So what we have is a 20-acre parcel of land that has 3 or 4 horses on it you're going to use in therapy for traumatized children. We don't intend to increase the number of horses there. So really there's nothing changing other than we're just rezoning or using a special use for this piece of property?

11. Ms. Ladd – Right. To allow me to have a business rather than just personal use.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Stephen Weichbrodt, 1400 Classen Boulevard – My interest in this particular parcel of land is that we are the neighbor to the west of this property. Jennifer's property line is the western boundary; ours is the eastern boundary. My concern is some of the words like "public stable." The only public stable I'm familiar with is Thunderbird Riding Stable and that's fraught with anybody that wants to come in and ride horses and sometimes they have parties and things and it gets out of hand and things like that. That's what my concern is. I have no objection to Jennifer's request for treating the children. I think that's a noble cause and I'm very supportive of that. My concern is if she is just wanting to use a portion of her property on the east side, why does she want to rezone the entire 20 acres if she's not going to use that? Why not just rezone the part that's necessary to accomplish her goals, instead of the entire 20 acres? I think in the event that the property changes hands in the future, then the objectives of that zoning could be different than what Jennifer's are.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Dave Boeck moved to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-42 to the City Council. Chris Lewis seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-42 to the City Council passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 10, being:
CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY CIES PROPERTIES, INC. FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF 36TH AVENUE N.W. AND WEST ROCK CREEK ROAD.

10A. ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-43 – CIES PROPERTIES, INC. REQUESTS REZONING FROM RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, TO R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT (4.97 ACRES), AND PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (10.51 ACRES), FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF 36TH AVENUE N.W. AND WEST ROCK CREEK ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative
4. Preliminary Site Development Plan

10B. PP-1112-19 – CONSIDERATION OF A REVISED PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY CIES PROPERTIES, INC. (CLOUR PLANNING & ENGINEERING SERVICES) FOR BROOKHAVEN NO. 41 ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF 36TH AVENUE N.W. AND WEST ROCK CREEK ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Revised Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Commercial Site Plan
6. Preliminary Site Development Plan
7. Pre-Development Summary
8. Greenbelt Enhancement Statement

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Ms. Hudson – This is a request for rezoning from RM-6 to R-1 and a Planned Unit Development. The entire area is currently zoned RM-6. Tract 1 is what they will be rezoning to R-1 and Tract 2 is what they're requesting for the Planned Unit Development. The single-family is approximately 5 acres. The Planned Unit Development is approximately 11 acres. The PUD will be divided into approximately 40 single-family tracts. There is currently an apartment complex going in on the east side of the property. With the reduction in the RM-6 zoning, the proposed development will be compatible with the area of single-family homes currently in the area. Staff supports this request for R-1 and PUD. The applicant's representative is here and he has a presentation for you.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:
1. David Hargis, Clour Planning & Engineering Services, 408 Bannister Court, representing the applicant – Brookhaven No. 41 Addition Revised Preliminary Plat. This is a subsequent submittal to what was submitted and approved last November. The former preliminary plat, submitted in November, had to be submitted because we were seeking the final plat of the Falls at Brookhaven Addition and we already had a final plat ongoing of the Brookhaven Mansions Addition. These areas that were zoned RM-6 – we weren't really sure how we were going to further subdivide, so we just listed on there "future development is unknown" and now that we do have further subdivision, that has necessitated resubmission of a preliminary plat. So our current zoning now as it stands is R-1, C-1, and RM-6. What we are proposing is R-1, C-1 and PUD. Here's a commercial area, and we're not really planning on changing that one. It's doing very well just as it is. This was the original R-1 areas. This was initially planned to be a final plat for Brookhaven 41, and then, of course, we have Brookhaven 40 in this area and a little cul-de-sac to kind of augment that. Note that we are including the detention pond in this area as well. Even though it's under construction, it's not tied to any final plat. It was going to be dedicated

within a private drainage easement, but we felt – and the staff also felt – it would be better to tie it to some future final plat, so we're going to do that with the PUD. This is our new preliminary plat. You can see where we've shown taking the RM-6 addition – we want to rezone it to R-1. We'll extend our cul-de-sacs over to the east. This is an unnamed street right now because this addition doesn't exist. Wyckham Drive will tie into this one here and, of course, terminate it's own little cul-de-sac. To the south, we have the entrance to the PUD area. The Planned Unit Development is going to resemble Brookhaven Square Additions, which are north of the Sooner Fashion Mall. We have Brookhaven Square 1, 2, 3, and 4. There has been some demand and interest for some more of that type of housing – the townhouses – especially in this area. We have a lot of neighbors around there. We have Warwick Addition to the north. We have Brookhaven 25 to the south, Brookhaven 26, Brookhaven 40. This is future Brookhaven 41 final plat. Prairie Creek Addition over there on the other side of Rock Creek Road. CP Land Addition and the commercial area with First Bank at Brookhaven, Razook Addition, Brookhaven Day Care Addition, and our new neighbors the Falls at Brookhaven apartments and Brookhaven Mansions Addition senior living center. So there's a lot of activity going on out there right now. If you drive by you'll see the construction for the Brookhaven Mansions and the Falls going on concurrently. This is an aerial view. You can see where Brookhaven Boulevard terminates right now. One of our initial final plats will actually allow us to extend Brookhaven Boulevard to Rock Creek Road. That is an overlay of the lot layouts to the aerial. Everything fits in here. This is a site plan for the commercial addition – it hasn't changed; it's the same. We're really not doing anything at that time. This is another aerial – kind of like a fly-over view. Again, you can see where we can connect Brookhaven Boulevard to Rock Creek Road. This is another aerial view to the northwest, and to the southwest. I'd be glad to answer any questions you have.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:
None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:
1. Ms. Pailes – Is there still an oil well out there.

2, Mr. Hargis – There is an active oil well out there. It's in the commercial area. We're not developing now.

Chris Lewis moved to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-43, and the Revised Preliminary Plat for <u>*BROOKHAVEN NO. 41 ADDITION*</u>*, to the City Council. Diana Hartley seconded the motion.*

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-43 and the Revised Preliminary Plat for <u>BROOKHAVEN NO. 41 ADDITION</u> to the City Council passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 11, being:
CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY MB REAL ESTATE II FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BOYD STREET AND MONNETT AVENUE.

11A. RESOLUTION NO. R-1112-141 – MB REAL ESTATE II REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LUP-1112-8) FROM OFFICE DESIGNATION TO MIXED USE DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BOYD STREET AND MONNETT AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

11B. ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-44 – MB REAL ESTATE II REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO MUD, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BOYD STREET AND MONNETT AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Concept Design Renderings
4. Site Plan
5. Floor Plans
6. Pre-Development Summary
7. Greenbelt Enhancement Statement

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Ms. Hudson – This applicant is requesting a change to the NORMAN 2025 and rezoning from R-3 to a Mixed Use Development District. The subject tract is at the corner of Boyd and Monnett. The land use is currently designated as office; if changed it will be mixed use. The rezoning from R-3 to the Mixed Use Development District. The applicant has proposed a mixed use development consisting of retail commercial on the ground floor with residential uses on the top two floors. The primary purpose of mixed use development is to create an environment which promotes a mix of housing and commercial retail type uses on the ground floor within a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood, creating walkability. Although this request is not consistent with the 2025 Land Use Plan, it is in line with what is going on in Campus Corner as far as developments and pedestrian activity. There was a protest at 4.8%. Staff does support the rezoning request for mixed use and the Land Use Plan change. The applicant is here and has a presentation for you.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:
1. Barrett Williamson, 1230 Camden Way, the architect for the project – Good evening. Hopefully we'll make your job real easy tonight. Josh gave up tickets to Loud City to be here to run this Powerpoint for us, so we'll get through this as quick as we can. This is one of the first new buildings proposed in the Campus Corner area in decades. I think the other most recent is the 401 Lofts that are east of us, which I wouldn't necessarily call part of Campus Corner. We're excited to share our concept with you tonight, and we intend to set a very high standard for Norman's future core development. Let's go to the first slide. Here are some fast facts. The existing R-3 zoning allowed or required a 15' setback along Boyd, except for the 25' sight triangle. It also allowed 3 stories. With MUD zoning, that allows a 0' setback, which creates more of a street wall, more of an urban core feel. We're proposing 3 stories on the front and rear of the property; it allows up to 6. We didn't feel that that was appropriate scale for the development between the Campus Corner area and the railroad tracks, and we'll go into that in a little more detail. It requires two different unit types on the residential, which we've designated as lofts and flats. The lofts are two-story units; the flats are single-story units. It requires a 20% open space; we're proposing approximately 35% open space, which is

exceeding the requirements of the zoning. It also, with the third story – stories 3 through 4 require an additional 5' setback along our north property line, which we have complied with. We wanted to enhance the street wall. We wanted to articulate our building façade to make it the correct scale for the development, so it's more of a residential scale. We wanted to take advantage of natural lighting and want to use quality materials. This is a site plan. I think it's probably in your packet, but you do see some dashes on there over the parking area. The parking area is completely covered, with the exception of the parking that's off of the alley. One of the things that we wanted to do is get light and air circulation down into the covered parking so that it didn't feel dark and sequestered. One of the other things I wanted to demonstrate – we've got really great developer past performance on this project. This very same team did the Sooner Textbooks – basically five facades along Asp and this is the quality of the project that we propose to do going forward. I want to talk a little bit about some precedents. How many three story buildings are there on Boyd Street? So we started down on the west end. This is the Chouse here, and we're going to work our way east. Newman Hall – 3-1/2 stories. The University obviously exceeds 3 stories. President's House. Whitehead Hall, and it's 3, 4, and 5 stories. Campus Corner, 2 stories. There's our office, we're proud to say. Across the street, Engineering Building. And then Casablanca and you can see the Energy Center in the distance, which will be right across the street from, and then this is our property here. This map currently shows the existing stories along Boyd Street between University and the railroad tracks. If you look up at the top of the graphic – at the top is like an elevation of the buildings. So if you start on the left-hand side, working your way right, we've got 3 stories, which is Whitehead. There's Campus Corner with 2 stories. The pink buildings are across the street to the south, which are the University buildings, and then the yellow building with the 3 is our proposed building. This is a view from our building looking toward the northwest, just to give you an overall idea of how it relates on the site. A view from the southeast. East/southeast as you would go onto Monnett. Looking from Monnett toward the southwest. This is the relationship of the project to the property immediately to the north. This is from the north. One of the things that we made a conscientious effort to do in respect to the neighbors to the north was to not create a long, blank, 3-story façade. We've got a deliberate gap to where we can get winter light down onto the neighbor's property. It's not in the ordinance that we have to do that, but we felt that being a good neighbor that that was important. It also creates light and air and open space for our tenants as well. A little bit later we'll get into a 3-D model that we can show you how the windows and everything are oriented to not have any balconies or anything like that looking down over the neighborhood to the north. The zoning allows 30 units per acre in the mixed use development. We're slightly over that – we may be at 31, but we felt that that was appropriate for this type of development and the development going forward. I know the Planning Commission is going to be wrestling with that issue. I think there's some much higher densities being proposed. We really felt like this was all that the site would hold. We also think that these kind of developments are the future. They promote walkability. They create more energy and street life. People that will be living here won't necessarily be wed to their cars. They'll be able to walk up and down Boyd, Campus Corner, Legacy Trail, over at the University, and so on. This type of project sets a very high standard for future development. I think really importantly it establishes a precedent for the appropriate scale and character of building along the Boyd Corridor. The articulation of the façade, how we tried to break the façade into four separate mini-facades, helps to adjust the scale down to a more pedestrian level. It's also in the zoning ordinance that the facades shouldn't be some big blank slate. It's got clear glazing for the retail sections. Again, that's something that's going to promote the walkability of the area. Kind of as a conclusion, these were some things that we felt were important that we feel like our development addresses very successfully. Now I think we'll go to the 3-D model. One of the things that we were conscientious of in developing these on the north side of the property, was to have the bedrooms toward the property owner with balconies toward the center of the project that would face east and west – the idea being that we wouldn't have people hanging out yelling over the balcony at the neighbors – although we don't expect that kind of tenant because this will be about $1 to $1.25 a square foot per month, so not everyone will be able to

afford to live here. It will be upscale and high quality. I think that's something that we took into consideration that we weren't necessarily required to do. One of the letters of protest, of which we received three – in the early models, and at the Pre-Development hearing, we did not have this landscaping shown. We do feel it's appropriate. I believe it's required. It just wasn't anything that we had graphically shown. But we do intend to take advantage of that to try and mitigate the view and some of the noise to the property owner to the north. Now I would like to specifically address the items on the letters of protest. The first one was from the property owner at 914 Monnett. Water runoff and drainage. We actually have less paved area than we would if this was a parking lot. The drainage is required by the code to be directed away from the adjacent properties. The drainage will be developed by a registered civil engineer. So we don't feel like that is something that will impact that neighbor negatively. There was a comment about trash and traffic and noise. Boyd Street being an arterial street with relatively high traffic volumes, there is an inherent amount of noise from that, but we don't feel like we're going to be adding significantly to. Again, the separation, consisting of the combination of landscaping and a privacy fence, will screen the parking lot. They also made a comment about why not just closing in the parking garage. One of our reasons for that is to improve the air circulation and visual security. We don't want it to be a dark place that people don't feel welcome coming into. We want it well-lit and safe feeling. One of the protestors – and this was the same property – mentioned that privacy and said that will be a thing of the past. Well, I don't think it's really fair for us to not develop a project -- it's been vacant for many years – just to promote a neighbor's open space. So, regardless of whether this is actually approved or not, something is going to happen with this land. Even if an 8' tall house was built there, their view is going to be blocked. There was a concern about construction traffic and parking. First of all, it's a short-term issue. We don't expect that the construction will be over a year. The construction vehicles will park on the site. Under rare circumstances, there will be temporary disruption of traffic for the off-loading of large equipment and materials. I don't think this is really an unusual thing. It happens on a daily basis on the alley behind our office on Campus Corner. But it will not be nearly as frequent as Campus Corner, because you don't have the beer trucks back there every morning. Deliveries for the future retail business will be via the alley or off of Monnett for large deliveries, similar to the Campus Corner alleys. With the retailers being small, niche retailers of approximately 1,000 feet each, we really anticipate that the majority of the deliveries will be made by small vans with boxes under 12' tall, so many of the deliveries can be actually made into the parking lot. There was a concern about the hours of operations for construction. We don't anticipate that to be but from 8:00 to 5:00. There could be times when it's 7:00 to 4:00, but kind of your typical 8-hour construction day. The last concern expressed by this property owner was on the condition of the infrastructure. The condition and maintenance of the alley – not to point fingers – but that's really the City's responsibility, not ours. Our project will not increase the need for additional maintenance of the alley. Being on the south end of Boyd, we don't anticipate that the tenants that live here, or people coming to shop here, are going to drive 300 feet down an alley when they could take Monnett or Boyd or Asp, just because of the convenience factor. The project's design will also upgrade utilities as required. In the event that we need to increase our sanitary sewer size, which we don't anticipate, but if required we'll do that. Another positive thing is that we're likely going to be relocating all of the electrical underground so that if you noticed in some of the photographs – there's kind of some crazy wires going on over there. That was, by far, the longest letter, so I'm very near the end. 518 Macy had a concern about the building height. The current R-3 zoning allows three stories, so we're not proposing anything more than what would be allowed there under the present zoning. The southern view of the property owner to the north will be cut off by the development. Well, again, the lot will develop regardless, so I don't think that's really a valid concern. The resident of the proposed development will look down on adjacent property to the north. Again, let's kind of go up high and do just a quick circle around. We don't have any balconies proposed on the north. We do have basically a fire stair to egress people off the property that will go down to the parking area. It will be secured. You will have to have access to get into that, even though we're showing it with glass rail. It's not something that just anybody can walk up. Go around to

the alley. On the west side we've got balconies. We've got balconies on the east side. We've got balconies on the south side. All of these are basically sub-divided so there's really not any peaking at your neighbor. Again, the gap here on the north was purposely developed to be considerate of the person to the north's light and air. I think their last comment was architectural congruence. The proposed design is based on what we think of as a timeless scale, proportions and massing. This type of façade is found throughout Norman and the Midwest. It is an updated version of that, but we refer to it architecturally as Plains Commercial. It's characterized by large openings that evoke the storefronts of many historic downtown retail buildings, including those in Norman. This style was constructed from the late 19th Century through the Great Depression and is adjacent to Craftsman style residences throughout the country. The last letter of protest was from the property owners of 763 Jenkins. They listed a total of nine comments after the Pre-Development hearing, which I believe we addressed. Only the comment that I'm going to address was actually circled as part of the protest, and that was a question on the affect on the alley, the traffic, and the wear and tear. Again, being directly off Boyd Street, we anticipate that the majority of patrons and residents will arrive to the property from Boyd Street. If the project was mid-block, that may not be the case. Many alleys have similar traffic counts in urban areas. Why would a patron or resident take a congested, poorly paved alley in lieu of a well-maintained Monnett or Boyd Street. In conclusion, 4.76% opposed. In essence, what that says to me is that 95.24% approved. We have endeavored to go beyond the minimum requirements outlined in the MUD zoning ordinance. We have proposed more open space than what was required, widened perimeter sidewalks for additional walkability, and conscientiously designed the building forms to give additional consideration of the neighboring properties. We feel we are setting a precedent that will further guide high-quality development along the Boyd Street corridor. With that, I will distribute a handout of this for you and be available to answer any questions.

2. Mr. Lewis – First, I'm wondering how soon you're taking reservations on unit #8. I think it's a wonderful project. My second question really is more just for my peace of mind. If you can go back to the diagram that shows the alley and shows us where the trash receptacle is going to be – is there going to be any type of fencing? So if the wind started blowing, it wouldn't be blowing right into the neighbor's back door.

3. Mr. Williamson – There will be an enclosure around the dumpster. The fence will also help. The dumpster enclosure is actually required as part of the City ordinance, as is the privacy fence.

4. Ms. Pailes – Could we see the western façade? The front there – the bottom is stores. Are the second and third floor along the front façade facing Boyd empty spaces? Is that true? Am I reading that right?

5. Mr. Williamson – They're balconies. They don't have roofs, but they've got walls. So you have a view.

6. Ms. Pailes – Well, here's my deal. The MUD designation I don't technically have a problem with. I have a big problem with how much it crowds that house to the north. And, actually, those apartments could scoot forward by – what? – 25 feet and give the house behind you a little space. Let me just be more specific. The house behind you is really crowded. If you had R-3, you'd have to have a setback of about 25' ...

7. Mr. Williamson – 15' on the side yard, so it would buy them 5 more feet.

8. Ms. Pailes – That's a back yard, actually. Boyd is in the front and that house is behind you.

9. Mr. Williamson – The lots front Monnett. Because if you look at the property to the north, look how close they are to their south property line.

10. Ms. Pailes – But actually your frontage for the stores is really – I won't argue that. It's just how much it crowds that house. I have a real problem with that. We've talked a lot about smart growth. We're having long city discussions on density. And part of the presentation by the staff to orient us all on it was talk about new urbanism, which was supposed to bring forward the virtues of neighborhoods as designed in the 20s and 30s, pre-car. Well, you've got a neighborhood here that was designed in the 20s and 30s, and this totally overwhelms it. It's totally out of scale. It's totally out of architectural congruence and it's looking right into their back yards. So, while the MUD is great – that's a good thing – I find your perching in their side yard to be a little bit much, and you probably have some options. Your second and third floors actually have some wiggle room there architecturally.

11. Mr. Knotts – You have commercial installations here. Where are the customers going to park?

12. Mr. Williamson – They'll park in the parking lot off of the alley and underneath the buildings.

13. Mr. Knotts – So the parking underneath the buildings is not restricted or carded or anything like that?

14. Mr. Williamson – It's part of the new MUD ordinance, but it's shared parking, because the residents are expected to be gone during certain times of the day and then the customers use them. But basically from 5:00 on all the parking is for residential.

15. Mr. Knotts – Including the commercial on the alley?

16. Mr. Williamson – We needed 1.8 per unit, so I've got the calculations. It's 1.8 times 13, so it's about 24 spaces are required for the residential. I believe we've got 36 proposed in our development. But at nighttime, when the retail is closed, you've got places for visitors and guests to park as well.

17. Mr. Knotts – Well, in that area, I would expect the retail to be open until 9:00 at least.

18. Mr. Williamson – It could be. There's no parking required for Campus Corner businesses. But there are going to be people walking up and down the street that are going to shop at these places, in addition to people just coming by car.

19. Mr. Knotts – Of course, what I'm concerned about, and the reason for my question, is that, if you don't have adequate on-site commercial parking, that parking will wind up on Monnett or any of the other side streets walking in and it's better for the neighborhood not to have that happen.

20. Mr. Williamson – I agree. The parking does meet the zoning ordinance – all the parking calculations. I believe that Jane reviewed those. We went through all those together. One other thing, just to point out, we're not anticipating any restaurants in this retail development. It's going to be retail merchants. So there's not going to be any food service in these, and those do draw cars.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Elizabeth Jackson, 763 Jenkins Avenue – We met the gentleman when they came to the Pre-Development meeting. Some of the problems – they were kind enough after the meeting to

take our input and I thought they were going to make some changes, because they were all in kind of agreement about the parking on the alley and how you're going to get in and out. But I expected to see some kind of diagram showing that they had taken – actually, there were suggestions – into account. And they were saying that's a good idea. Because these people are going to be trying to back out. There's the other little shopping mall right across the alley where people are parking, and then we have the city services – our polycarts are on the alley, our recycling bins are on the alley. It's a busy alley. And to say – these are just assumptions, I think, that were made – that, oh, people are not going to drive north on the alley; they're all going to go south onto Boyd Street. And if there's traffic on Boyd Street, there's going to be some congestion. But I think that it should be dealt with before any brick or mortar is put down. If you go north on the alley, it's very old. It has been resurfaced, but it's been ages and it gets a lot of wear and tear. We drive down the alley because that's where our carport – we're usually driving down the alley. And we go north on the alley usually, but we can go south. There's a lot of use. There are other – the strip mall that has the comic book shop and the restaurant – they must have 50 parking places that enter and exit – some on the alley, some have the exits onto Jenkins Street. We've lived there for over 30 years and you get used to it when you become a part of the neighborhood. People who are not used to it – people moving in to these nice apartments or the retail visiting those – I think they're going to have problems that they are not really wanting to consider. I agree that there was not enough space between the north side of the building and the neighbor to the north. First we saw about this when we got the mail was that there was going to be no space. Then when we came to the meeting, 10-15 feet – I mean, 5-10 feet. And now they're just saying it's back to 5 feet. And I think that's just pushing it a little bit for the neighbor to the north. I can't think of anything else. I will say it is a beautiful design. I admire the architects for coming up with it. I think it's too large for the lot and should be scaled back and they're going to have to deal with the parking for everybody to be satisfied with it. Thank you.

2. Cheryl Clayton, 503 Tulsa – I live in the core area of town. I agree. I think this could be a nice development. What concerns me about it, and the precedent it's setting, has to do with parking. The way I calculate it, there would be, in fact, the 24 parking places that were needed for the residents, and then I calculated 27 parking places at 1 per 200 square feet for the retail. The 28 covered parking spaces are controlled access, so that really only leaves uncontrolled 8 parking spaces. Living in the core area of town, what you have to appreciate – if you don't live there – is the extent to which the University parking and retail parking, and my neighborhood being The Mont, has pushed itself into the neighborhood. These streets are small. It's really hard to accommodate that kind of parking. Plus, it's the older part of town and it has little one-car driveways, so when you try to get in and out of your driveway and you have people – the people park just bumper to bumper right up to the edge of your driveway. It's just darn near impossible, sometimes, to get out. So I think as we go forward with this – and I think we all recognize we're going to have some higher densities here in this part of town – but we really need to address the parking issue. And if we have to fudge somewhere – and I really hate to say this, because I do love the landscaping and all that – but I'd almost rather see the buffers and stuff go and have adequate parking, because it really does affect those of us who live in this neighborhood. So I hope as you go forward, we will make sure that we have adequate parking. Thank you.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Lewis – I want to make sure that I understood you correctly in regards to parking. The parking that is underneath the building is not going to be controlled access. It is going to be open prior to the hours of 5:00 p.m. for the use of the businesses that are there. Is that correct?

2. Mr. Williamson – The controlled access is maybe something that is not fully understood how we're planning on implementing that. We're looking at using a token type lot, so if you're a resident you have a card to swipe, you come in and you park. If you're a customer, you come

in, the gate goes up, you get a token to get out. So it's not closed off to the public during retail business hours.

3. Mr. Lewis – So those parking spaces are going to be accessible.

4. Mr. Williamson – Absolutely. It won't work with 8 parking spaces.

5. Mr. Lewis – I'm trying to be clear because there was some misunderstanding. Those parking spaces underneath the building are going to be accessible by the patrons of the businesses that are in the building as well as the residents.

6. Mr. Williamson – Absolutely.

7. Ms. Gordon – According to the staff report, the summary of the request – and just tell me if this is in line with what it is – it says the target market is young professionals or, perhaps, employees of the University who want to walk to work and have pedestrian access to Campus Corner area, which means they won't be leaving with their cars during the day if that's your target market. Is that right?

8. Mr. Williamson – Some may, but really our target market is whoever has got the money to pay $1.25 a square foot.

9. Ms. Gordon – Clearly. But my point is that you may have quite a few of those people that choose to live there that could potentially be University employees and may just walk to work and it doesn't free up those parking spaces. Is that a possibility?

10. Mr. Williamson – It is. If you take that same rationale of thinking, if you don't need a car – or if you don't need two cars and maybe you just have one, because in higher density developments where people can walk and get their food they don't need two cars because both earnings partners are not commuting to work.

11. Ms. Gordon – There is no one in Oklahoma that doesn't need a car. I see what you're saying.

12. Mr. Williamson – People who seek out these kind of developments – and there are a high number of those and you can start looking at Bricktown and areas like that – there are people in Oklahoma in the last 10 years that have reduced the number of cars that they own because they live by where they work. I would like to remind and reinforce that everything on this entire block, not just our corner, is zoned R-3. So this zoning, and this ability to go three stories, extends to the north, I believe, all the way to Duffy Street.

13. Ms. Pailes – Would it be possible to cut straight through that parking garage from east to west?

14. Mr. Williamson – It is. Currently it is designed that way.

15. Ms. Pailes – That seems like not a good idea because if people can shortcut, they will, if they want to avoid messing with Boyd or something.

16. Mr. Williamson – Do you mean pedestrians or automobiles? There are gated entrances into the parking lot.

17. Mr. Boeck – You can ram those gates, and judging from the gate success stories or issues around Campus Corner there's no gates left.

18. Mr. Williamson – There's a gate on my lot. I would say we park right behind Campus Corner and that alley is absolutely busier than the alley between Monnett and Jenkins and has probably more parking in it. It still has a lot of people's garages and access. That alley works, as does the controlled access parking that I rent. I live in that environment.

Chris Lewis moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. R-1112-141 and Ordinance No. O-1112-44 to the City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

19. Mr. Gasaway – I'm kind of a preservationist at heart, so when we do projects in existing core area neighborhoods, I like to give them a significant amount of thought. As I'm prone to do when I think, I ramble a little bit. So I have some rambling thoughts about the project. First of all, a lot of these projects are coming up in the campus area and it makes me a little sad but, as a city, we're still not prepared with specific recommendations on what we feel is appropriate in these areas, both in terms of density and height. We're just starting a study that I think will be very beneficial. This one certainly is a lot different than the one we had last month. It's significantly different. But still, I think it's something we ought to think about highly. One advantage to this property is it's already vacant. We're not tearing down any houses. That would be of large concern to me, but it's been vacant for many years. So we're not destroying any property. If this project is done correctly, it could be a fine example that will set a standard for some of these other developments that people are wanting to do in this area. If it's not done well, it will be exactly the opposite – something that we're stuck with for 50 years. It looks like it's a pretty good example of something that is a good blend of campus itself – of the University – and of Campus Corner. I realize it's a little large, but I think with the campus and Campus Corner there, this is probably a good fit for that niche. A few concerns that I have. One, it has been mentioned, it does impact the house to the north, and I think that should always be a concern. Probably my biggest concern is that it, to some extent, opens up some spillover onto Monnett. I hear from time to time that there are some interests in property along Monnett for this specific use. That is a residential neighborhood and this kind of tips the corner a little bit into doing some of that on Monnett. I think at all costs we need to remember that Monnett is a residential street. While this particular project impacts that some, it's not directly onto Monnett, but I think anything else – there's a vacant lot, I think, one house up from this which makes it kind of an open property to open that up, and I think we should be very mindful of that – you know, that Monnett needs to remain a residential area. Those are my concerns. I think the positive part of it outweighs that, so I will be supporting it. But I just want everybody to be mindful – above all this is the back yard to a residential area and I think the architects have done a good job working with that and, again, I think the design, being collegiate, is a good buffer between those two.

20. Chairman Sherrer – Just a point of confirmation for staff. The current zoning allows three story buildings, correct?

21. Ms. Connors – Correct. This property is zoned R-3, as well as all the property around Monnett.

22. Chairman Sherrer – So there's no additional height by this change?

23. Ms. Connors – That's correct.

24. Ms. Pailes – It is zoned R-3 three stories, but with R-3 you would have a bigger setback, and it is the setback that I find most upsetting. At three stories it doesn't impact just the house next door – it impacts the neighborhood because they can look down on a good chunk of the houses. Everybody points to OU as having very large buildings. That's true. OU has definitely gotten in the giant direction, but they do offset it with actual open ground, not just balconies

and other things that technically count as open space, but actually open ground. So, yes, they do build very large scale, but they do offset it with actual open space. I would like to split this in terms of voting. I'll be happy to vote for the MUD designation. I don't think I can vote for this particular plan. So can we go ahead and split those?

25. Chairman Sherrer noted that there was already a motion on the floor.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	Cynthia Gordon, Roberta Pailes
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Resolution No. R-1112-141 and Ordinance No. O-1112-44 to the City Council passed by a vote of 7-2.

* * *

RECESS
8:47 to 8:54 p.m.

* * *

Diana Hartley moved to postpone Item No. 15, Greenways Master Plan, to the July meeting. Chris Lewis seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Curtis McCarty, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	Tom Knotts, Roberta Pailes
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to postpone Item No. 15 to the July 12, 2012 meeting passed by a vote of 7-2.

* * *

Mr. McCarty announced that he needed to be recused on Item No. 12. He left the room.

Item No. 12, being:
ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-45 – 823 PROPERTIES, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-2, TWO-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, FOR 0.24 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 930 ELM AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Development Plan
4. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Ms. Hudson – The applicant has requested rezoning from R-2 to RM-6, Medium Density Apartment District, to allow for the construction of a three-story, six-unit apartment building, with a parking lot which would be on the west side of the lot. The existing zoning is R-3 and R-2 around the area. Existing land use includes some sororities on the south, Stubbeman Village to the southeast. There is a ministries services building to the east, and the University in the distance. On the west side of this lot is a duplex. The current use is a single-family home. The 2025 Land Use Plan designation for this lot is high density residential use. With the close proximity to the University, the 2025 Land Use designation for the higher density developments, and the screening that they have proposed for the adjacent property to the north, staff does support this request. We did have a protest from the property owner to the north at 1.9%. The applicant's architect and representative are here and have a presentation for you.

2. Mr. Knotts – It appeared to me that the garage was also a living quarters behind that house.

3. Ms. Hudson – I'm not sure. I actually called to ask and they couldn't get hold of the owner to be able to tell what was back there. They might know now.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:
1. Sean Rieger, 136 Thompson Drive, representing the applicant – Commissioner Knotts, I don't believe there is anybody living back there right now. I'm not positive about that. It is currently zoned R-2, so that would be allowed that you could have two different units on the property. I'll go into a little bit of length tonight just because we do have that one protest and they are here tonight to advocate against the project. You saw those slides. This area is very much surrounded by pretty high intensity uses. C-2 zoning is Stubbeman Village. C-2 zoning is as intensive a zoning as you can have in the City of Norman, so this is really in the midst of some high intense zoning. There's an aerial of what we're looking at, and you can see on the aerial – there's the Gamma Phi Beta house – basically the south Greek area is immediately south of this site. Stubbeman Village, the tall Walker Tower which you saw off in the distance is right there and you get into church uses and University religious uses all around it. Really, these two or three houses here are kind of an anomaly in the area in a way. What has happened is this applicant is in the process of purchasing this corner property to develop into not a really intense use – six units. This isn't what you just saw previously of a massive border-to-border block building. This is just a small six-unit apartment building with the parking lot behind it. That's the site looking up closer, you can see over here, is multi-family use right there. That's the University religious center, Stubbeman Village off the corner, and this is the site right here. There's some mature trees around it which we'll be preserving – they're really off the site to the north. This is what I really want you to look very closely at. This is a very intense NORMAN 2025 Planned area. This site is planned high density residential in NORMAN 2025. Not medium density residential on 2025, but high density residential. It is already planned for what we're proposing, is RM-6, Medium Density Residential for the site. So I would remind you Commissioners, that when we come before you

with a proposed zoning that is in line with 2025, you do, in a way, as an applicant, have a presumptive right to achieve that zoning because your community has said that's what you want it to be. That is the ideal condition. And that's what we're seeking tonight is RM-6 under the high intensity high residential use of 2025. There is the actual zonings. Really the only parcels that are not in line, now, with the high density residential 2025 Plan are the three right here – one of them protesting – and the one before you, the applicant. But you can see RM-6 over here, R-3 zoning which you just heard Mr. Williamson talk to you about, C-2 and C-1 zonings over here, and then all of the University facilities off to the east. This is the site plan. Again, in the interest of brevity, I'm going to ask Rick McKinney to come up and actually talk through how he has planned this site.

2. Rick McKinney, McKinney Partnership, 3600 West Main Street – As you can see on this site plan, we have six units, three stories high. The ground floor of this is outlined in the purple there. Each unit is approximately 1,000 square feet. We're a little bit over 6,000 feet for the whole building. The height will be under 35 feet – it's a low 35 feet with low ceiling heights inside. There's a breezeway in between the two bottom units, and it will be a controlled access for security. And then as you get up to the second and third floor, those two units will connect, but still allow room for the stairwell in the middle. The facility will be fire sprinkled. You'll notice on the site plan down below there's a lot of on-street parking. The duplex to the left – those cars back into the street. The sorority on the bottom of the page – those cars back into the street. We have 12 contained parking spaces on our lot with the required landscaping. We have screened polycarts for each of the units. There's also a 4' masonry wall on each side of the parking lot drive going into the site. One thing we're going to do is the front of the project will face Elm Street. It will be well landscaped. It will have a residential feel to it. We're going to have box dormer windows popped out of the unit. You can see by the articulation of the façade. We're looking at brick and stone and siding for this project. There's a 25' setback off of Elm Street, a 15' setback off of Hoover Street. There was one concern we had from the neighbor was the view from the units looking down to the single story house next door. I have shown the outline of the house. Our entire facility is to the east of that house. There's a swimming pool in the back yard of this house next door. They were concerned about being able to look down onto that unit. If you look at the floor plan, what we've done at this point – these are two-bedroom units, but the two bathrooms for those units are on the north side and the showers actually abut the north wall, and those have glass block in the shower. There's a small window right here off of the bathroom, and then the bedroom window here faces east. The only window that actually faces the neighbor to the north is this bedroom window right here in the middle. If we go back to the site plan, that window is approximately in this location. Their swimming pool is back over here, and our rear yard – we're required to have a 20' rear yard – we are almost 75' from the west property line to the back of our unit. So virtually there will be no units looking down into the back yard, which is one of their concerns. This shows the breezeway in between with controlled access. His vision for this property would be to build a relationship with the sorority across the street, would be an example. Once you've done that where the upper level classmen start to use this facility and it would become a place where they would stay year after year across the street from their house. Also, we have no balconies. He did not want to have balconies where people could step outside, party, things like that, make noise. So there's no balconies projected out. We have landscaping all the way around the facility in excess of the city's standards. With that, if there's any questions for me before I sit down?

3. Mr. Boeck – The only question I would have is you don't need two stairs?

4. Mr. McKinney – No. If you sprinkle a building, wood frame, you just need one stair.

5. Mr. Rieger – I have a few more comments. I think it's important to note there is one protest here. It's 1.9%. Again, I hope Rick has explained well enough to you, as you see on that site plan, the pool is back here, the building is far out front with windows looking out to the east,

at best. All of this is R-3 zoning back here. They could certainly build up tall and look into that back yard much easier than we can. I think it's important for you to understand the motivation to some extent, at least, of the protest. In April I was given a call by this neighbor and they requested for us to buy their property. Their son, as I understand it, graduated from law school and was living there. He has moved out and they need to sell the property. It is currently listed on the MLS at $299,000 and they purchased the property in 2008 at $256,000. So they're listing it right now for $186 per square foot. The comps in the area are roughly $112 per square foot, $126 per square foot, $116 per square foot. My client simply is not interested in buying their property. They asked me again tonight on a different price would he be interested in buying the property. It was quite clear, I think, in April that the couple told me that if we weren't interested in buying they would protest the project, and they have tonight. So that's part of the protest, I think. It's important for you to understand that and hear that. Again, I would just simply remind from the staff report you see the really intense uses all around this project – significant intensities around and we are already platted. We are exactly in line with 2025 as this is proposed and, therefore, we do request your support. Staff supports this, I think quite easily, because it's in line with the 2025. With that, I request your support. I thank you very much for your time.

6. Ms. Pailes – Fine with me. Great. It's a good scale for the neighborhood. It's lovely. Thanks.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Blaine Nice, 100 N. Broadway, representing Mr. Meade who owns the residence at 924 Elm, just directly north – First, I guess I need to respond to his comment about the property owner or his representative contacting him and asking to participate and then they wouldn't do it – it's like trying to extort money out of them or something. I don't think that's anything different than Mr. Rieger would do if he had a client that owned property that a three-story building was proposed to go next to, which is going to be five feet from the property line. They point out that the pool is not next to the building, but this building is going to be five feet next to the property line. The property owner's objection to this is that it's going to lower the property value – he already has it on the market and the realtor has advised him the price needs to be lowered. Yes, the price per square foot may be higher than any of the other properties in the neighborhood, but it's the nicest property in the neighborhood. It's a beautiful one-story bungalow. It's got trees. It's got a nice landscaped yard that they sit out in and it's got a pool. There was a residence next to it. Now there's going to be a three-story apartment with 12 people next to it. I understand it's nice and Mr. Rieger points out that Stubbeman – but Stubbeman is two or three blocks away. The sorority is across the street. And this is 5' from their property line. I understand in the grand scope of the 2025 Plan that is what is called for in this area. But, as Mr. Gasaway pointed out a few minutes ago, we're still studying how we're going to deal with these and what rules we're going to have with these. I just think it's a little premature to have this crammed into this lot when you've got a single-family residence next to it. You're having these discussions – I think they've had one public meeting and the public meetings end in August. I just think that the rules haven't been set of how we're going to handle this increased density. I understand it's within the Comp Plan and I appreciate that. I just think that the rules aren't there. But my client – it's going to increase the noise. It's going to increase the traffic. Mr. Williamson was a little bit naïve, I believe, and I think you may agree with him that you're going to have these types of structures and somebody is not going to bring a car to college. All 12 girls are going to have a car and every friend they invite over is going to have a car. I mean, there is no question it's going to increase the traffic and increase the density. That's just the reality. Try as we might, Oklahomans haven't bought into that we can walk very far and we don't need automobiles. That is not reality. And that's what's going to happen here. The parking lot is going to be next to the pool. There's going to be a lot of noise. It interferes with their use of the property. When they bought the property there was a residence next to it. Yes, it was multi-family, but it was not a three-story apartment. I understand there's some very good qualities in this proposal. Mr. McKinney has done a good job. We're not saying it's not a

good design, other than it's 5' from the property line. And if you owned a house and it was zoned a certain way and somebody comes in and asks for a change of use – a change in zoning – not something that's permitted with the zoning but a change in the zoning and to put a structure 5' from your property line, I don't think any of you sitting up here would like that. I'm just asking you to recommend denial of this at this time. I just don't think it's ready for this area. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

2. Mr. Rieger – I just want to make sure you're aware – Mr. Nice was equating this to the last project and to the very high density discussions we're having. That is not this. The very high density discussions you're having with the Elsey projects and others is 100 units per square acre. This is 6 units on I think about a quarter of an acre. It is nothing like that. RM-6 is not the intensity of zonings that the high density discussions are having or anything like the last project where you just approved a 5' separation full width of the block, three stories with windows all looking down into the neighbor. You just approved that project. This is far less density than that. Thank you very much.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:
Chris Lewis moved to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-45 to the City Council. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
RECUSED	Curtis McCarty

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-45 to the City Council passed by a vote of 8-0.

Mr. McCarty rejoined the meeting.

* * *

Item No. 13, being:
RESOLUTION NO. R-1112-131 – A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, ADOPTING THE ORIGINAL TOWNSITE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AS AN ELEMENT OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Original Townsite Neighborhood Plan (bound separately)

Item No. 14, being:
RESOLUTION NO. R-1112-132 – A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, ADOPTING THE BISHOP CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN AS AN ELEMENT OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Bishop Creek Neighborhood Plan (bound separately)

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Ms. Atkinson – Thank you for the opportunity to very briefly discuss with you the Bishop Creek and Original Townsite Neighborhood Plans. We were here about a year ago with our last two neighborhood plans, and we've been working on these two during this past 12 months. The neighborhood planning process was established as a goal for the City by the 2025 Plan, so we are consistently doing about two neighborhood plans a year. If you choose to recommend adoption of these two tonight, that will be plans 5 and 6. These get adopted, with your recommendation, into the Norman 2025 Plan as sort of micro-focused views of these neighborhoods. These are policy documents; they do not include regulatory language. Really what they do is just deal with whatever issues are afoot in these two places. Again, the core area includes a large number of neighborhoods. Some of them are CDGB neighborhoods – you are familiar with that program. Some of them are not. In this case, Bishop Creek Neighborhood is just a core area neighborhood. They approached us and asked us if we would work with them, which was a real pleasure to do. We talked a lot in that neighborhood about social organization. Their infrastructure is great. They're a relatively young neighborhood; things are pretty good there; incomes are relatively high. But they need to figure out how to reconnect the social fiber of the neighborhood. Original Townsite is just that – it's the City's oldest neighborhood. It was platted in 1890. So some of the infrastructure needs are much more significant there. The neighborhood plans basically lay out the neighborhood's aspirations for the future, they strengthen a sense of ownership by people participating in the planning process, and they identify a number of projects that could be implemented over the next ten years. Ten years is about the shelf life on a neighborhood plan. We won't really deal too much with the process, although if you have some specific questions I will be glad to answer them. Again, what we're asking you to consider tonight is to recommend adoption of these two neighborhood plans, in which case they will make their way to City Council sometime this summer.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:
No one in the audience offered any comments.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:
1. Mr. Boeck – I got to participate in one of these neighborhood plan developments. I actually came up with the name for Bishop Creek. It's a great process. I really appreciated the process. I didn't get to make the first round of meetings, but I did make the second round. I just think that the City, in doing that process, is really doing a service to the neighborhoods in a core area. It probably would work doing it in all neighborhoods, because I think it really helps the neighborhood identify and kind of connect at the social, street level. So thank you.

Chris Lewis moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1112-131, the Original Townsite Neighborhood Plan, to City Council. Cindy Gordon seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1112-131 to City Council passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Chris Lewis moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1112-132, the Bishop Creek Neighborhood Plan, to City Council. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Curtis McCarty, Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1112-132 to City Council passed by a vote of 9-0.

2. Mr. Gasaway – Mr. Chairman, might I say thank you to Susan. It takes a lot more staff time than you would imagine to do one of these and to work with the community, and it's something that's very important for a lot of these neighborhoods. Thank you for your time.

3. Mr. Boeck – It brought up some interesting things in talking about accessibility and, you know, I'm "Mr. Make Norman Age Friendly" and so sidewalks or streets and discussing kids getting to school at Lincoln and we had this discussion, well, we could put in sidewalks, but when we put in sidewalks that means cars – and a lot of these driveways aren't big enough for two cars so, all of a sudden, your back end is sticking out over the sidewalk and you get a ticket, so maybe we don't want sidewalks in our neighborhood. So it's realistic conversations about what makes the neighborhood usable or not usable.

* * *

Item No. 15, being:
R-1112-119 – A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, ADOPTING THE GREENWAYS MASTER PLAN.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Alternate Resolution
3. Key Guiding Principles of the Greenway Master Plan
4. Resolution No. R-1112-119
5. May 17, 2012 Letter – Heiple Law Offices, Inc.
6. NDC Resolution
7. April 12, 2012 Planning Commission Minutes

This item was postponed for one month, prior to consideration of Item No. 12, by a vote of 7-2.

* * *

Item No. 16, being:

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

1. Chairman Sherrer acknowledged Jane Hudson, who was selected as Principal Planner, and expressed appreciation for all her work.

2. Ms. Connors – We began our high density discussion this past Monday, and there is now a series of five more meetings. We will get you the schedule.

* * *

Item No. 17, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Norman Planning Commission