

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

JULY 14, 2011

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 July 2011. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chairman Jim Gasaway called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cynthia Gordon
Diana Hartley
Tom Knotts
Chris Lewis
Roberta Pailes
Andy Sherrer
Zev Trachtenberg
Jim Gasaway

MEMBERS ABSENT

Curtis McCarty

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Doug Koscinski, Manager, Current
Planning Division
Ken Danner, Development Coordinator
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst

* * *

Item No. 2, being:

CONSENT DOCKET

Chairman Gasaway announced that the Consent Docket is designed to allow the Planning Commission to approve a number of items by one motion and vote. He read the items recommended for inclusion on the Consent Docket, as follows:

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 9, 2011 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES AND THE JUNE 23, 2011 SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 4, being:

FP-1112-1 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SOUTHLAKE GROUP, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR SOUTH LAKE ADDITION, SECTION 12, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF CLASSEN BOULEVARD (US HIGHWAY NO. 77) AND SOUTH OF RENAISSANCE DRIVE.

*

Chairman Gasaway also noted that the applicant has requested postponement of Item No. 8, **CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TECUMSEH PROJECT, L.L.C. FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD AND EAST OF ASTOR DRIVE**, until the August 11 meeting, and that could also be done as part of the Consent Docket.

Chairman Gasaway asked if any member of the Planning Commission wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, he asked if anyone in the audience wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, he turned to the Planning Commission for discussion.

Tom Knotts moved to place approval of Item Nos. 3 and 4, and the postponement of Item No. 8 until the August 11 meeting, on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote. Roberta Pailes seconded the motion.

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

| | |
|--------|---|
| YEAS | Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Roberta Pailes, Andy Sherrer, Zev Trachtenberg, Jim Gasaway |
| NAYES | None |
| ABSENT | Curtis McCarty |

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to place approval of Item Nos. 3 and 4, and the postponement of Item No. 8 until the August 11 meeting, on the Consent Docket, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 9, 2011 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES AND THE JUNE 23, 2011 SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

This item was approved as submitted on the Consent Docket by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

FP-1112-1 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SOUTHLAKE GROUP, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR SOUTH LAKE ADDITION, SECTION 12, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF CLASSEN BOULEVARD (US HIGHWAY NO. 77) AND SOUTH OF RENAISSANCE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Final Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Site Plan
5. Preliminary Plat

This item was approved on the Consent Docket by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 6, being:

O-1011-62 – MOHAMMAD DAVANI REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A BAR WITH LIVE ENTERTAINMENT FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED C-3, INTENSIVE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, LOCATED AT 117 N. CRAWFORD AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Pre-Development Application and Site Plan
4. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Mr. Koscinski reported that this is an establishment that started business and has some of their licenses. Because of the way they wish to operate, they need to go through this procedure. There was a Pre-Development meeting last month and one person attended and supported the request. This is downtown and is surrounded by other commercial uses. This block has several other entertainment venues. North of the site are some retail uses. South of it are several other entertainment and/or music venues. Directly across the street is the City's parking lot, which is available at no charge at this time. There was a protest on the application, which constituted 3.5% of the notification area. Staff supports the request. It is somewhat compatible with what is immediately nearby and there is some parking available in the immediate area, which addresses one of the major concerns. The applicant essentially intends to have smoking, which puts him in the bar category, unless you can have separate ventilation systems and it is really too small, and rather expensive, to do that. He wishes to have Middle Eastern dancers as the live entertainment.

2. Roberta Pailles asked what all is encompassed by "live entertainment." Mr. Koscinski responded that any restaurant is automatically allowed to have live entertainment inside – it can be a band, canned music, poets, a wide variety. The applicant doesn't qualify as a full-service restaurant because he doesn't sell enough food. Sugars is an adult entertainment venue, which is another category of special use.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

None

PARTICIPATION BY THE AUDIENCE:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Zev Trachtenberg moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1011-62 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

Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Roberta Pailles, Andy Sherrer, Zev Trachtenberg, Jim Gasaway

NAYES
ABSENT

None
Curtis McCarty

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1011-62 to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY HALLBROOKE DEVELOPMENT GROUP ONE, L.L.C. FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND WEST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

7A. RESOLUTION NO. R-1011-115

HALLBROOKE DEVELOPMENT GROUP ONE, L.L.C., REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LUP-1011-13) FROM FUTURE URBAN SERVICE AREA TO CURRENT URBAN SERVICE AREA FOR 129.90 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND WEST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W., REMOVAL OF THE PROPOSED OUTER LOOP DESIGNATION, EXPANSION OF THE COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FROM APPROXIMATELY 9.3 ACRES TO 21.64 ACRES, AND AMENDING 9.79 ACRES FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO OFFICE DESIGNATION, 16.56 ACRES FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION, AND 11.02 ACRES FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. NORMAN 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

7B. ORDINANCE NO. O-1011-55

HALLBROOKE DEVELOPMENT GROUP ONE, L.L.C., REQUESTS REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (21.64 ACRES), CO, SUBURBAN OFFICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT (9.79 ACRES), RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT (16.56 ACRES), RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT (11.02 ACRES), R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT (65.57 ACRES), AND PL, PARKLAND (5.27 ACRES), FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND WEST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Preliminary Site Plan

7c. PP-1011-23

CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY HALLBROOKE DEVELOPMENT GROUP ONE, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR UPLANDS ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND WEST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Traffic Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan
6. Oil Well Site Plan
7. Alley Waiver
8. Pre-Development Summary
9. Greenbelt Commission Checklist and Comments
10. Greenbelt Enhancement Statement

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Mr. Koscinski reported that this is a complicated application in the sense that there are a lot of pieces. The entire tract is currently designated for future residential use. All of the developments in this area have been coming in one-by-one and getting approved for different types of zoning. Sewer lines are being laid to service this area, and that is the main driver for this whole area to become developed. Water lines will come later. The entire tract will become Current Urban Service Area based on the imminent availability of utilities. It was originally designated for low density use with a little spot of commercial on the corner. Tract 3 would be a larger tract of commercial. Tract 2 encompasses a large detention pond and some low-density apartments. Tract 1 is an office designation similar to the one that was approved for the property next door. There is a higher density multi-family area in Tract 4 at the north, which is buffered by what will become a public park in that area. The rest of the property (Tract 5) retains its residential designation. There is a property surrounded on the north, west, and south by this project that is owned by the church. The rezoning reflects the proposed 2025 changes. The property is vacant. To the north of this property is the City of Moore and there are some homes along 36th and in a gated community to the west. To the east of this tract is the Commerce Parkway area, which is largely commercial, industrial, and a little multi-family. South of the subject property is the Marlatt Addition, which is the only current residential use, with large homes on approximately 2-acre lots. The property to the west is still vacant and development there has not yet started. Protests were filed that constituted approximately 16.7% of the notification area, largely from residents of Marlatt Addition and the residents of Moore to the north of the project site. There were also protests from outside of the notification area. The same engineer is developing all of the tracts in this area, so there has been quite a bit of coordination and integration of the design, the utilities, and drainage. Staff supports the plan change; it is consistent with what has been going on west of this site. The plan supports multiple densities to try to provide different housing opportunities for different clients in the community. Staff also recommends approval of the rezoning and preliminary plat.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Tom McCaleb, engineer for the applicant – This is not terribly complicated, but there are some moving parts. We submitted this application March 8 of this year and went to the Pre-Development meeting on March 22. We also met with the Greenbelt Commission on March 21, and we recently submitted the application you have before you for the 2025 Plan Amendment, the traffic study, the rezoning application, the drainage report, and the preliminary plat on April 8. It was scheduled for the May 12 Planning Commission meeting. We met with staff after they reviewed the tract and they had some geometrics and some zoning changes that they wanted us to consider. We agreed to continue that application for a month to try to accommodate the questions and the modifications that staff suggested for the June 9 meeting. A few days before that meeting we were notified that citizens in Moore had not been notified. So at that meeting we agreed again to continue it and make proper notification to those folks in the Moore area. That has been done. That gets us to tonight. We think we've done all the correct things. The application's request for land use change has been justified, as per the staff report that you've got in front of you. Staff has reported on page 7a-2: "The 2025 Land Use Plan identifies two criteria that should be addressed in order to change the approved land use designations. First,

there must have been a change in circumstances resulting from development of properties in the general vicinity which suggest that the proposed change will not be contrary to the public interest. Like all the recent subdivisions which have been reviewed and approved in this area, the principal change is the extension of water and sewer" that Doug just eluded to. The one sewer line that we've laid to sewer the tract that you've seen and approved called J&J, Whispering Trails, Foxworth, Redlands, and the new church, has been accommodated with a sewer line that we laid from Franklin Road west through J&J and up to Indian Hills Road. That line is built. We completed the as-builts today and we're submitting it for the walk-through for final. That line is now in place. That's one line. Now we're going to do another line. The other goal that we need to accommodate is the 2025 Plan does encourage and support diversified types of housing and densities in order to better serve different income levels of folks. Tract 5 will abut the future gateway park that has been presented to this board and provide a buffer between the apartment area and the lower density areas in Moore. Lower density apartments that we're proposing – duplex, triplex, four-plex – are proposed in an area that abuts Indian Hills. There is also a large detention pond. This is a good example of the drawing that we put together that shows the diversification of all the areas I'm mentioning to you. The area below is J&J. This area is Glenridge. This is the church. This is Foxworth, Whispering Trails, and Redlands. Those all have been designed, with the assistance of staff, to give what we have called good planning. It also shows diversification of all the different housing types and how connectivity can be employed. What this drawing also shows is connectivity of green areas. This is the green area that represents all of the areas that will be green or detention or active waters. That's all open space. This open space generates through J&J, flows through this tract, through the church, on forward into this tract, on forward into this piece right there that is a proposed and approved parkland site. Then it will traverse through the linear park that is being recommended and suggested by this application. That has also been shown to this board. We brought that to you a few months ago, suggesting a gateway park. Gateway park attaches to the north of this tract before you tonight. This is Commerce Parkway tract that you've already approved. This is part of that process. This is the Gateway Park. It's illustrative, showing what could be done. We made great strides trying to put all of this together so it all connects and interconnects with transportation, utilities, and open space.

This is the utility drawing. It shows how the comprehensive drainage will work and how all the water will be directed to the betterment of everybody, including some of the folks in the Marlatt Addition, who have gone on record with the Council that they have some drainage problems. We've heard that. We acknowledge that. We're trying to mitigate those problems as much as possible. There is a large detention pond we're putting right there that will buffer this tract and the townhomes tract right there. And the water will be picked up, detained, and discharged so an enormous amount of water does not damage the Marlatt Addition. A separate utility is being considered, and that is the other sewer line. The other sewer line would go through this area. If you're familiar with the Community Christian School, we have an agreement with the school that brings a sewer line that will be west of their football field and west of their new concession stand that sticks out a little bit too far. But we're going to lay the sewer line so that tract will have sewer. Then we'll bring that sewer line to connect to this tract that this party has not seen yet – it's called the Apex Property. Presently we have a sewer line that serves Uplands. City staff has asked us to reconsider and see if we could realign that sewer line and maybe serve the Marlatt Addition, which is this tract. So we

are considering if we can take the sewer line and go like this and come up with this and provide a connection for the Marlatt Addition. They have expressed interest in a sewer connection – they have no sewer; it's all septic. So we've looked at that. The Uplands people have asked me to look at the feasibility of making that connection and the cost and how it's going to work. So we have a preliminary design that will work. That would impose Marlatt to come up with a solution for their tract. We've also looked at how that can work. We're comfortable now. We've met with the Director of Utilities and utilities engineer and have that information.

In addition, there is the requirement to put in a 12" water line one mile from 36th Avenue to 48th Avenue that will serve all these properties. We now have a group together, like we do the sewer group, to pay for that. So we have started the design of a water line for that one mile that will be paid for by these property owners – not Marlatt. Marlatt also has an existing 6" water line that was installed with the cooperative effort of the City a few years ago. It's a dead-end 6" line that goes from 36th Street and out to about right there and dies. We have been asked if that line can be connected with the 12". That line is on the south side of Indian Hills Road. So we have agreed to do that. We're going to take the 12", connect to the 6" and loop it. That will enhance their water capability and fire protection for the whole Marlatt Addition. So right now on the table this 12" water line is to be built that serves all the tracts. It will connect to the big line here in 36th Street. And the sewer line design is underway to fulfill the obligation to make Uplands work, and it will also be designed so that the Marlatt Addition could also work. That all has taken place here in the last several weeks.

When we had the Pre-Development meeting we only had about four people show up and there was really no adverse situation in that meeting. We explained to them what it was going to be and they seemed to be fine. But now, as you know, there have been a few protest letters turned in. The client has met with the Marlatt folks on two occasions to try to mitigate and respond and try to take care of some of their concerns. We think we've done quite a bit. We probably haven't alleviated all the concerns, but certainly the major ones we have. The densities that we're proposing are less than the allowable in every zoning category. Our single family zoning comes out to less than 4 to the acre. The lots are comparable sized to the Redlands tract and they're larger than two other tracts. So they're pretty good sized; they meet all the City requirements. Staff has reviewed all these criteria and the geometrics.

One of the issues we've got that has been a problem is the Outer Loop. It is the gray area. The Outer Loop was a mystical area that has been determined to be the new bypass through Norman. That was a location on the ACOG plan. It was proposed to be a highway – four to six lanes – that would connect to I-35, extend all the way to here and keep extending all the way to Oklahoma City. That project now is not dead, but is wounded badly. ACOG has taken it out of their 2035 plan. So it is going to be terminated in the 2025 plan. In talking with Susan Connors and Shawn O'Leary, that is happening. We thought it would be happening last October, but it hasn't happened yet, but it is dying. This will have to be taken to the City Council for final death. So what we're suggesting to do here is we're going to swap this gray potential four to six lane road for a park which will look like the Gateway Park. That's what we're swapping with the folks in Moore. Now how big is this park. The developer of Uplands is providing a park site – a linear park that accommodates the park requirement for the Foxworth and Whispering Trails, and his tract, and all this as extra. There is no requirement for that; that is just a bonus park – 13 acres is the totality of parkland, linear and on the east side of

36th Street. So that's what we're offering with this mitigation here between the two pieces of land. We think we've solved about all the utility problems, or at least we have a bona fide solution that will accommodate everybody out there. The plan has been reviewed, and reviewed, and reviewed by staff and we have staff support tonight. We have a very diverse plan and we've had a cooperative effort for quite a while with several people who own land – major pieces of land. They have cooperatively agreed and we have put together a master plan that we think is for the betterment of everybody. It all connects. It moves. It has traffic requirements that have been solved and utility problems that have been solved. The applicant is here tonight – Trey Bates, Mickey Clagg and Ben Newcomer – that is Uplands.

2. Trey Bates, 3720 Timberridge, one of the partners in the development – Over the last few months, we have gone through a lengthy process to try to make sure that everybody was notified and everybody had an opportunity to be heard, and that we took into account as many of the concerns as we could. I want to express my appreciation for the president of the Hidden Lakes POA who is here. He'll probably say a few words, as well as all of the folks from the Marlatt Addition that, over a period of multiple days and many hours, we've sat and listened to and tried to work through the various misinformation as well as information related to the project. Just briefly, this is an incredible mixed use opportunity for the City of Norman. It's principally a low density subdivision with supporting townhomes and multi-family, tied together with commercial along the urban arterial and across from 36th Street. I'd like to note that in the existing Land Use and Transportation Plan the commercial piece of this that abuts the residential is already in the Land Use and Transportation Plan as commercial. As you go west along Indian Hills Road, we tie it together with some townhome type, little bit higher density housing, and then further to the west, directly across from the radio station, we add some office space, again trying to buffer the existing houses from the change. This crown jewel of the project – and Tom has already given away part of my speech – but there's about six to seven square miles of projects that have been approved. Well, the crown jewel of this allows us to tie a park system and trail system where all of these projects have the ability to walk, bike, and move from shopping to the various residential uses to the office space without necessarily having to drive. This epitomizes the concept of development where you can raise a family, where you can start a family, where you can retire, where you can work, where you can shop, and where you can play. And this doesn't happen very often. This is kind of one of those – everybody says this is the last one, this is the great one – but it's not very often that you have as clean a slate as we were able to start with here and then so many projects all kind of come together at the same time. So what that provided was an unprecedented opportunity – not that everybody was working together so much, but the fact is, as all of these projects came together within a relatively short period of time, we could take advantages of what each individual project had and put together something that truly is magnificent. And I'm really proud of it. I know that this is a lot of change for people. The Marlatt people we've heard a lot of frustration about issues they've dealt with over the years and I understand it. It's hard to envision. But Western is being improved all the way to Oklahoma City. You've got an incredible explosion of commercial in Moore, up 36th Street and Telephone Road. You have the additional improvements of I-35 all the way through Norman now nearing completion. At some point, the Indian Hills interchange is going to have to be upgraded; it's coming. So you've got an amazing opportunity for Norman to take advantage of all of this

confluence of all of these events and build a great development. I know that for the people, again, that live out there, it's been the edge of town forever – it's been the open field where they saw horses grazing or the crops growing. But the reality is, regardless of this project, the development is coming and this is an opportunity to tie together an incredible project for the neighborhoods. I feel comfortable when I lay my head down at night that these people one day will wake up and be really happy with the fact that they have quality projects happening all around them that will ultimately improve property values. So I would hope that you all would approve this project tonight.

3. Mr. Knotts asked whether the drainage has enough surge south of Indian Hills to accommodate all of that if something goes wrong down here so that it won't flood. Mr. McCaleb responded affirmatively. Right now there is an existing 36" corrugated metal pipe that carries the water across Indian Hills and it goes in a couple of areas and it drains down to a pond. We need to release some water that is presently going down there to make sure that they have water. We don't want to intercept all of that, but we're going to intercept a huge chunk of it. Mr. Knotts asked if this is all surface flow. Mr. McCaleb replied that there will be some surface, but primarily it will be underground. Mr. Knotts asked whether the west side of the lower area will intercept some of the water. Mr. McCaleb said those are going to be live waters. It's water that's just going to be at a static level. We will have wells in there that will make sure they have a static level. It will be a retention pond that will have water at a certain level at all times, and also will have capability of rising during the floods to take that water off. So the whole thing is a combination of those facilities.

4. Mr. Trachtenberg commented that one of the things that he admires about the whole system is the inter-connectivity and the trails. He asked if they had considered the possibility of connectivity to the Ruby Grant property. Mr. McCaleb indicated that the intervening piece of property is owned by a different entity. He has been in a lot of communication with them, because they needed an easement for the sewer line. He has done some master planning for him that does that, but that is not being presented at this time.

5. Ms. Pailles asked the height of the apartments at both the north and the south ends. Mr. McCaleb replied that on the south side are townhomes, and they're two story max. They will be similar to the tract of land north of Sooner Fashion Mall – Brookhaven Square. The one on the north would be apartments – probably two story again. I think it will be 16 units. There are no immediate plans. Ms. Pailles asked about the commercial areas. Mr. McCaleb said they will probably be one story. Mr. Bates added that, with regard to the RM-6 area at the north end, the concept is for an all masonry type structure that would be two-story structures. Mr. Trachtenberg asked what the office component is going to look like. Mr. Bates indicated those haven't really been designed, but the concept for the entire project is substantial masonry type construction – not the low end kind of starter home concept that I think you see in a lot of areas. The idea is that we'd build this toward an upscale neighborhood and hopefully coordinate this in such a way that it attracts that kind of market. I think the advantage of the huge amenity package with the trails and that sort of thing will hopefully attract the kind of clientele that will support those kinds of markets. The concept is a professional office park type setting. So I can envision surgical centers,

doctors' offices, other professional offices. Mr. Trachtenberg asked if it will be like the Quorum area. Mr. Bates responded that he and his partners were involved in building Quorum, and it will be similar.

6. Mr. Gasaway asked about the road access to the development. Mr. McCaleb stated that one of the modifications that staff suggested was that there be one road off Indian Hills and then one connecting the residential area through the commercial area to 36th.

7. Mr. Gasaway asked if Mr. McCaleb believes the drainage solution can handle the water from the north side of Indian Hills in addition to the additional runoff from the impervious surface. Mr. McCaleb said that's correct. We prepared the drainage report. We've met with Mr. O'Leary and the drainage engineers on multiple occasions to make sure that he agreed and he does.

8. Ms. Gordon commented that Street C goes through the residential area and actually cuts through the commercial all the way over to 36th. That's quite a bit of commercial from Tract 3 and quite a lot of traffic going through that residential neighborhood. If I was a driver, I would sure take that instead of Indian Hills Road and skip that intersection. Mr. McCaleb indicated that this road is a collector all the way to 48th. Staff suggested that we take this point right here and continue it to 36th Street. We had suggested that not be a collector, but they wanted it to be a collector road.

9. Ms. Gordon asked the width of the gateway park in the narrow area. Mr. McCaleb said it is 50 feet at the narrowest. Ms. Gordon asked the width near where the apartments are going to be. Mr. Bates said it will be 200 to 300 feet.

PARTICIPATION BY THE AUDIENCE:

1. Lou Ball, 3730 West Indian Hills Road – In the Marlatt Addition, mine is about the fifth tract of land in off of 36th. This addition is going to affect me and my family directly, being as we're property lined right on the discussed development. I've only lived there for five years, so I don't have as much emotional tie that some of the people behind me probably have to what's going on here. And when we moved here, we fully thought that that land would be developed. We talked to our realtor – we talked to people that advised us and helped us with our move down to Norman from the Iowa area. We come from a very country background and the one thing that we were going to get out of this was going to get a country feel to it, still be out away from a lot of the traffic, be able to raise our family. I talked to Trey at the meetings and he provided a lot of detail. I love the idea of the community and the parks and such, but my greatest concern is two things – with the addition of the extra commercial, and a couple of people have made reference to the fact that the increased traffic and the flow of the traffic and how it's going to work relative to where I'm going to be pulling in and out of my home – I have great concern about that. I also have concern, and I spoke to Trey about this, too – with the drainage pond which is directly across from my property – dealing with the idea – I think they spoke earlier about some of these other ponds over here and I'm not sure what the terminology is, but I won't say maintained because I don't think that's what was used, but they would have a fill system and they would have a constant level and have a certain appearance, and it sounds as if the pond that's across the street from my property will not have that same appearance,

based on what they just said – that it could be low, could be high. So I have a concern with that. Also with the traffic and, not having been from Norman, I'm not familiar with the property that was discussed as far as the office buildings go and the appearance of those office buildings. You made reference to a certain office building – I'm not sure where that is. So I have great concern about the appearance of it and having it fit the look of the neighborhood and looking as much like homes as possible, because when we bought the land it was zoned R-1 for homes to be there and we thought we were going to be moving into a neighborhood that was 100% homes – no office buildings -- looking out your front door to look at office buildings, not looking at duplexes or any other kind of buildings of that nature. That's what's being changed right before our eyes, and not really having a feel for how that works and there's no guarantee how it's going to look ten years down the road; once it's approved, they can put in whatever they want. My greatest concern is what's going on on the very first portion of Trey's development there right along Indian Hills. If it was all residential and they had this great plan of doing the parks and everything, I think it would be great. But in its current state with the additional traffic that's going to be going in there – we're already going to be dealing with a lot more traffic if it goes to four lane and I understood that when I bought the property. But then to throw businesses and medium density living in there and then a lot more commercial right along that path, you're looking at a totally different living situation than what I purchased my house under. And that's my greatest concern, is that it's not going to be what we thought we were going to do for the 15 – 20 years – whatever we ended up living here. And we looked at 12-15 pieces of property and we bought that piece of property knowing that it was zoned for residential homes. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

2. Donald Davis, 5532 Steed Drive – There are only two apartment buildings west of 36th Street here in Norman. They're off Main Street. They're surrounded by duplexes and creeks. Going north from Main Street, where they're located, you go through nice neighborhoods which are full of townhomes and multi-million dollar mansions. Further north there's all the Brookhavens. They're all on nice lots. The Polo Club, Ashton Grove with million dollar houses, and Cambridge, plus the Grandview Estates and on to Crystal Springs, which are multi-acre estates. Likewise, there are lovely homes and neighborhoods and acreaged estates in the south part of Moore. Even the apartments around the Moore Country Club are very spacious and parklike in design. I'm very much against this densely compressed proposed neighborhood that's north of Indian Hills with over 500 homes and hundreds of apartments. Potentially, there could be over 3,000 new residents in less than 3/8 of a section. I don't know of any plots here in Norman that are that densely populated with four or five houses per acre. Our neighborhood is one house on one acre and that seems kind of tight to me, but seeing those little bitty, teeny, tiny lots up there – it will ruin the character of the rural idea of homes in our neighborhood that go all the way from Main Street out these five miles, past the coach's house and then to be deadlocked – it honestly is going to turn Norman into – pardon me, but Moore. Little tiny houses – cheap houses. Now we're in the Moore School District, and although Moore has built a new south high school and a new elementary school up on 34th, they're still, when you add in the potential – maybe 2,000-3,000 people here and likewise the same number to the west of our Marlatt area, you're going to have to put in a new elementary school probably. I don't know if the people here in Norman even care about that. But the thing I worry about is that with all the guttering, the curbing, and the street runoff of rain water and these retention

ponds, which will not hold the overflow – even now with the open farmland soil that soaks up the rain when it does rain, two of my three acres are flooded usually six or seven times through the year. But that was planned in the Marlatt area. That was used as the upwaters for Little River to help hold and retain, but with this neighborhood going in north of Indian Hills, unless that water is taken and taken someplace north, it will come back over the road and it will come through the Marlatt area and it will come through our neighborhood and it will go over Steed Drive like it has several times in just the last few months. Now there is a retention pond at the end of Jaronek's yard, which holds water, which then goes into coach's little pond, which will hold water. Those things help. They help keep our neighborhood – the aquifer down. They help keep all of our wells nice and sweet and help hold water into our neighborhood. But when you have an influx of water, and the one thing I don't think they've counted on is the speed of the water. And lots of times my two acres will fill up in just less than an hour. And that's quite a bit. It makes my two acres of property unsaleable – I can't get a note and I can't sell the property because now they're in the floodplain. But I like that. I like the greenbelt idea that it's going to have. I just don't think, as Mr. Ball just said, that unless it's really considered what to do with this water that there's going to be a major problem. And have you all noticed? There's gutters – street gutters in Moore where they're building all these new buildings for the doctors offices. There's street gutters in the street. Moore seems to be willing to handle this problem, but here in Norman all they do is put out mosquito ponds and these retention ponds – and how many – I can count, I guess – one, two, three, four, five, six in this area. I'm afraid, unless they're fenced and guarded and they keep the BT dunks in them – you know what those are – to help keep the mosquitoes down, or stock them with fish – that these are going to become problems. Week before last I found a copperhead in my garage. Now, I expected that, because I live across the street from a pond. But when you add that into a densely populated neighborhood where there's going to be lots of kids – well, who knows what problems. And my time, I'm sure, is almost up. I just want you to remember that these developers who come up with these real clever ideas that look wonderful on paper very rarely end up living in these neighborhoods. And they leave the problems and the situations – all the extra people, the cars – there's only three outlets onto Indian Hills, and with all those people coming in and out, going up to Walmart and over to Heyday, that will make that a very high-traffic neighborhood, and I feel for your children, Mr. Ball. I wouldn't want anybody out running on the streets out here because it's going to be quite a high-traffic neighborhood. But, again, these people that design all this – they never have to live there. They don't care. They've got their money and they've left. They leave the problems to poor unsuspecting people like me, who move into a neighborhood and then have to pay the taxes for it. Thank you.

3. Robert Ashton, 3812 NW Sterling – I've lived in Marlatt for 41 years. I didn't know that living in the internal portion of Marlatt I wouldn't get a notice and be counted as a person that was objecting to what was going on around me. I can certainly tell you it will impact me, because I would say probably for the next half a dozen years the amount of dirt movement and vehicles, construction traffic, and general tie-ups on the small road that we have will really impact me. The other thing I'm worried about is the City of Norman just went through a long period of talking about how we have to take care of the lake where our drinking water comes from. Well, you are taking out of the filtration project that Mother Nature supposedly takes care of, I was told, a lot of

acreage here that flows directly into the Little River. Some of you may remember many years ago we fought a long battle against the City of Moore to keep about 40 of these acres from being de-annexed from Norman and into Moore. And, in fact, the City Council did de-annex it, but we got a petition up, got an election, and got it back, and the Council had to eat what they done. Now you're going to take that acreage, with all that filtration that the dirt and grass can supposedly do, and cover it with concrete and blacktop. Now somebody down here has got the wrong message. Either they were right when they were worried about the lake and all the stuff that was flowing into it, or they're wrong because you're taking all of this out of the system. So I think you really need to consider what you're doing here. Thank you.

4. Jeff Zehr, 3707 NW Pioneer – A lot of my questions have already been asked, but there are a couple that I do have. The park addition – who is going to maintain that? Are the residents going to be responsible for maintaining that? The City of Moore going to be responsible for maintaining that? Is it going to become a dump station for everybody's trash? Is it going to grow up to be not the nice park that we want it to be? The other was – Milt brought it up. The school issue. I have four young boys that are going to school in the Moore district right now. They attend the new elementary. When this is built, where are they going to go? Are they going to be in classrooms – I understand that there's a limited number of students that can go in a classroom. But if we don't have another school – a junior high, a grade school, eventually another high school, are my kids going to be going to school in a trailer house that's parked behind their present school that they have right now? In this plan right here, I don't see a school being developed or being planned. And who's going to pay for that school if we do decide to build one? The other issue was they said there was four houses to the acre – when we did our meeting and calculations, we calculated close to 5 houses per acre, so I'd like to have that clarified and get that understood. Mrs. Gordon brought up a good point about the buffer on the north side of this addition. The south side of the addition there's not a buffer. You have a retention pond. There's nothing there but apartments. One thing that struck me odd in this discussion was the developers kept talking about hopefully and probably. Hopefully we get the right kind of neighborhood that we want. And it's probably going to be masonry and look nice. That kind of bothers me. I'd rather see something concrete, something set – this is what it's going to look like, this is what Lou is going to look at out his front door. Haven't seen that yet. So those are some of my concerns. And, again, the other issues were brought up. The traffic was another concern of mine. My four boys right now can go outside and play. Traffic gets a little bit fast up and down our neighborhood, I'm able to control that – I sit in my front yard and I'm able to control that. With what's going to go on here, there is no way we're going to be able to control what kind of traffic is coming in. Thank you.

5. Brian Beddo, 3823 NW Pioneer – My concern is I don't know whether the water that comes from this addition is going to increase or decrease through this neighborhood. We own a creek that runs to the west of our house and a couple of years ago the City decided to file criminal charges against me because I refused to clean out the creek. The creek never has had a problem – it was the City's culverts that were too small. Currently there is development going on in this creek and, if the water increases, then it's going to cause more erosion and it's going to impact the houses that are in this creek. And if the water decreases, it's going to impact the pond that is in this neighborhood and it will not have any water in it. So those are my concerns. If

you change the water flow either way, it's going to impact this neighborhood. Thank you.

6. Jerry Meek, 4213 Hidden Lake Circle – I'm a resident of Moore, Oklahoma and hopefully that doesn't give me two strikes. I come tonight wearing two hats, one as the President of Hidden Lake Property Owners Association, and one as a resident who falls within the 350 notification. When Mr. McCaleb had the plan up that showed the notification residents and then it showed those that were outside who had filed protests, I think it's important for the Planning Commission to understand that a number of that percentage that Mr. McCaleb spoke to were initially because of the fact that, just by accident, the residents of Hidden Lake happened to find out about the June agenda. What you had was a number of residents who, at the midnight hour, responded by filing a protest. So hopefully you will understand how that came about. I have to, in good conscience, tell you that I first made a call to your Planning Commission and the response I got regarding the notification and why we weren't notified – the response I got was less than a courteous one. I don't know if that's because I was a resident of Moore, or if that's just typical for staff in Norman. I brought the protests down – a stack of them – personally and filed those. I had an opportunity to visit with the City Clerk. I told her that I was given a response that was less than courteous by staff and that I was told essentially that the City of Norman did not have to notify me because I was a Moore resident and the second reason that I was not notified was because of something here in Norman called home rule. Still not sure what that is. But that was the response I was given. I mentioned that to the City Clerk and she was very nice in responding, Mr. Meek, I'll check into that. Soon after that, I had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Bates. He was kind enough to give me the time, as well as another resident, to explain to us what his plan was. First and foremost, we didn't have that opportunity prior to the June agenda because we weren't notified. He brought this plan that you see there. If you look to the far left corner on the north side of the greenbelt, you see a little pond. To the right of that is a house. That's my house. When I straddle my south fence, I can put one foot in Norman and I can put one foot in Moore. In the explanation that Mr. Bates gave me regarding the development, I probably am less affected, yet I am the probably one resident that has the closest proximity to the development of 50 feet – not the three or four times that. I'm here to tell you today that I took exception to, and I want to voice that tonight, that I believe that the City of Norman – you people – my request would be that you look into how your staff does notification. It concerns me that maybe notification hasn't been given to other people in the past, because there is a – regardless of where you live, if I own that property and I lived in Durango, Colorado you still are obligated to notify me. We all have, as citizens of this state, by law we are allowed due process. That, I believe, was not afforded to every one of those houses that you see that line that buffer – not one house was given notification. Mr. Bates and I visited. Subsequent to that, I was walking in this door to file those protests and he called me and said that he had counseled with others and it was his decision to pull that from the June meeting. His concern – and I won't speak for him – I'll just tell you that, as I took it, his concern was that we were given due process and given opportunity to be notified. I commend him for that. His concern was real. His explanation to me – his vision to me was one that I personally don't have a problem with. I think that anyone who sits on this Commission behind that circle would have the same concerns if someone by chance told you that in a few days was going to be a rezoning and there was going to be apartments out your front door. I don't believe

that you would have acted any less responsibly in filing a protest. I want to put on the hat as a resident and tell you that I personally am not opposed to Mr. Bates and his development. I believe that he has truthfully told me that he will make a determined effort to build a development wherein that, contrary to certain statements that were made – I live in Moore. I live in Hidden Lake Addition, which is executive homes. Probably the least priced house in that addition would be \$300,000 up to in excess of a million. So they're not little, small homes and they are large tracts. So we have a valid concern that our property values would be diminished by something that wasn't acceptable. What Mr. Bates has showed me – it's less than what I would want, but it's not anything that I can't live with given he would follow through with what he said he would do to try to enhance his development somewhat off of the quality of homes that he will be adjacent to, which is the Hidden Lake Addition. So, in conclusion, please look into how your staff directs the general public when they are notified in the future. And, as far as the residents go, if I speak on behalf of Hidden Lake and those that are represented within that 350 feet notification, it would be our desire that the Commission would look at that development, the density levels to be something that would be reasonable for those things that would parallel or be adjacent to it. Thank you very much.

7. Dick Manley, 3619 NW Della Street – You guys are all professionals. These guys are professionals. What they presented to you – my heart just jumps out when I look at that and I think look at all that beautiful development that we've been wanting to have. I've been there 45 years. Look at that beautiful development that's there. What I'm going to try to tell you is those are all houses all the way from where this development started at the bottom that they tied together clear up to the Moore property line. This Uplands has in it what nothing else has in it that's been developed. It has one ten-acre – almost ten-acre spot across from the church that's gonna be suburban office space. That's the only thing that's been approved that's not residential, other than the corners where it's commercial. What I would like to see is this beautiful thing that they've got all these trails and everything that they want to put in there – all of this handling of the water – everything that they've talked about and tied together is totally professional and would be an absolute boon to us, who have lived out there with nothing around us for half a century and here all this is coming. All we're asking is don't make this new addition multiple use. None of that other stuff is multiple use, to the extent that they want to make multiple use here. Apartments. Office space. Out in the country as it is right now. It'll be non-commensurate with everything else that's gone on all the way up to the Moore property line. Now, right across the street from our addition on the east is a Planned Unit Development area – but that's not the proper term for it. It's a Special Unit Area that has been designated by this thing right here – designated as Special Planning Area 4. Special Planning Area 4 is situated between 36th Avenue NW and I-35, from Indian Hills Road south one-half mile. Now I'm not as eloquent as some of these other people, so I'm going to have to read this. But you all people – I don't know if you're familiar with it, because you can't – you're on the Planning Commission, but you can't be familiar with everything that's in this book. So what I'm going to try to read you is Multiple Use Area for a half mile right east of us has already been established as a Special Planning Unit Area by this book. That means it can't be anything else, unless you people say it can. It's designated to be multi-use. A half a mile. That covers every bit of the Marlatt Addition. There's another slide that shows that area and it's cross-hatched, and that's the one that – it's this thing right

here. That's that multiple use area. It's already designated as a Special Planning Area 4. Proposed land uses. This area is designated for mixed use development. The primary emphasis is to allow for a mix of employment uses – office, light industrial – with some supporting commercial and medium or high density residential housing as part of an overall, unified planned development. It is envisioned that employment and commercial uses would be oriented toward Indian Hill Road and I-35 to the north and east – and so on, and so on, and so on. What I'm going to tell you is, if you look on page 21 of this book – page 22, you'll see there's another planned area just below that. Area 5 – 36th Avenue NW and I-35 from Franklin Road north one-half mile. Same kind of deal. That's to the east of us. Look at here. This thing shows you a park – it shows you a park right there where that multiple use is. There's going to be a park right there. Ruby Grant is just past the road down there. All of this surrounding us – the only place that multiple use is is on the east. Right after this was written – 2004 – they established multiple use as an introductory way to develop. That's what this 2025 plan did. It also talked about planned urban development processes and planned urban development processes – can I read the definition of that? Planned urban development process – a land development project comprehensively planned as an entity utilizing a site development plan which permits flexibility in building site, mixtures of all types, attached and detached housing, usable open spaces, and the preservation of significant natural features. In 2005, right after this was written and established the multiple use idea that the Planning Commission would promote, this area right here – which is to the east of Uplands – they own it – put in a PUD 0506-3 and guess what that PUD did? Established that area on the east as multiple use. Now we're surrounded by everything here and my heart goes out when I look at that and I think everything they've done is beautiful, if they would just take out the apartments, the office, and the apartments, and even the commercial on the end that's already established – they want to make it bigger. If they would take that out, every bit of this whole thing is residential. That's all we're asking. Do not approve Uplands for multiple use when right across the street the same owner has got multiple use. Why doesn't he put that stuff across the street? The City has established right across from us multiple use. I have no animosity toward these guys. They've got to make money. All we're asking is we've been out there for all these years and it's all been residential – everything that's come from Norman up to us from Main basically have been residential. As we got out here at the bottom of this, look at the size of those lots. Big beautiful lots with J&J. They get a little bit smaller, but they get all the way up to Indian Hills Road. That's commensurate with everything we've got in our addition. We jump across the road and it get's smaller.

8. Lindle Coleman, 3604 Sterling Street – Thanks for listening to our concerns. I live in the Marlatt Addition, corner of 36th and Sterling Street. I grew up there since I was about 2. I left, came back, built a house in '93 and have been there ever since. I love the area, and I want to clarify that I believe, from my perspective, the protest was not necessarily just development in general, but the rezoning and the rezoning to the medium to high density. I believe that development is going to happen in this area. I'm actually excited about some of this. I appreciate Mr. Bates and the other developers taking time to visit with us and explain a lot to us. And I do believe that they try to put in the greenbelt and try to make this really nice. I believe growth will happen. But I guess the concerns and the protest for me is specifically around the unintended consequences of that development, and particularly the medium to high-density. The medium and high-density – the entrances to those areas are very limited. I haven't

seen any plans for four-laning any of the roads, so my question is around traffic. Are we going to have four lanes of roads on all four legs of that intersection? Another question is around the interchange and overpass. Is that going to be a four-lane and widened, because that is a main hub off the interstate that will be used to access this area. And, in my opinion, right now it's already becoming overcrowded because a lot of times we can't get out of our neighborhood as it is with the two-lane. And then on the water flow – the unintended consequences of that change in that water flow – how that's going to affect the ponds that are around there and how those buffer zones are going to be maintained. I'd hate to see those grow up in weeds, become dry – just that concern of how that's going to look in the end. And then the sewer costs – will there be a cost incurred on the Marlatt residents to tie into the main line? We've already spent \$6,000 and above per resident to have a septic system. And what would be the cost of that? That's another question. And so overall, it's really – I think the main concern for me is the medium to high density. When you pack all those people into those smaller areas with limited entry and exit, what's that going to do to the overall area. Thank you.

9. Sadie Willmon-Haque, 3920 West Indian Hills Road – I live in the Marlatt Addition. I am here to speak concerning the Uplands Addition to the north of our home. I live right next to the radio towers. I am here to speak on behalf of my husband – he couldn't be here, he's in class – and my daughter, Dora – my adorable daughter Dora, who is seven weeks old today. I'm from Oklahoma City and I just thought I'd throw this in, but my dad actually paid \$2,000 for our home in Oklahoma City, so that's the complete cost of the home I grew up with in 1979. Now, I've been lucky, through education and different things, and now I pay about \$2,000 to live where I live now, and have worked really hard. I have my Ph.D. in Psychology, graduated from OU, and it's been really nice to move to a nice area. We have lived there about four years. Actually, we've bought two homes in the area. We used to live at 3908 West Indian Hills Road, but when our neighbor put up the for sale sign – it was a bigger house – we sold that and moved to our current home, so we just moved our stuff next door over the fence. We just love the area so much. When we moved there, our understanding was that there would just be some development in our area, and like the gentleman right here said I'm really excited over multi-use development. I'm concerned about traffic. Right now I can't even hardly go out and check my mail without getting hit by a car. I don't like that. I don't like having a lot of people. I feel like it might lead to more crime. I've been concerned about water flow since I've lived there. We have two acres and our one acre floods when it rains heavily. And like someone said, the water rises really quickly and so it floods pretty quickly, so I just worry about that. I love my home. I told my husband – he doesn't like for me to brag, but my home is my dream home. It's quiet. It's like the country but I can access Moore and just different shopping centers. I like the people. I love the location. I had a dog – unfortunately she got hit by a car – so I got to know a lot of my neighbors from walking her. It's just a wonderful place to live and I would like it to – if there is development, that it would be I guess single-family homes. Thank you.

10. Ron Ashley, 3608 West Indian Hills Road – I live on the corner of Indian Hills and 36th Avenue. We live in the Marlatt Addition. I'm here to speak concerning Uplands Addition to the north of our home. We've lived there for seven years. We like our location. We like our home, and we like our neighbors. We moved there because we

like it. We purchased our home because it's a little bit country – that would be me – and then my wife, she's a little bit city. There are single-family homes west of 36th Avenue from 164th Street to Carrington Lakes development. We have the Harvest Church north of our home on Telephone Road and Bridgeview United Methodist Church will build their home on West Indian Hills Road. All land east of 36th Avenue is mixed-use or commercial up through Interstate 35. The new commercial development would continue along the I-35 access road as it has since we've been there. As you know, from the Walmart store south it's really coming this way, and we anticipated it would go along there. I understand that from 36th Avenue to I-35, I assume probably half of that would go right on down to Norman and would be commercial. I assumed also that Crystal Lakes development would come north. I look for that to be single-family dwellings. We live within two miles of any retail business I need. I do not want to see commercial property across the street from us. I want to see homes comparable to our homes. If you go north on Telephone Road, you see the Hidden Lake development and the Park Glen development. Currently west of us is Talavera. To the south we have the Carrington Lakes development and east of us is Crystal Lakes development. There are no small homes in these areas. The Uplands Addition developers have been understanding of our concerns. I appreciate that very much. They've all spent time with me. I'm asking you to review and revise the commercial and mixed-use portion of the Uplands Addition to single-family dwelling. Thank you.

RECESS

8:08 to 8:22 p.m.

11. Mr. McCaleb – Some of the concerns that were expressed by some of the people concerned drainage. We have accommodated the drainage and we had that in the drawings a while ago. There were two concerns expressed by citizens. Some said we want to make sure we keep getting the water we're getting, and one says we don't want to be flooded. And that's exactly what we tried to put together. There's a 36" diameter pipe going underneath Indian Hills today. That's the only pipe that crosses the road. If you equate that number, the structure that would be required would be an enormous box if you traversed it all the way through Marlatt. We don't want to do that. We want to make sure they keep getting the water that they want, but we're going to deter the rest of the water so they don't get flooded. This intersection right here – Mr. Manley said several Council meetings ago that he had a drainage problem there. We heard him and we acknowledged that, and so we're going to take that water from this quadrant of property that's hitting there and it will no longer be hitting there. We will pick it up and run it back to here. So that will be eliminated. So there's significant impact on water that's presently flooding the Marlatt area – and I say flooding – it's getting it wet pretty good. But we're going to remove a considerable amount of the problem, at the same time making sure that the drainage area that they are getting presently is allowed. Mr. Bates is going to address this detention pond right there. I might say that one of the comments was raised – we neglected to try to figure out a school for the area. Not true at all. That piece right there is zoned for a school in the Moore School District; we did that with J&J. Yeah, we thought about it. It's planned. We know it's going to happen. That's what that is. The density of the single-family houses – we've got 257 homes in uplands that goes over 65.57 acres. That's 3.9 density lots per acre.

12. Trey Bates – There was a question about whether it would be a wet or dry detention pond, and when Mr. McCaleb was talking about the other detention areas and we were talking about regenerating that. As currently in Mr. McCaleb's design, that's set up to be a dry detention pond. However, as we develop it, we may end up making it an amenity that could contain water. I'd like to point out that we've had a lot of experience in doing developments, and if there is a wet detention pond or, in fact, if it stays dry there will be a property owners association or some sort of property owners method of collecting money to maintain and keep that as a positive amenity. I had mentioned this to a number of residents who had brought this up before that our interests are absolutely aligned. In order to make this a great project that people will want to live in, this has to be an amenity to the project and that's why we put it right there on Indian Hills Road. One other thing I'd like to address is the general recurring theme in terms of the overall development scheme, and whether it's just straight single-family or mixed-use. And the important thing that I'd like to point out is that we have to provide the services to our residents who are going to live out there. There are potentially, obviously, thousands of homes that will happen out here. And recall that as east Norman developed, those residents out there didn't have services – they didn't have the commercial opportunities, they didn't have the opportunities to work and they started traveling over to west Norman. And so then you started creating that problem where the services weren't adequate to supply the residents that lived out there. You also heard over and over again various people talking about already traveling to Moore to shop. The opportunity here, as we fast forward ten, fifteen, twenty years into the future is we see this as an opportunity for a multi-faceted residential, commercial and office development, and the services that are designed, as you'll see in your staff recommendation, support the oncoming potential housing that's out there. So it all fits together, and I'd like to just close again by pointing out the concept that historically we used to look at certain areas as this was just residential and this was just commercial and this was just office. But I think the general consensus now is that you want to create neighborhoods – walkable, liveable neighborhoods with various income opportunities, various types of housing, places where you can work, places where you can live, places where you can shop, places where you can recreate, and that's what the concept is behind the project, as opposed to just a straight R-1 type development.

13. Chairman Gasaway asked who maintains the park area, once it's established. Mr. Bates responded that the Gateway Park has been reviewed and accepted by the Parks Department and will be a City park. Now, all of the common spaces in between – the detention facilities and that sort of thing -- would be maintained by a property owners association.

14. Ms. Pailles asked about the comment that the density was about 4 houses per acre. Mr. Bates responded that, in the residential area, that is correct.

15. Chairman Gasaway asked about the right-of-way dedication on the north side of Indian Hills and 36th and whether those would be two or four-lane roads. Mr. Bates said it will be a full four-lane – I think there's actually turn lanes at the intersections, so at those points there would actually be a fifth lane. Mr. McCaleb clarified that the Marlatt area only has 33' platted, and the normal right-of-way is 50'. So our half would be two lanes and then the third lane – the turn lane at the intersection. From there west, where you have both sides, that will be four lanes.

16. Mr. Trachtenberg asked the density of the apartment components. Mr. Bates explained that the concept on the RM-2 area is a townhome concept, similar to what you see adjacent to Sooner Mall. The RM-6 would be more of a brownstone concept – 4 to 6 units on a two-level building – all masonry type brick building. Mr. Trachtenberg asked how many units altogether. Mr. Bates said there will be 180 in the north part.

17. Chairman Gasaway noted that somebody had commented that the buffer on the north was a good idea and asked why there wasn't something like that on the south. Mr. Bates said that along the south side along Indian Hills Road we will have a multi-lane road separating the existing housing, plus the addition of the buffer strip through that detention area. The conception of that was to create an additional buffer. Now, the trail system was to tie Gateway Park along the north to the rest of the six or so miles of projects that have been approved in the prior few months.

18. Ms. Connors explained that there are two special planning areas that were noted in the Norman 2025 Plan that are near this property. One is Special Planning Area 4 and one is Special Planning Area 5. These were identified in the comprehensive plan to have special characteristics that needed to be looked at before they could be developed, and they would be developed through a planned unit development process. There are criteria in the Norman 2025 Plan that list what types of land uses and what characteristics need to be preserved as those areas develop. So those need to be brought in as planned unit development areas specifically by the property owners. So, just like the other areas of the Norman 2025 Plan, they have land use designations. They've created these possibilities for mixed-use areas. Neither of those areas have come in and requested any development to date.

Another issue was about our notification process. We notify within 350 feet of the property in question. What happens is the applicant actually gets the list from an abstract company or the county assessor's office and they develop the list and they bring that list to the City of Norman and we notice those people. I know that in the first round of notice the list that was brought to us did not include the City of Moore residents and that was brought to the applicant's attention and, based on consideration from their attorney, they chose to postpone the hearing of that case and redevelop a list and notice again. The City notices the list that is brought to us. And it is, in the City of Norman, 350 feet from that property boundary. I'm going to ask that Leah Messner, one of our assistant City attorneys, come and speak about home rule.

19. Mr. Knotts asked if the special planning area means that those areas necessarily have to be mixed-use. Ms. Connors responded that these areas will have to be developed under the criteria that were developed in the Norman 2025 Plan, unless they're amended. They could come and request amendment from what is designated in the Norman 2025 Plan, just as other developments have requested change. It was a planning exercise and it didn't zone the property.

20. Ms. Messner explained that home rule is a concept we talk about at the City a lot, and without some explanation, it may not be easily understood or understood right off the bat. The City of Norman is a charter city. It means we are governed initially by our City Charter and we have ordinances underneath that. By becoming a charter city, we are allowed to be different than state law, and that's where you get the home

rule concept. We're a home rule city, and so we get to set some of our own laws and our own ordinances that might differ from state law, but we're allowed to do that as a charter city. Other cities that are not governed by a charter are called statutory towns, and they're required to follow whatever the state law is. So if the state law for notice on an issue like this might be different than our city ordinance, the statutory town would have to follow the state law, but because we are a charter city, we are allowed to follow our ordinance, which is a 350 foot notice area.

Mr. Trachtenberg asked if that means there is no requirement under state law that we notice people outside the City limits. Ms. Messner responded that we follow our city ordinance in regards to notice for zoning issues, because they're issues of home rule and issues unique to Norman and not other places in the state. They're matters of local concern.

21. Ms. Connors addressed the earlier comment about what the office and commercial developments would look like. There is a masonry requirement in the City of Norman. Eighty percent of the façade needs to be masonry, so that would be a requirement for either of those land uses to develop with that masonry requirement.

There was also a question about who builds the schools. When property is turned over to the school district it is through the school district that the schools get built and they do that through the mechanisms they have available for constructing new schools.

22. Chairman Gasaway asked about the costs for the Marlatt residents to tie into the water and sewer. Mr. Danner said if the sewer line comes up 36th Avenue, adjacent to Marlatt, it would be the responsible party of the Marlatt Addition to bring the sewer to them. If they're adjacent to 36th, we have a requirement within 500 feet that you're supposed to tie into a public sewer. They currently have water through an assessment district that they did.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Ms. Pailles –First, just to clarify for the audience, the Planning Commission is advisory. So our mission is to clarify issues, bring up problems for the attention of the Council. We will vote and recommend to the Council. Our vote is not binding. What is binding is the Council action, and so you all need to be advised of when this will come before the Council. The detention ponds are not a worry. Every construction event involves a detention pond and their maintenance is always provided for and they work well. The general drainage issues, I have no way to judge if that's going to be a problem or if it's entirely adequate – I simply don't know. I was going to say there's distrust of the commercial and apartment areas, which, upon consideration, the neighbors might consider it's not an entirely bad idea. The third that's commercial removes population. It means fewer people; it means less density, in essence. It means fewer kids in the schools. So it may, in some ways, be something that you would appreciate. It also may actually be more attractive. If you consider that it was solidly single-family residence, what you're likely to get is stockade fences along Indian Hills Road, and probably the commercial and townhouses are basically more attractive fronting Indian Hills than the back yards and stockade fences would be. So it's possible if you consider it, you might not object to that kind of mixed-use element. I personally take the neighbors' concerns very seriously, and I like to be able to assist people in their bid for democracy as they approach us. And I admit myself to be a little bit mystified

on how to bring this to kind of a friendly resolution. One of the things we didn't consider tonight – the Tecumseh Project – also had some neighborhood protests, and the developers there made some very specific accommodations. For one thing, they gave you a very specific plan of what the commercial areas would look like and specified that they would be residential in style and gave a suggested drawing. And the neighbors have a right to sort of bargain for that. They can be very attractive, and they can be perfectly attractive commercial residential style buildings. They also bargained for low lighting on the commercial areas, and also low architectural signage so that they would not be intrusive, so you would drive down the street and actually the commercial areas would be an enhancement. And it is within the neighbors' rights to ask for things like that to enhance the entire area. There is a comment by the staff that recommends that until such a time as the interceptor line is near completion, final plats should not be submitted to the Planning Commission. In other words, this is not going to go forward immediately. I would personally suggest tabling this and getting the neighborhood and the developers together and seeing if they couldn't kind of work things out better so that when this comes before the Council there is general agreement on the style and the system and the general appearance of the neighborhood.

2. Mr. Lewis – Certainly it's an item that there's a great amount of empathy with. Certainly if we looked out of our doors for 50 years and saw a field, that certainly is something that we're accustomed to. But there are several things that I heard that really stood out, and one was the concern of Marlatt regarding storm water, and I think Tom addressed that very well, that the majority of storm water will be directed into tributary G in order to protect Marlatt from flooding. So I think from this development standpoint that is a very good thing in the design. In regards to the school, certainly I remembered, as you reiterated, in the J&J development that came through that land was specifically set aside for a school, so that will be taken care of in the Moore School District. But a couple of the things that I get the impression that maybe is uncomfortable is some of the commercial development. One of the things that the City of Norman is challenged with is that 65% of our overall income comes from sales tax revenue, and when we have a development that far up into northwest Norman, many people will just drive over to Moore and Moore will reap the benefit of a very large development and many, many people that live up in that area. One of the things that I think Mr. Bates has provided for us is a sales tax revenue stream that will allow the City to be provided with the revenue to provide City services to that area, such as fire, police, those types of things, which is commendable in such a development. That way we retain the sales tax revenue within our city, as opposed to people driving to Moore to spend their dollars. Who wouldn't want the dollars spent in Norman so that Norman can benefit and provide those services? Lastly, the thing that really concerns me, and I believe the gentleman has left – I believe his name was Mr. Meeks – was his overall impression with his interaction of our city. I will ask the City Manager to look into that further. I would commend Brenda Hall, our City Clerk, on answering his questions and his characterization of that interaction, but I will ask our City Manager to look into this video streaming and take his comments to heart and his overall impression of his interaction with our Planning Department. I would hope that anyone that comes to the City, whether they're from Oklahoma City, whether they're from Austin, Texas, would always, without exception, have a good and positive experience and good remarks to make about our city instead of something I had to

listen to from Mr. Meeks. So, other than that, I will be voting for this. Certainly it is a very difficult and challenging development to vote on, but I do think overall, long term, and that's what I must look proactively long term it will benefit the City of Norman and I think it will be a beautiful development that everyone can be proud of.

3. Ms. Gordon – I really want to like this plan. I really do. But I have some problems with it and some I've already addressed. I have a real problem with that one street cutting through the residential neighborhood and then cutting through commercial. I think that's problematic. From what I heard, I thought City staff recommended that and I don't get it, quite frankly. I have a problem with the gateway park. I love the park – love the connectivity of it in the grand scheme of all this area, but I think we are really kidding ourselves if we think that 50 feet of a stretch of parkland is going to be a buffer from single-family residential houses next to a dense apartment complex. So I'm having trouble kind of wrapping my head around that. I tend to kind of disagree with Commissioner Lewis in that the vibe that I'm getting from everyone tonight is not necessarily having a big issue with the commercial part of this, but with the density of the residential part – the density of the houses in the neighborhood, the density of these apartments going up in the area. And that's kind of the overall feel I have, that I think in general this is a good idea, and I like looking down the road and I don't have too much of a problem with the commercial part of it, but I just get an overall sense that it's a bit too much for the space. I like the mixed use and wanting to do different types of residential for different income levels and such, but I don't necessarily think this is the best area for that given the general surrounding vibe of all of the other neighborhoods. So, for that reason, I think it can be tweaked. I think it can be improved upon. And I think it needs work. So I won't be able to support it tonight.

4. Mr. Knotts asked to clarify the three items before the Commission. Ms. Connors indicated that we have a Norman 2025 Land Use Plan change, we have a zone change, and the preliminary plat. Mr. Knotts commented that this is not the final plat. This kind of the beginning of the negotiation between the designers and the neighborhoods surrounding that. Preliminary plat is just that – preliminary and it really doesn't say that we're going to build it exactly like this. Ms. Connors clarified that the preliminary plat really defines the parameters of the development and the final plat needs to be consistent with the preliminary plat when it comes through. They could make small changes, but if we moved major roadways or did major changes to this, it would have to come back with a preliminary plat amendment.

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1011-115, Ordinance No. O-1011-55, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend adoption of the Preliminary Plat for UPLANDS ADDITION to the City Council. Chris Lewis seconded the motion.

5. Mr. Trachtenberg – I'm going to support this development and I want to explain why to the folks who oppose it. I do so in full sympathy with the idea that a part of town that has been a certain way for a long, long time is going to change. That is always tremendously disappointing and discomfoting, whether you've lived there for 41 years, as one of the citizens who spoke has, or if you just bought in expecting to have it a certain way. But I think anyone, whether you're a long-time resident of Norman or a relative newcomer, has got to notice what is going on in central Oklahoma and in this

part of town in particular. These changes are not coming from last week. As we've heard, this very project has been in the works, or sort of publicly discussed for a number of months, and it's in the context of a whole wave of development in this area. When you find out about it, it's shocking, for sure. But it's not brand new. This is what's been going on for a while around here. One of the things that I value about this project and one of the reasons I'm supporting it is precisely because it is part of a comprehensive, systematic approach to development in this area. I think one of the features of a lot of residential developments that we see all over the country, but we certainly see here, is it's one little island next to one little island next to one little island, and never the twain or three of them or four of them really talk to each other or meet in any way. I think that's really bad in all kinds of ways. I think one of the things that's valuable about this development as part of this larger set is it's integrated – it's connected. And, as such, I'm afraid I have to very respectfully disagree with the gentleman who spoke against the idea of mixed-use. Mixed-use is a kind of a technical term for some of us here. We spent a lot of hours working on what's called a mixed-use ordinance, so when I hear that word, I think, wait a minute – this isn't mixed use because there's a special designation for mixed use. But I take your point. This is a mixture of uses. And, to be sure, that's not how we've done things in this country for a long time. I think we've really made a big mistake over the years in the United States, and even right here in central Oklahoma, just saying we're going to have one use for miles and miles and miles. I think a number of people have explained why it's advantageous not to do this. Let me just propose an environmental reason. You don't have to drive as much. Right? I mean the way we've got things set up -- and somebody referred to east Norman before. You live way over here – to get to where you need to go you've got to drive for miles and miles. I think that's not a good way to live, frankly, in my view. I think one of the things that a development such as this does is provides the opportunity to walk or bike or be near to the things that you need in order to live. It doesn't isolate homes away from the other activities of life, and I think that's a really good thing about this project. So I'm in the happy position of agreeing with my colleague, Mr. Lewis, in my support of this development and so I will be voting for it.

6. Ms. Hartley – I just wanted to clarify something. The gentleman said something, referring to the developers and the engineers as professionals, and saying that we were all professionals. We are public servants, serving on this Planning Commission, and I am not a professional engineer or developer. I work with non-profit organizations. I happen to have served on the Park Board for eight years in Norman, and I also was part of the 2025 planning group that looked at land use within Norman. One of the things that I think is really important, that I think Mr. McCaleb pointed out very early on, is that this project does address one of the major goals that the 2025 Plan team, that consisted of 300 individuals in our community, where we went through this process I think almost 9 years ago now – that it does encourage and support diversified types of housing and densities in order to better serve different income levels and family types. That's exactly what this project is all about. Change is coming between the area of Moore and Norman, and I really feel like this is a good project that addresses that. It also disappoints me that people paint developers in a very negative light. I know Mr. Bates. I know Mr. Clagg. I know Mr. McCaleb. They don't do shoddy work. They do good work in this community and they do live here and their kids go to school here and they pay taxes here. And to the woman in the audience who, after Commissioner Lewis said that he was going to vote for this, made this symbol – like we take bribes – we don't.

We make difficult decisions sitting on this horseshoe and I'm offended that someone in my community would make that gesture toward Commissioner Lewis. So I ask you, as we vote tonight, like we've all said - we have empathy for you, but we also have tough decisions to make about the future of our community, and that's why we're here.

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

| | |
|--------|--|
| YEAS | Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Curtis McCarty, Andy Sherrer, Zev Trachtenberg, Jim Gasaway |
| NAYES | Cynthia Gordon, Roberta Pailles |
| ABSENT | Curtis McCarty |

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1011-115, Ordinance No. O-1011-55, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend adoption of the Preliminary Plat for UPLANDS ADDITION, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 6-2.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:

CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY THE TECUMSEH PROJECT, L.L.C. FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD AND EAST OF ASTOR DRIVE.

This item was postponed until the August 11, 2011 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicant as an addition to the Consent Docket, by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-3 – NRH MEDICAL PARK WEST, L.L.C. AND VILANO SALIM, L.L.C. REQUEST CLOSURE OF THE UTILITY EASEMENTS LOCATED ALONG THE SOUTH BOUNDARY OF LOTS 21, 22, AND 23, AND ALONG THE NORTH BOUNDARY OF LOTS 24, 25, AND 26, LOCATED IN BLOCK 5, NRH MEDICAL PARK WEST ADDITION, SECTION 4, ON PROPERTY BOUNDED BY HEALTHPLEX PARKWAY AND RC LUTTRELL DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Petition
4. Utility Letters

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Mr. Koscinski explained that this is a 15' utility easement. It straddles the middle of six lots – three on the north, three on the south. The applicant intends to purchase all six lots and construct one new multi-story office building. The utility easement is in the way. It has drainage and utilities. Everyone has been contacted. The utilities are going to be relocated if they're in the way. Staff has no objection to closing the easement. It can be served without this easement. There are no protests on the request.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Harold Heiple, 218 East Eufaula, representing the applicant – I'm not here to ask for any apartments or office buildings or anything – just a garden variety easement closure that sits across six lots. It backs up on the back side of those six lots and is fifteen feet wide. The hospital has made a contract to have one multi-story building built here. No protests. The staff report says there is a drainage structure within the easements. When I was preparing the application, I assumed that when I asked to close the utility easement that that carried with it the designation of the drainage easement. After talking to Ken Danner, to avoid any confusion, I did send an email to the staff a couple of days ago asking that the words "and drainage" be inserted after the word "utility" in my legal description so there's no doubt that we're asking to vacate both the utility and the drainage easements that are all within that 15 foot section. The recommendation is that this be closed conditioned on making a provision for the replacement of the drainage structure which already exists within that easement. Mr. McCaleb has submitted the letter to Ken Danner and Ken told me earlier that the letter was satisfactory to him, that the drainage solution will be submitted to the City and approved, obviously, before there can be any occupancy. The utility companies have been taken care of, so I think all the bases have been touched and we would respectfully request you recommendation for approval.

PARTICIPATION BY THE AUDIENCE:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Zev Trachtenberg moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1112-3, with the addition of "and drainage" after "utility" 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 | Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Roberta Pailes, Andy Sherrer, Zev Trachtenberg, Jim Gasaway |
| NAYES | None |
| ABSENT | Curtis McCarty |

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1112-3, as amended, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 10, being:

ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-4 – THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA REQUESTS CLOSURE OF THE 6’ WIDE UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG THE REAR PROPERTY LINE OF LOTS 1-20 AND 25-44, BLOCK 1, HARDIE-RUCKER ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED BETWEEN JENKINS AVENUE AND LINCOLN AVENUE AND NORTH OF FARMER STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Petition
4. Utility Letters

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Mr. Koscinski reported that this is an older part of Norman. It has been purchased by the University. All the structures have already been removed. The property is now fenced and they're under construction with drilling piers and site preparation for the imminent construction of a new multi-story building. The easement is in the way. The property can be served without an easement up the middle. We concur with the request to close it. There is a manhole that we need protected, unless it is relocated somewhere in this process. That's the only condition that staff would ask be honored – that something be done with that manhole so that we either have access to it or it's protected or moved. No comments were received from any utility companies that were negative. We have no protests. We support the request.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Mark Caywood, Smith Roberts Baldischwiler – There is a manhole that sits a little bit outside of the street right-of-way and it's slightly into the easement that we're going to vacate for the Sooner Center, but when we go to District Court to vacate it, we will put language in the journal entry protecting the City's right to maintain that manhole.

PARTICIPATION BY THE AUDIENCE:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Ms. Hartley noted that there are a few Commissioners that work for the University of Oklahoma. She asked if they need to recuse themselves from participation on this item to avoid any conflict of interest or violation of the City's Ethics Policy. Ms. Messner explained that the City of Norman's Ethics Policy does govern the Planning Commission. There are two types of conflicts within the policy: either an actual conflict, or a potential conflict. With an actual conflict, you have some kind of direct benefit or detriment or employment consequence that you might receive from your vote on this item tonight. So if you think vacating the easement might affect your job, you could ask to recuse, the Commission could vote, and you would get up from your chair and leave the room. However, if you think the conflict is potential – you can't really speculate as to what the result of it might be, voting on this item and its impact on your job at the University – you can go ahead and disclose that you work for OU and go ahead and remain in your seat and vote.

2. Mr. Trachtenberg disclosed that he works for the University of Oklahoma. Ms. Gordon indicated she also works for them. Mr. Gasaway added that he is retired.

Diana Hartley moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1112-4 to the City Council, with protection of the manhole. Chris Lewis seconded the motion.

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

| | |
|--------|---|
| YEAS | Cynthia Gordon, Diana Hartley, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Roberta Pailes, Andy Sherrer, Zev Trachtenberg, Jim Gasaway |
| NAYES | None |
| ABSENT | Curtis McCarty |

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1112-4 to the City Council with protection of the manhole, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 11, being:

PRESENTATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

1. Ms. Connors presented a summary of the Annual Report.
2. Mr. Lewis asked, in regards to the numbers presented, are those normalized for inflation? When we're talking about it's the third highest or the highest, are those normalized for the valuation of the dollars and inflation. Ms. Connors responded they're just the actual dollars each year. We take the actual figures that we have gotten through the process each year, so they're not modified in any way. The actual value of construction would take into account, to a certain extent, that change in the value of construction materials. Mr. Lewis said what he is getting at is they would increase year over year just by general valuations. Ms. Connors agreed.
3. Mr. Sherrer noted the several large construction projects over the last year that were mentioned, including the jail, the hospital, and the new elementary school. Do you have any idea how we compare if you took those numbers out? Ms. Connors replied that we had a lot of multi-family. I don't think it would be a crucial fall in value. But, of course, those large non-residential construction projects – schools, churches, hospitals – are large ticket items. It would probably modify the place of last year in the list. We could probably do that each year. Mr. Sherrer commented that last year just seemed exceptionally high, based that on what I do for a living and how that relates to the overall construction.
4. Ms. Hartley asked if there is a plan to update the 2025 Plan. Ms. Connors reported that the direction that City Council has chosen to go is that they're looking at an overall Transportation Plan and working to incorporate that into a new update of the 2025 Plan. So in FY12 they have budgeted money for the Transportation Scoping Project and they have not budgeted money to update the 2025 Plan.

* * *

Item No. 12, being:

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

1. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Ms. Connors indicated that Mr. Knotts has been serving as the Planning Commission representative to the Planning & Community Development Committee. That committee used to meet at 8:00 a.m. the second Friday of the month. That committee has been changed to the Community Planning & Transportation Committee and will now meet the third Thursday at 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Knotts indicated he would prefer not to continue as the Planning Commission representative because that requires him to close his business early. He reported that the City Council members have been interested in the Planning Commission discussions and how things were progressing. The representative has been an active participant.

Mr. Lewis volunteered to serve as the Planning Commission representative.

Mr. Heiple indicated that Councilmember Dillingham had indicated to him that the meeting would be on the next Wednesday evening at 5:30 p.m.

2. Mr. Heiple – Because you've talked about long-range planning that came up tonight, between what the members of the Marlatt Addition said, because they've been out there 40 years, reminds me that 44 years ago I bought a lot on Morgan Drive, started to build a house, and I was looking across the back yard at a golf course, which was kind of a brand new Westwood, and somebody was asking me what are you going to do when the City closes it and puts apartments back there, and I said I guess that's a risk that I live with. But the points that they made were cogent, but it reminded me that when Susan Connors first arrived in town we had a conversation about not only needing a traffic study, which we desperately need of the arterials and section line roads, how we might not only improve them to carry traffic, but find some alternate routes. As a possible example, Robinson to Front to the campus and that sort of thing. Which has led to the fact that the Council has now indicated that, yes, we need to do this traffic study prior to updating the 2030 Plan. One of the conversations that Susan and I had about section line roads – the old business used to be that at the intersection of arterials you put 10 acres of commercial at each of the four corners, and then you didn't allow commercial to strip up and down the street, and that because they become such traffic carrying arteries, which need to be improved -- because in Norman, Oklahoma you can't get from here to there, when it comes to talking about getting across town – we need improvement in that. There needs to be some rethinking of how we zone along arterials, and we were talking particularly about any single-family residential backing up to an arterial. As you know, now the people that are living on Indian Hills Road that were here from Marlatt, their driveways are going out onto Indian Hills Road. Well, you can't do that under current regulations, but you can back up, which brings up the stockade fences that one of you said might not be as appealing as some other things would be. My point is that I suggested possibly we ought to consider something like you're not going to have any R-1 zoning with 300 or 350 feet of the centerline of a section line road or arterial. I don't throw that out as a be-all, end-all – I throw it out as part of the thing that you're going to need to think about changing the overall thing. Because, as Susan said, some of our subdivision

regulations are out of the 1940s and 50s. They need to be updated. And I think our planning section does.

One of the other things that I talked to the Mayor and Rachel Butler about a year ago was the concern about the composition of both the groups that have done 2020 and 2025, because basically it has been any citizen can volunteer, show up, and be a part of it. And I suggested that that really needed to be changed because it's not representative of the average citizen of Norman. As you know, a lot of times the survey from 2025 has been quoted as the Bible and the Gospel of the attitude of what the City wants. Well, if you look at that survey, it's less than 3/10 of 1% of the population. The average age of the people compiling the survey was age 50 and the average length of residence in Norman was 20 years. That is not the average Normanite – 50 years old and 20 years residency. I suggested at that time that what we needed on these things was a representative or representatives of groups that are affected – I mean groups of any kind, whether they be PTAs or school districts or Sierra Clubs or anything – interested groups. But a representative to come to put that together to get really a more broad-based proposition. As an example, you can't get people in their 20s and 30s and early 40s to serve on these things and to come to these meetings because they've got kids and soccer practice and ballet lessons and all that kind of thing. But if you have their PTA representative, then they can have somebody from the PTA coming to each of those meetings really representing that. These are things I'm throwing out. I'm really not looking for any answers. I don't have any specifics. I'm just saying we are about to embark on a really exciting time of let's look at the traffic study, let's follow that then with a revision of the 2025 going up to 2030. It's time to really start thinking, not outside the box, but inside the 21st Century box. I appreciate your service.

And this report you gave tonight – this summary was the most concise and most informative I've ever heard on the annual plan. Too often I've heard people stand up here and just read the whole thing and it's a lot of pages and a lot of topics. But that was one of the best summaries and surveys in a very precise time and we thank all of you for that.

3. Mr. Knotts commented that the Plat Activity Map gave him a better focus on what is really going on in Norman.

* * *

Item No. 13, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.

Norman Planning Commission