

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

NOVEMBER 14, 2013

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 November 2013. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chairman Chris Lewis called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Curtis McCarty
Jim Gasaway
Roberta Pailles
Andy Sherrer
Cindy Gordon
Dave Boeck
Sandy Bahan
Tom Knotts
Chris Lewis

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Scott Sturtz, City Engineer
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator

* * *

Item No. 2, being:

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 10, 2013 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Jim Gasaway moved to approve the minutes of the October 10, 2013 Regular Session as presented. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Roberta Pailles, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon, Dave Boeck, Sandy Bahan, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis
NAYES	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the minutes of the October 10, 2013 Regular Session as presented, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 3, being:

SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. AT 2601 S. CLASSEN BOULEVARD

3A. R-1314-54 – SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT, L.L.C., REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION, FLOODPLAIN DESIGNATION, AND COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION AND COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2601 S. CLASSEN BOULEVARD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report
3. Pre-Development Summary

3B. O-1314-23 – SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, RM-4, MOBILE HOME PARK DISTRICT, R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, AND A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 2601 S. CLASSEN BOULEVARD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative with Exhibits A-E

3C. O-1314-24 – SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, RM-4, MOBILE HOME PARK DISTRICT, AND R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF 12TH AVENUE S.E. BETWEEN CLASSEN BOULEVARD AND CONSTITUTION STREET, AT 2601 S. CLASSEN BOULEVARD.

and

3D. O-1314-25 – SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM RM-4, MOBILE HOME PARK DISTRICT, AND A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF 12TH AVENUE S.E. NORTH OF THE INTERSECTION WITH CLASSEN BOULEVARD, AT 2601 S. CLASSEN BOULEVARD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

3E. PP-1314-10 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, (A REPLAT OF SOONER MOBILE HOME PARK ADDITION), LOCATED AT 2601 S. CLASSEN BOULEVARD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan (Commercial Areas)
6. Preliminary Site Development Plan (PUD Area)
7. Request for Alley Waiver (Commercial Areas)

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – You have five applications before you tonight for the redevelopment of the Sooner Mobile Park and RV Community. The existing 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan

shows that the current site has Low Density Residential and Commercial. If updated, you would have Medium Density Residential with Commercial. You have Low Density Residential to the north and to the east, Medium Density Residential and Commercial to the south, and Commercial across Classen to the west. The existing zoning for the Planned Unit Development shows a single-family PUD to the north, multi-family student housing PUDs to the east and to the south, and commercial zoning to the west. The C-1 tract would consist of possibly some restaurants. The C-2 tract is proposed for a gas station and a grocery store. The existing zoning in that area is, again, like the Planned Unit Development with single-family to the north, multi-family to the east and south. The preliminary plat encompasses the entire proposal. The existing land use in the area is the single-family to the north, multi-family student housing to the east and south, additional commercial to the south and across Classen Boulevard. This is a photo of the site at the corner of Constitution and Classen Boulevard; that is the current entrance for the mobile home park. This is the existing commercial strip mall to the southwest at Constitution and Classen. There is also commercial on the northwest corner of Constitution and Classen. This is a photo of the gated single-family Planned Unit Development that is on the north side of the development. This is looking back to the south; that's the heavily treed area where the mobile home park currently exists. This is that commercial strip mall that is directly south of the proposed development. This is the multi-family to the south and the multi-family area to the east of the proposal. This is an aerial photo to give you an idea of the mobile home park in the center with the multi-family on the east and south, the commercial development, and the single-family to the north. The application has gone through the process for us. It has gone through Pre-Development; no protests at the Pre-Development meeting. It went before Greenbelt Commission, however there was not a quorum at the Greenbelt Commission, so it was moved forward to Planning Commission tonight. Staff is in support of these applications and does recommend approval for Resolution No. R-1314-54, which is for the land use changes, Ordinance Nos. O-1314-23, O-1314-24, and O-1314-25, which are the Planned Unit Development, C-2 zoning, and C-1 zoning, as well as PP-1314-10 for the preliminary plat. The applicant's representative is here with a presentation and staff is available for questions if you have any.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Hal Ezzell, 100 48th Avenue N.W., representing the applicant Sooner Mobile Home Redevelopment, L.L.C. – I'm only going to speak very briefly, and I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Tommy Martin with SMC Engineers to go through some of the technical aspects and utility aspects of the project, and then I will come back up to address some of the items with regard to the PUD development within it. We also have available, should you have any questions, representatives from the traffic engineering firm, as well as the ownership, and as well as the people who will be developing the PUD. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Tommy Martin and let him move forward on some of the technical aspects. Thank you.

2. Tommy Martin, SMC Consulting Engineers, 815 W. Main Street in Oklahoma City, engineer for the applicant – First of all, I'd like to thank this Commission for allowing us to address you this evening. This tract of land is further described in your staff report. All engineering issues have been identified and examined. A brief history: the site was previously platted in 1983 by our firm for the mobile home usage. Subsequently, our firm also rezoned a small area of the western portion of the tract to C-1. Solutions have been prepared and submitted to staff. Staff has reviewed those solutions and required joint meetings, resulting in staff recommendations for approval. I will now briefly present those solutions. Sanitary sewer – there were several sanitary sewer lines constructed for this tract, some public and some private. As you know, the mobile home park does not require all lines to be public. There were a few sanitary sewer lines constructed by other parties other than our firm. To identify and allow for a comprehensive review of the sewer lines associated with this tract, SMC required a complete ALTA, topographic and utility survey to be performed. With the assistance of staff, we have formulated a plan to resolve the quantity of the sewer lines and have resolved 90% of those issues. Some of the lines that are constructed have no easements by title examination and, therefore, must be

considered private. The site does have sanitary sewer available and capacity does exist. The site plan that SMC prepared complies with staff's approval for the alignment and use to sewer the entire preliminary plat. Water line -- currently there is no public water line along the west boundary. This will help me depict a little bit better how we're going to route the water on this. There is no water line along the west boundary. The applicant is required to construct a 12" line which will connect to an existing 12" line located at the northwest corner of the plat, and then extend a new line along the west boundary to the southwest corner of the plat. From there, a bore will be extended under Classen to connect to an existing 16" line located on the west side of Classen. The commercial tract and apartment tract will extend two 8" water lines easterly along the proposed Classen and Constitution Streets. These lines will transverse into and through the apartments and loop together. The design will have fire hydrants installed per City requirements and per review of the Fire Department. The results will give a looped system to provide sufficient water for domestic and fire protection. Storm sewer -- SMC prepared a drainage and detention analysis that has been reviewed and approved by Norman Engineering staff. The detention will be constructed with three ponds that will provide the required detention and guarantee the release to be at the historic discharge. The northeast detention pond will not encroach on the 100-year floodplain. SMC has already prepared a floodplain permit and been approved by the Norman Floodplain Committee to allow the construction of the reinforced concrete box to extend into the floodplain, as dictated by the location of the existing box along Classen. Traffic was a concern of both staff and the developer. SMC engaged Traffic Engineering Consultants to review those issues and submit the results in the form of a Traffic Impact Analysis. BJ Hawkins is present tonight and can respond to those questions, if any. Briefly, traffic improvements to be constructed by the applicant include a 3' widening on the east side of Classen/Highway 77 to create a southbound left-turn lane into the development, providing 150' of storage. Two: traffic signal modifications as further described in your packet. And three: two new public roads -- Constitution Street and Classen Street. These new public roads will extend east to the proposed public access to both gated entrances to the apartment site. The development will create no adverse congestion beyond the existing conditions, and staff has concurred with the traffic report. Other traffic issues for access are clearly described in your packet and staff is recommending approval. One other item to note is there are no existing oil wells on the site and no concerns for such. In closing, as stated in the beginning, all technical engineering issues have been addressed and staff is recommending approval. We ask for this Commission's concurrence with staff's recommendations. Again, thank you for allowing us to speak with you tonight.

3. Hal Ezzell -- Thank you for your time this evening. This project -- a portion of it -- you've seen before in the form of the Aspen Heights project, which was originally proposed, as you will recall, on a site directly adjacent to Hitachi. When that site did not pan out, they began looking for a secondary site in the general area and identified this site as one that would be even, in fact, more suitable for the project.

This is the aerial that's been discussed somewhat, but I wanted to emphasize a couple of things here. Number one, you see an extensive and a very heavily forested floodplain area that will act as a buffer to this R-1 neighborhood. There will be some interior shots that will also show you how heavily treed the area is on parts of the interior. One of the things that the PUD developer has taken great pains to do, and is actually readjusting again, is to keep as many of these trees as possible. These are very nice, very mature trees. It was correctly stated that the Greenbelt Commission did not have a quorum that night, but this area is part of the trail master plan, and what the trail master plan shows is a trail basically coming through this area, coming down through here, and connecting to the Classen site. That area is going to be preserved and that's going to be an option should the City figure out a way to ultimately fund the trail master plan. So those options are going to be maintained for the future.

Crimson Park is directly to the south, and The Cottages is directly to the east boundary of the property. In the 2025 Plan, as you well know, there are generally two criteria that you're looking at to decide if a Plan change is appropriate and in order. The first criteria can be

generally summarized as that the development around the area has changed such that it warrants a different use, and the second criteria is generally described as there's no adverse impact as a result of the requested change. Staff put in the report, and I greatly appreciate it, the history of how this property has been dealt with and treated throughout the course of strategic planning by the City. Up until 2004, this property has always been designated either as high density, within the traditional meaning of that, or medium density. It was only in 2004 that it was changed to low density residential. At that time, in 2004 when that was done, none of this existed. This is now – and you'll see from some of the aerials – it would really make it highly improbable that this would ever be suitable for R-1 single-family housing. Here is Constitution Street – you can see OU golf course right there. Unfortunately, this is not on the CART path, but hopefully the City and the University will get some – this is a great multi-modal location here if they ever do it leading straight up to the south campus area. Again, you've already seen that.

The C-2 tract is going to be a grocery store. That's one of the things I think that's very exciting about this project. The southeastern part of Norman, if you're not familiar with it, is considered long-neglected – at least to the people who live over there – in the provision of services such as grocery stores, restaurants, etc. I would agree. It would seem that the west side of Norman has an abundance of grocery stores, while the eastern and southeastern part has not seen that same flourishing. That will be an excellent service for the area and for the residents. The C-1 tract is designated as a probable restaurant site – again, something I think is sorely lacking in that area. You can see it's currently a hodge-podge of zoning. I'm not going to really talk at length, but you can see the layout.

In the Planned Unit Development part of this, there are 179 units. I think that's noteworthy because it's not really a greater density change than what is there currently. Currently there were 85 mobile homes and 50 RVs, and those 50 RVs were long-term RVs, most of which were occupied as though they were residences. So you're going from 135 units, if you will, to 179 units. This is looking to the interior of the site from Constitution. This is important because I think it's illustrative to look at why this is not going to be a single-family site. You can see the scale of the height of The Cottages. I don't see anyone barbecuing in their back yard with that staring down in on them. This is another interior view; this is standing on the front part of the site looking in. This – it's hard to tell – but you're looking south at Crimson Park. This is a little bit better view of what someone on the southern boundary would be seeing if they were in their back yards. So I think this really is a use that is appropriate; it makes it more compatible with what's around it. As you will recall from the satellite, you maintain appropriate buffers to the single-family to the north. This is the northeastern corner of the property. Again, I'm trying to give you an idea of the density of the foliage there and the trees. This is what is going to be put there. I think you've seen this before. But this is in the American Craftsman style. They're structured as separate housing. The theory behind that is that there are a lot of people that like to live in housing, and they like to have the amenities of a community, but they don't necessarily want to be all attached together. That seems to be the trend in multi-family. Again, more representations of how this would look. Again, American Craftsman style.

This slide I want to talk on because there has been a lot – and I've seen this developing – of discussion that's arising about we are approving lots of multi-family – another multi-family project. Don't we have enough multi-family? The answer is that the market would tell us not yet. So what I have here – these are straight off the U.S. Census Bureau website. Our 2012 estimate of population is 115,562; our 2010 estimate was 110,925. That represents over that period of time – April of 2010 to July of 2012 – a 4.2% increase in our population in the City of Norman, while the State as a whole only increased 1.7%. So what that means is that you all are doing your job successfully; the Council is doing its job successfully and Norman is becoming an ever more desirable place within the State of Oklahoma to live. Going back to the decennial census in 2000, the population was 95,694. So if you take that number from 2000 to 2012, what you see is a 20.8% increase over that period of time, and that averages out to an annual average of about 1.73%. I had always heard that anecdotally the number is 1.6-1.8 – and that lines up with that. What municipal planning officials will tell you is growth is not a problem or difficult to control until you hit about the 7% number. At a 7% growth number you're now outstripping your ability to

add infrastructure and provide services. So now let's take a look at multi-family. In 2000, the number of renter-occupied housing units – and this is the whole rental housing stock – is 17,393 and in 2000 we had a vacancy rate of all rental housing of 8%. In 2010, that number of renter-occupied housing units was 20,238. The 2010 vacancy rate of all rental housing had declined to 7.2%. So over that 10-year period of time, we added 2,845 rental units and our vacancy rates declined for the whole of the rental stock from 8 to 7.2. Now, I think that's important and it illustrates a couple of facts. Anecdotally – and I know people have said this to you before – we have the sense that we're approving so many multi-family. I think those are valid questions, so my standpoint is what does the data say? What do the numbers say? Not our emotive reaction to that, but what do the numbers say? So that illustrates the fact that, even though we're adding multi-family units – and, frankly, we're adding multi-family units at a rate greater than what was contemplated under the 2025 Plan when it was originally set forth – I believe the rental units contemplated under the 2025 Plan was something in the neighborhood of 1,742 and we are, since adoption of that plan, we've – we being collectively the City of Norman, not me – has allowed 2,200 and some odd units to be slated for construction. The problem with the 2025 multi-family numbers is they're not prepared by experts – they're shot in the dark guessing. Multi-family is an animal that is more complex than people at first assume. Not all multi-family is the same. Within multi-family you have several layers of multi-family. You have market rate properties, such as the most recent one, The Falls at Brookhaven that came online in the last few months. You have senior, such as The Mansions at Brookhaven. You have low-income oriented housing. You have student-oriented housing. So multi-family has lots of different stripes that you have to look at, and they each have different demand curves for them. So one of the questions that was raised at the April meeting was, well, that's great that your projects are going to be so successful, but doesn't that create softness elsewhere within our rental markets? And the answer, as you see from the data and the numbers, is no, it doesn't create a softening. We have a declining vacancy curve, even though we're adding rental units. The other issue is I think it's an over-simplification to say student housing means that it's going to be all students and that it's going to be all OU students. There are a lot of college students in Norman that do not attend the University of Oklahoma. We have people who attend Oklahoma City Community College, Oklahoma City University, the University of Central Oklahoma, Rose State. So there are lots of students beyond just what is at the University of Oklahoma community, but there's no guarantee – it's not a covenant or restriction that you have to be a student to live in the complex. I personally think it's more correct to characterize it as an age-driven factor, rather than just purely student. I think those are all important factors to look at when you're evaluating whether or not another multi-family housing project is appropriate.

In addition to that – and I know it's been mentioned previously, but I want to reiterate – these projects just don't go forward because somebody thinks it's a good idea. If you're going to loan somebody 75% of \$30 or \$40 million for a project, you're going to well vet the data associated with that project, from the competition, the vacancy rates, the absorption rates, etc. Your lenders, especially the larger lenders, are not going to accept we just think this is a great college town and a great place to put this project. You have to prove that it will work. I think also lost in the discussion is the idea that everything that's ever permitted gets built. There are a lot of things that move forward that don't ever actually get constructed, and I suspect because at the end of the day they were not able to justify that the project would support itself, either based on location or other factors. These numbers – and I just want to implore you as you consider this project and any other multi-family project that comes forward – the data shows that we have not reached our tipping point. I think there probably is a tipping point that the market would tell you, and I hope as the City revisits its plans in either the 2030 or 2035 update – I know there are some industry folks that are very interested in partnering with the City and even cost-sharing with the City to do a true feasibility study or market analysis and let's say and set conclusively where the probable tipping point is. Every housing – whether it's single-family, multi-family – everything has a tipping point, but what the data shows is we are not there as of yet.

The other thing I wanted to talk about very briefly that's unique in this project is the reality of it is there are 85 individuals and families who are being displaced. Those 85 people who are

being displaced – this is not convenient for them and that is not a factor that the developer and owner of this property have taken lightly. We have assisted them in coming up with what I think is a very good set of incentives to assist in the relocation efforts with regards to those residents. And just to describe them for you, generally speaking, the cost to move a mobile home is about \$5,500-\$5,600, depending on who is doing the moving. We negotiated with some other mobile home parks in the area – specifically Sunnyslane Estates and Granada Village are the two who are offering incentives to the residents of Sooner Mobile Home Park where they will pay for the move. So that covers the up-front cost for them, and they're also providing two months free rent – December to December, in essence. When you live in a mobile home park, December typically is one of your tighter months, so if you're going to get a concession, December is the ideal month to have your free rent. So both Sunnyslane Estates and Granada Village are offering to pay for the move for the individuals. Now that is about a \$5,500 value, or more if you have a double wide mobile home. Now Sooner Mobile Home Redevelopment is offering to the residents cash payments to assist in relocation of \$4,000 for those that have a single-wide, and \$7,000 for those that have a double-wide. In addition to that, there is a rent abatement on the table that, if you pay rent through the 31st of May, then the rent from January through May will be rebated back to you in the form of a cash payment. That makes the total on a single-wide \$5,650 or the total on a double-wide \$8,650. So that is, I think, a very fair sharing of the expense and a very good gesture. It was very important for the owner to treat the folks in the park fairly, equitably, and assist them to the extent possible. Now that assistance is conditioned on a couple of factors. One is the property has to be successfully rezoned. If it is not successfully rezoned, then it will not be purchased and there will be no funds available to pay those incentives. That's just the reality of where the money is coming from. In essence, I refer to this as a profit-sharing plan on the part of the owner. They are taking a portion of the proceeds from the sale and they are distributing that to the residents in the form of direct cash payments. To date, 22 mobile homes have been relocated already. The park is going to be closed regardless, and that is in process, so those 22 individuals have already taken the initiative – they've gone, they're toured the parks, they've decided where they want to go, they've arranged for their move, and they have moved. The other conditions associated with that assistance are – and this may be more detail than you want, but I want to share it with you – they have to move their mobile homes, they have to clear the site, and that's really it. It has to be successfully rezoned and they don't get to protest. We presented them with a contract. This is not an empty promise – it's a binding written agreement that says what we're going to do and what they're going to do. It's a very creative thing to do. I've not seen it, frankly, done in any development I've ever observed, either in my time on the Council or otherwise. I think it speaks highly of the ownership group and their sense of taking care of those folks.

With that, I think that has kind of covered the things I wanted to hit on, which is, number one, the 2025 Plan adjustment is appropriate. The development around this site has changed. It is no longer suitable for single-family homes, and the single-family homes to the north of it have an adequate wooded buffer that will prevent that from ever being an issue to them. As the engineering firm mentioned, the traffic service has been addressed; the service level will stay the same. It's not negatively impacted. There are appropriate utilities available. From a general sense of multi-family, I know it can seem like multi-family fatigue, but what the data shows us is that we should not yet be concerned about the number of multi-family projects. With that, I would respectfully request that you approve the project this evening. I think it will be a boon to the southeast quadrant of Norman. I think they will greatly appreciate having a convenient grocery store as well. With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

4. Ms. Pailes – One of the things we were talking about before we began was what was going to happen to the folks in that area. So it's nice to hear that that was addressed. I live in the area and normally people think trailer parks – but it's actually a very nice neighborhood.

Mr. Ezzell – It is. They have a great sense of community there.

Ms. Pailes – Those folks buy those homes, right? And then sell them to the next. They're rarely moved. I'm kind of surprised that they manage to move any of them, because they

haven't been moved in a long time, most of them. So I'm assuming a lot of them will probably take the cash payment of \$4,000 and leave, I would guess. Do you have any notion ...

Mr. Ezzell – Well, you are correct that there are instances where a mobile home can't be moved. We have done our own assessment, prior to engaging in this process, and we identified four that we thought fit the bill of there is going to be no way they can move these things. When the machine yanks them, the doors are going to buckle, the windows are going to pop. We think there are four. The owner has allocated a budget for a discretionary item to deal with those very limited instances where the home just absolutely can't be moved. They are going to receive the \$4,000 assistance payment and, if appropriate, a rent abatement. But we have also allocated some discretionary funds within that because, for those individuals – and the hard part is, when you're looking at this and saying I'm trying to write a contract and I'm going to have to address it to 85 different situations potentially – it's very difficult to do. So what we do is we set a general parameters that are going to cover everybody, and what we have communicated, and in addition to communicating that directly to the residents, we've also communicated with April at Food and Shelter for Friends to say if people come to you with needs, please make us aware of what they're coming and asking you for, because we can probably assist with that. One of the things, for example, is there may be some folks that need help with utility deposits and that's great that Sunnyslane Estates is going to move their mobile home and they will have this future cash payment coming from Sooner Mobile Home Redevelopment, but they've still got to come up with the \$220 electric deposit and oftentimes they do reach out to groups such as Food and Shelter, and we've reached out to Food and Shelter to say if these people reach out to you, please reach out to us. The best thing we could do is set aside a discretionary budget to deal with those instances. We think there's going to be three to four where they truly cannot be moved and, as you've correctly stated, they do own them. So, from their perspective, it's well I own this; I wish I could move it, but I can't. So we're going to help those folks. We've only yet – I've been contacted by one that they went to move it on Tuesday and that's exactly what happened – the doors buckled, the windows popped out of it and the mover said we can't move it. So we will have a meeting on Monday and we're going to decide how to help that individual.

Ms. Pailles – It's a very odd situation. It's kind of like you buy a house in a subdivision and then later your subdivision is sold. I mean, you've purchased it in good faith and all that, so it's a very odd situation, and I hope no resident loses badly and I'm glad you've addressed that.

5. Ms. Pailles – It looked kind of like the C-1 area went up into the floodplain area.

Mr. Ezzell – The lot does go into the floodplain area, but there's nothing that will be constructed on it. You cannot – to the extent that there's a lot line there, then that's not in the floodplain. That may be the boundary, but you would never be able to permit any structure whatsoever in that floodplain right there.

6. Ms. Pailles – Planning Commission is not supposed to worry about the economics of things – that's the builder's discretion. There's a lot of empty commercial space in this area. The corner of Lindsey and 12th is almost entirely empty, and that's been up for three or four years. Do you think this is going to work?

Mr. Ezzell – I don't think anything will go on that site until somebody believes that it will work and they have something for it. There's nothing speculative that's going to be constructed on that site.

Ms. Pailles – And there's actually two grocery stores within a mile of this.

Mr. Ezzell – Yes. At Lindsey and 12th.

Ms. Pailles – Lindsey and 12th and Lindsey and Classen.

Mr. Ezzell – But this will be a much better grocery store, I assure you. Not a Whole Foods. I wish. I don't think Whole Foods will locate on a 6-acre site. But it will have some very nice amenities that I think some folks will enjoy and appreciate the alternative. But, no, there's nothing speculative going on this site. This is actually being retained by the owner and they're

just going to hang onto it. I expect, in reality, given the site and the debts and what's in the floodplain, that will probably be consolidated at some point and really it will be one site.

7. Ms. Pailes – And the elevations you showed us of buildings – is that exactly what's going in – sort of their two story roughly Craftsman style?

Mr. Ezzell – Yes. I can invite Charlie Vatterott up from Aspen to talk about what they build.

Ms. Pailes – That's okay.

Mr. Ezzell – Yes, that's what they build. That's their product and they've built them all over the southeastern United States.

8. Ms. Pailes – In terms of the greenbelt – usually for greenbelt projects there's an engineer's report – usually from Tom McCaleb. Or there used to be. Maybe we don't get.

Ms. Connors – The Greenbelt Commission does not require an engineer's report.

Ms. Pailes – I mean we used to have a report, usually from Tom McCaleb, on ...

Ms. Connors – As you know – as Jane indicated, the Greenbelt did not have a quorum the night this came before them, so there is no report coming out of Greenbelt because they couldn't vote.

Ms. Pailes – But I assume that the report done by Tom McCaleb and or his ...

Ms. Connors – Well, Hal, I think, prepared it.

Mr. Ezzell – I prepared the Greenbelt submission.

Ms. Pailes – So we didn't – that report exists, but we didn't see it.

Ms. Connors – That's correct, because it didn't get moved.

Ms. Pailes – Because it was not acted upon. It's just extremely frustrating, because, like you said, this actually would complete a trail.

Mr. Ezzell – I agree.

Ms. Pailes – And it didn't get acted on.

Mr. Ezzell – One of the things I want to thank staff for is they've actually changed the Greenbelt Enhancement Statement – the application form is much more improved over what we've had to work with previously. You're right. This is a trailway master plan opportunity and you could tie it right through.

Mr. Sherrer – Excuse me. It's over 50% greenspace – is that correct? – on the project. I think I read that.

Mr. Ezzell – I think in total that's a correct statement, because so much of the northern wooded boundary of the property is in the floodplain, it remains green and open.

Mr. Sherrer – That's pretty exceptional to me for most projects I've seen.

Mr. Ezzell – And they're also – I know the architect currently is working on how they're going to end up ultimately orienting the buildings because there are some really, really nice mature trees in there that they want to keep from an aesthetic standpoint. The trees have spent 50 years growing – you can't replicate that.

9. Mr. Knotts – Are you planning safe rooms in any part of this housing project?

Charlie Vatterot, Aspen Heights Executive Vice President – Not at this time. No.

10. Mr. Gasaway – Mr. Ezzell, I think you had mentioned that, if this project passes, the people that live in the mobile homes will be given the funding as you stated.

Mr. Ezzell – That's correct.

Mr. Gasaway – If, for some reason, it doesn't pass and the park closes anyway, then they're all on their own?

Mr. Ezzell – That's correct. The park is closing and we have, to date, moved 22 homes already, and many of the RVs are just there month-to-month. So that process is happening. It will only be a matter of do they have a check coming – yes or no – and to the extent that the ones are still left, then yes they will unceremoniously be getting the notices to vacate. That's the

only downside of this type of housing is you do not own the dirt underneath it. You're like a tenant at will with that regard.

Mr. Gasaway – So the ones that have moved now have already paid it out of their pockets?

Mr. Ezzell – Well, most of them have moved to either Granada Village or Sunnyside Estates, and those parks have paid the cost of the move.

Mr. Lewis – And, Hal, that was the clarification I wanted to make, just to make certain. The housing residents that choose to move to one of the mobile home parks that are actually doing their own subsidy – they'll get paid regardless of whether this project goes through or not?

Mr. Ezzell – They get the cost of the move paid for and the free rent those parks have offered.

Mr. Lewis – That's a negotiation that they made with that mobile home park that doesn't have anything to do with you?

Mr. Ezzell – That's correct. We helped in setting some of that up, but that's their decision and they've made different decisions about how long of a lease that they require in order to get that assistance. Then there are some parks in the area that have offered no concession or assistance whatsoever. For example, Canadian Trails or Shores here in Norman at 48th and Main is offering nothing. We feel very fortunate with having talked to the new owners of Sunnyside Estates and Granada Village – oddly enough both out of the Denver area, but unrelated – they want to replicate what these folks had at Sooner Mobile Home Park. Sooner Mobile Home Park is very unique in the sense of community that it had, and that's one of the things that we hate, but it's an unfortunate consequence and the fact is that that will be disrupted, but we are comfortable that, at least with regards to those two parks, they are doing everything they can to recreate that sense of community, and I think that's why they're asking and so excited about Sooner's good residents relocating there.

Mr. Lewis – And that's something that happens regardless of what happens with this project?

Mr. Ezzell – Correct. It's already happened.

11. Mr. Gasaway – Hal, I don't know if you want to cover this or have your traffic engineer do it. I'm sure you all have done a proposed count from the grocery store, the gas station, and the new residences on the traffic count entering.

Mr. Ezzell – I will say that's correct, and that's about all I can say. I'll have to turn it over.

Mr. Gasaway – The main reason I'm asking – my son works for a large grocery store here in town and when I take him or pick him up, there's five or six cars at every instant during the day – during the peak hours of the day – either coming or going. So that probably will be a pretty large number.

B.J. Hawkins, 404 SW 171st Street – I'm the traffic engineer. Yes, we did take into account the gas station, the grocery store, and the apartment complex on our traffic study. All the volumes of the traffic at the peak hours of the day are included.

Mr. Gasaway – What were those numbers?

Mr. Hawkins – Just for those specific, or the entire development?

Mr. Gasaway – Entire development, because ...

Mr. Hawkins – Entering in the a.m. is 137; existing in the a.m. is 216. Entering in the p.m. is 370; and exiting in the p.m. is 287.

Mr. Gasaway – So those are half-day periods, then?

Mr. Hawkins – No. Those are the peak hours. The a.m. is going to be anywhere 7:00 to 9:00 and then the p.m. is 4:00 to 6:00. It's just a one-hour period in there.

Mr. Gasaway – Also, you all said in the presentation that you were going to pay for some traffic signalization changes.

Mr. Hawkins – Both intersections – Constitution and Classen – will have to get modified. The north intersection, obviously, there's no drive to the east, so they have to add that drive and a signal for that. I'm not sure about the north location, but I know the south location had a

couple of traffic signal poles that are going to have to get moved. So it's just modifying the intersection to work with the new driveway alignment.

Mr. Gasaway – For the public's benefit that might be watching, could you pull that up and show us where that new signal would go?

Mr. Hawkins – It's going to be at the existing intersections.

Mr. Gasaway – Where would the new signal be?

Mr. Hawkins – A new signal pole at that intersection. Because, obviously, if you're heading westbound at the newly constructed drive to the north, there is no signal pole because there is no drive. They're just adding that signal pole at that intersection on the northwest corner.

12. Ms. Pailles – Are there septic tanks there in some of those units from old?

Mr. Ezzell – I don't believe so. Those were plotted in the early 80s – 80-81 was when they really started coming through. I think you said 83 was the final plat. They're all private sewer lines, but there are no septic tanks. No.

Ms. Connors – I can answer that, Commissioner. There are no septic tanks on the site.

13. Mr. Gasaway – Those are both fairly new intersections and fairly new design, but there's lots of kind of convoluted things that go on there, with the turn-off and the split and the turn-around. What's that main intersection rated right now?

Mr. Riesland – In terms of level of service?

Mr. Gasaway – Yes. Level of service rating.

Mr. Riesland – Off the top of my head, it's probably B or C, I would guess. Are you talking about the northernmost one – 12th and Classen?

Mr. Gasaway – Well, both, really.

Mr. Riesland – Constitution is a little bit worse than 12th and Classen, I believe. 12th and Classen is an A in the morning and a C in the afternoon. Classen and Constitution is a B in the morning and D in the afternoon.

Mr. Gasaway – So I guess my question is, we've got two intersections that at the peak times one is rated a C and one's a D and we're adding several hundred cars to those. What would the rating be then?

Mr. Riesland – Well, with some of the modifications they're going to make as part of the improvements, it stays the same at 12th and Classen, and about the same. Slight increase in the amount of delay per vehicle, but the level of service letter stays the same.

Mr. Gasaway – So we've still got a C and a D.

Mr. Riesland – Yes.

Mr. Gasaway – Okay. And you all are comfortable with that?

Mr. Riesland – Yes.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Gasaway – I will say that I'm going to support this. It's a good project and I think covers some needed amenities, such as the grocery store and that type of housing. It does cover some good areas. But I do still have some concern for the added traffic. I hope, when it comes to City Council, that we'll see that addressed a little more, because when I went through there today, it was about 3:30 in the afternoon – it was backed up from the north and from the south for a full block waiting on the light to change. I think adding from a fourth direction that essentially has no traffic now, when you're adding several hundred vehicles, I think it's going to have a major impact. I don't think a C and a D rating – I think those have happened by natural growth of the city, but then I think when we approve something that adds that traffic count, I think that's something that we need to seriously take a look at. So I hope when you all do go to Council, that you will cover that in a little greater detail.

2. Mr. Lewis – Hal, I have a quick question. About what amount of economic monetary impact is this going to have on the City of Norman? Not only the construction costs, but long-term.

Mr. Ezzell – That would be difficult for me to estimate.

Mr. Lewis – Millions?

Mr. Ezzell – Easily in the millions. The question would be with regard to – on sales tax, for example. You're going to have the property tax revenues that come from probably pushing \$50 million of construction. In round numbers, from a property tax standpoint, you can always look at that in a sort of factor of 10. So if you have a \$50 million project, you're going to expect that that's going to throw off about \$5 million in ad valorem revenues – or is my math -- \$500,000, excuse me, would be the ad valorem impact on an annual basis. That's new impact. That's certainly a much higher taxation factor than you have currently with the mobile home park and the travel trailers. That's a new positive added impact. Other impacts that you will see with regards to the finances are a project of this size is going to – on the PUD element alone – generate impact fees for the City pushing probably in the neighborhood of \$550,000, give or take, and that's not the commercial side of it; that's just the PUD part. A great portion, as you know, of those impact fees go to the funds that we're setting aside for future infrastructure growth. So this is the classic case where the future growth is certainly paying its own way. One of the things that you get with multi-family is you get a much greater density and use of service from a City utility standpoint – you get a lot more bang for your buck in a smaller period of time. That's a benefit. Sales tax revenues from the grocery store – that's really difficult to predict or to classify as a new value, because that's a probable shift. They're probably driving to some other grocery store in Norman and buying their groceries, so that's going to be a convenience factor. So I think it would be erroneous to say that there's a huge long-term sales tax benefit from the grocery store. That's probably just a neutral and a reassignment from somewhere else in Norman. But the property tax benefits are real. The impact fee benefits are real. And, to the extent that those are one or two functional restaurant sites – you know, someone may be voting with their entertainment dollar there from a convenience standpoint that might otherwise have gone to Bricktown or some other area. Again, difficult to predict, but there's probably some bump from that. But the probably clearest and most tangible benefit that you would look at would be those additional ad valorem tax revenues, which will add up – you know, at \$500,000 a year over 10 years, that's not an inconsequential sum.

3. Mr. Lewis – One can never put a price tag on displacing a homeowner, and that was my concern when this actually came to the table. It sounds as though a plan has been put in place that is going to accommodate and help those individuals who have lived in the mobile home park for many years to be able to move to another community and be well-established again. It also seems to me that we have a multi-million dollar investment coming into the City of Norman potentially, if we do approve this item – recommend this item for adoption, that's going to continue on year after year after year to put into, not only the City of Norman revenue funds, but also into the Cleveland County revenue funds, hundreds of thousands of dollars. So I think it is a very well-designed item that's coming before the Planning Commission. Certainly it's going to be a very positive impact for the City of Norman, not only once it's developed, but for many, many years to come. So I definitely will be planning on voting for the adoption of this item.

Jim Gasaway moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-54, Ordinance No. O-1314-23, Ordinance No. O-1314-24, Ordinance No. O-1314-25, and PP-1314-10, the Preliminary Plat for SOONER MOBILE HOME REDEVELOPMENT ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development, (A Replat of Sooner Mobile Home Park Addition), to City Council. Andy Sherrer seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Roberta Pailles, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon, Dave Boeck, Sandy Bahan, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis
NAYS	None
ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-54, Ordinance No. O-1314-23, Ordinance No. O-1314-24, Ordinance No. O-1314-25, and Preliminary Plat No. PP-1314-10 to City Council, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Connors noted the brochure that Commissioners have received for the one-day "Planning and Building Better Communities" workshop to be held at the Carrington Lakes Clubhouse on Monday, December 9, 2013. There is a \$25 fee. She asked if any Commissioners are planning to attend.

Mr. Boeck, Mr. Knotts, Ms. Pailes, Ms. Bahan, and Mr. Gasaway indicated an interest in attending.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.



Norman Planning Commission