

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

FEBRUARY 13, 2020

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 13th day of February, 2020. 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.

Chair Lark Zink called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Matthew Peacock
Erin Williford
Nouman Jan
Tom Knotts
Lark Zink
Erica Bird
Sandy Bahan
Steven McDaniel

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dave Boeck

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Lora Hoggatt, Planner II
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Beth Muckala, Asst. City Attorney
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist

* * *

CONSENT DOCKET

Item No. 2, being:

TMP-148 -- APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 9, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 3, being:

PP-1920-10 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY ONCUE RE, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR ONCUE #138 ADDITION FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.31 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE S.W. AND LINDSEY STREET.

Chair Zink asked if any member of the Commission wished to pull any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked if any member of the public wanted to pull an item. There being none, she asked for a motion.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Sandy Bahan moved to approve the Consent Docket as presented. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Matthew Peacock, Erin Williford, Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to adopt the Consent Docket, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

O-1920-9 – KEISER AND ATIDAH HOLBIRD REQUEST SPECIAL USE FOR "ONE AND ONLY ONE OF THE SPECIFIC USES PERMITTED IN THE M-1, RESTRICTED INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT" (22:420.3(3)(G)) TO ALLOW A MEDICAL MARIJUANA COMMERCIAL GROWER, AS ALLOWED BY STATE LAW, FOR 2.4 ACRES OF PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED RE, RESIDENTIAL ESTATES DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 13607 ROKA CIRCLE.

Chair Zink stated that the applicant has requested that this item be postponed to the March 12, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Sandy Bahan moved to postpone Ordinance No. O-1920-9 to the March 12, 2020 Planning Commission meeting at the request of the applicants. Erica Bird seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Matthew Peacock, Erin Williford, Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone Ordinance No. O-1920-9 to the March 12, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

O-1920-35 – DAVID BOX, ON BEHALF OF CHICK-FIL-A, INC., REQUESTS CLOSURE AND VACATION OF THE PLATTED 15' WATER LINE EASEMENT ALONG THE EAST PROPERTY LINE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2437 W. MAIN STREET (LOT 1, BLOCK 1, NORMAN CENTER NORTH ADDITION).

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Request to Close/Vacate Public Easement

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Ken Danner reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff recommends approval of the request to close a portion of a fifteen-foot water line easement located within Lot 1, Block 1, Norman Center North Addition subject to water line plans being submitted and approved and the water line modifications being completed in accordance with the approved plans.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Ms. Bird asked how far the fire hydrant will move.
Josh Malwick, engineer for the project – The fire hydrant moved approximately 100 feet. It is now going to be set back around 30 feet from the property line.

Ms. Bird – Do you anticipate that improving the Fire Department's access in any way, if they need to access that fire hydrant.

Mr. Malwick – I don't know that it would improve it from what it was already, but it's going to remove a lot of line that the City was already responsible for that now they won't be. Now that section that is not included will be maintained by Chick-fil-A and it serves their fire suppression system.

Ms. Bird – Do you anticipate it to be pretty comparable – the access for fire trucks?

Mr. Malwick – Yes.

2. Mason Schwartz, representing the applicant – This is for the second part of the canopy. The first part of it was approved back in December by this Commission, and ultimately by City Council. As we were originally going through the application process for this, the east part of the canopy, which is what we're here on tonight, posed a little bit more of a problem because of this water line easement, so we spent some time with the City and staff trying to work out a Consent to Encroach, which is the normal procedure for this type of situation. Just because of the way that the canopy structure would have to be put into the ground and where it would be in terms of the water line easement, the City was less comfortable with the Consent to Encroach and more comfortable saying, well, why don't you guys move the fire hydrant south, assume responsibility of the line north of the fire hydrant and then do what you want to do with it? We said that works with us. So we're obviously doing that at our own cost and we will assume responsibility of the water line and everything north of where the relocated fire hydrant will be. If you will recall, the canopy structure – what we were here on last time and going through a bit of why we think it's necessary and important and how it fits into this – those of you who have driven by this Chick-fil-A location are familiar with the volume of traffic that goes through here and the volume of business – unique, certainly, for this type of business. The entire canopy structure allows Chick-fil-A to deploy its employees out during busy hours and take face-to-face orders and whatnot. This is just kind of the last piece of it that wraps around the east. I think there was concerns from Commissioner Bahan last time on whether it was going to be built in the front or the back. This piece that we're here on today is actually the side, so it's not in the front. I would submit that it's not quite the same concern as what we talked about last time. And then, Commissioner Zink, I think you were talking about the safety last time as well. Again, this is over the window portion of it, so we're not really dealing with the employees being out there at the ordering station doing the face-to-face. So I think that's mitigated as well. Just a little bit of the differences between the two applications. We worked well with staff. Staff has been very

accommodating through this, and we think this is the best way to go forward and make everybody happy and allow Chick-fil-A to complete this project. We agree with the condition that staff has put in their recommendation for approval. We are unaware of any protests. Happy to answer any questions, and would ask for this Commission's approval as well.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Steven McDaniel moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-35 to City Council. Nouman Jan seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Matthew Peacock, Erin Williford, Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-35 to City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 6, being:

O-1920-36 – BETHESDA, INC. REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT WITH SPECIAL USE FOR A CHURCH, TO SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.27 ACRES GENERALLY LOCATED AT 1201 AND 1203 WEST BOYD STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. SPUD Narrative with Exhibits A and B
4. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Lora Hoggatt reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports this request and recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1920-36.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Gunner Joyce, representing the applicant – Just to cover briefly, we have a lot of supporters tonight, so that's kind of the audience that you've been seeing. They are in blue and blue ribbons, but if you're here, would you raise your hand just to show the support. Very exciting time for this organization. So just to cover real quick, this is the location map. This shows the current 2025 designation – the blue you see on my left-hand side – yours, too, probably – is Institutional; no change is requested to that, so still sticking with the Institutional Designation. The current zoning, like Lora just said, is R-1 with a Special Use for a Church, and we are requesting a SPUD. This is the aerial of the property. Just to the west, you've got KinderCare – a little difficult to read – that's kind of a children's daycare. Go a little farther west, you have a couple churches – Westwind Church and then Calvary Chapel. This is the site plan. It shows right here the existing building. There's an existing patio that will be used. This is the existing signage location. And here is the new enclosed playground area. This is an ideal site for Bethesda. It offers a lot of peace and quiet and tranquility. The enclosed playground offers a safe space for interaction and keeping it confined and peaceful. Again, here it is laid over the aerial, as you can see. A little bit about Bethesda: a non-profit United Way agency, beloved in the community. Bethesda works with child victims of sexual abuse. Bethesda is actually one of the only, if not the only, organization like this dedicated in the State of Oklahoma. They are a non-profit, no-charge to their clients. This map you can see is kind of their coverage; this is their treatment program in the dark blue and then their educational programs as well basically go statewide, so a vast expansion of coverage and they bring them all here to Norman. A quick summary of the request. Allowable uses, just like have already been said, O-1. We've taken out potential marijuana uses. Limited future office uses as well, to ensure that this never becomes a big commercial building – big office building. The impervious coverage – there is no change; it's still the 65% that is your regular R-1 ordinance. And then the tree preservation, like we talked about, is the applicant commits to not remove any of the mature trees, to the best of their ability, and if that does have to happen they will replant two for every one they remove of 4" caliper trees – so really focusing here on keeping that tranquil feel – that natural feel with the trees. Staff supported, recommended approval. Some quick quotes, they found that this location is ideal for Bethesda's needs and Bethesda and ourselves agree with that assessment: this is really exactly what they're looking for and a lot of excitement in the room tonight – very excited for this opportunity. So thank you, and I'll take any questions.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Erica Bird moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-36 to City Council. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Matthew Peacock, Erin Williford, Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-36 to City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

O-1920-37 – ALPHA OMICRON FACILITY CORPORATION OF KAPPA ALPHA THETA SORORITY REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-2, TWO-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT WITH SPECIAL USE FOR AN OFF-STREET PARKING LOT, FOR 0.33 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 748 COLLEGE AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports this request and recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1920-37. One letter of support was received within the notification area, which amounted to 2.3% support.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Gunner Joyce, representing the applicant – This is the second half of that energy in the room tonight. Very excited crowd for this opportunity of expansion. This is the Kappa Alpha Theta Sorority, a long-time member of the Norman community. Been here over 100 years, but been in the current house since 1935, so a long-time neighbor to this neighborhood, a long-time community member. This is north Greek Row, just like Janay said. This is now all sororities north of Parsons. This is the subject property right here. It is, just like has been said tonight, the last residential remaining north of Parsons. This is the 2025 and zoning, again. The current 2025 plan is High Density Residential. Once again, no change needed for this request. The zoning is currently R-2, which is a higher density residential. This requests to change the zoning to RM-2, which is kind of a more updated version of R-2, and solely doing this for the Special Use of the Off-Street Parking Lot. This, again, is an aerial, zoomed in this time, subject property and then the surrounding sororities. This is the site plan of the parking lot. As Janay said, the architect has gone out of their way and has done a very good job to get this to the R-1 65% impervious area, so it is compliant with the current R-1 zoning. It also leaves quite a bit of trees and really focused on keeping this corner of College and Parsons landscaped and compliant with the feel of the residential neighborhood. Once again, this is the overlay on top of the aerial. Staff has recommended support, has stated that this will provide an additional off-street parking location where it is certainly needed. Currently, there's a lot of need for parking in this area. There's on-street parking, and so this additional parking can get cars off the street and clean this up. There's also been similar amendments right up here. In the last 30 years, there's been six in this direct location that have gone into fraternity/sorority uses, so this is, again, with the flow of the current surrounding neighborhood. The history, like I said, the house was built in 1932. They've been there for a very long time. They're very excited about this opportunity to expand with a new parking lot. We have a support letter. Just to read you a little bit from it, this neighbor right down here where the star is located has stated they're fully in favor and fully in support of this. They enjoy the sorority as a neighbor and stated that they always maintain impeccable property, that it increases their property value and they have no doubt that this will do the same. The existing house right there now – the sorority looked at trying to convert that into a chapter house and do the best they could, but has found through due diligence and through conversation with neighbors that it's dilapidated. It would be almost impossible to save, and is not feasible to convert it into anything other than the parking lot. So that's how they ended up with this plan. We thank you for your consideration and happy to take any questions.

2. Mr. Peacock – Can you tell me a little bit about what the current parking requirements are for fraternities and sororities?

Mr. Joyce – I'm not sure I know off the top of my head. I know that they currently utilize a portion up here to the north of their property, and then they utilize a little bit over here to the west. So this will be additional. I know that – I believe they're not compliant currently, so this helps bring them into compliance.

Ms. Hudson – I was just going to let you know – the parking requirement you're asking for fraternities and sororities – it's one for each accommodation.

Mr. Peacock – So is this parking going to be designated for people living in the house, or will this be parking for visitors?

Mr. Joyce – It will be utilized for people in the house. I don't think they're placing restrictions on it, but it will be their property and so only their uses.

Mr. Peacock – Were you able to provide any kind of remodel estimates on the existing house that you said was dilapidated?

Mr. Joyce – No, they never got that far to remodeling. They know that there is quite a bit of asbestos in it and so anything was outside of the realm that they wanted to get involved in.

Mr. Peacock – That asbestos would also have to be dealt with in any kind of demo phase, so that's going to factor into the cost for the parking lot as well.

Mr. Joyce – Right.

Mr. Peacock – Would the applicant be willing to have the City Forester come out and inspect the existing trees?

Mr. Joyce – To the extent of the ones that they're keeping? Is that your question?

Mr. Peacock – Moreso the ones that are coming down. I see that you've got a really big one on the north side of the property there that's coming out with intentions to replace it – but, like you said, those are old-growth trees, so I'd like to know if having the City Forester come and actually take a look at them would be a feasibility.

Sean Rieger – Let me interject, Commissioner. Thank you. We would, although you know, as an architect, it is hard to lay out a parking lot – particularly difficult – and particularly difficult in terms of access points. I know the access point is something that I think they wanted on this side because they have the alleyway coming down, and we wanted to keep the access point away from the corner, as well. There's a lot of dictations there as far as the planning that sort of structured this. I don't think we have any problem with the Forester coming out and looking and, of course, giving us their feedback. Not a problem. Mr. Vermillon has been very helpful in that regard. We just had one the other night where we talked about that. But I would just caveat that, in the context that it's a structured layout that can be difficult to adjust.

Mr. Peacock – I understand that completely. Speaking of that actually – so you said the exit onto Parsons was going to be vacated. But I see the common alley here still remains. Is that going to be an exit onto Parsons as well?

Mr. Rieger – The common alley? Yes. Yes.

Mr. Peacock – That's going to remain?

Mr. Rieger – Correct. The alleyway is actually public way, basically, so we are not affecting the alley access at all.

Mr. Peacock – Okay. And then last question I have – I noticed they also have an existing parking lot across the street. I was just curious if you could maybe speak a little bit to the necessity of having a second parking lot in the rear, as opposed to some of the other houses there with just the one.

Mr. Joyce – They currently don't have enough parking as to the requirement of the current ordinance so they obviously are a non-conforming use because they pre-date all the modern ordinances. But they certainly do need more parking.

3. Ms. Williford – Can we go back to the existing property? Besides asbestos, what else did you find? Is it currently vacant? How long has it been vacant? What other problems exist with it?

Mr. Joyce – I know that it is currently vacant. It has been vacant for some time. I don't know the details of it. I know that the applicant has done an inspection and has determined

that they're not willing to undergo the cost. It's quite overgrown with native grass and trees and so it has kind of become an eyesore to some of the neighbors.

Mr. Rieger – I want to add, too, Commissioner. I know that the property owner attempted to sell this house to multiple other parties through other means, and those parties each refused to go under contract or continue under contract after they did inspections of this property. So I think it was a motive of this owner to actually try very hard to sell it to somebody that would keep it as a house, and they were simply unsuccessful. It was then that they turned to the Thetas and asked would you look at purchasing this property. So it was more the owner focused, when they were unable to sell it for anybody that would get in to redo the house.

Ms. Williford – Did she just try and private-party sell it, or did she – because I can't find any listing information about it.

Mr. Rieger – I don't know. We haven't represented her. But I believe she went – I believe she did have a broker, I thought, but you would have seen that.

Ms. Williford – Well, I just did a cursory look just now.

Mr. Rieger – I think previously she did.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Tom Knotts moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-37 to City Council. Nouman Jan seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Erin Williford, Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	Matthew Peacock
MEMBERS ABSENT	Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-37 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-1.

* * *

Item No. 8a, being:

O-1920-38 – FARZANEH DEVELOPMENT, LLLP REQUESTS REZONING FROM RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, AND RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR A SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FOR 10.514 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF EAST LINDSEY STREET APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE EAST OF 24TH AVENUE S.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative with Exhibits
4. Pre-Development Summary

and

Item No. 8b, being:

PP-1920-11 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR TURTLE CROSSING, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (CRAFTON TULL) FOR 28.359 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF EAST LINDSEY STREET APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE EAST OF 24TH AVENUE S.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Master Development Plan
6. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Lora Hoggatt reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports this request and recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1920-38 and the PP-1920-11, the Preliminary Plat for TURTLE CROSSING, A Planned Unit Development.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, representing the applicant – I apologize that I don't have a crowd with me on this one, but I can assure you there's a lot of excitement on this one, too, for the people that have applied. So I'll be quick. This is the item. It is, as shown to you, East Lindsey Street over here – 24th Avenue S.E. right here. The site – the entire plat – and this is a good one to show you. The plat, you saw, is a large piece of land, about 28 acres. It is this sort of angular piece that goes all the way down to this point. The zoning piece is just that subject tract. So we're only changing the zoning in that shaded tract; the preliminary plat covers the entire ownership all the way down, and I'll show you that it really doesn't include anything, just it's being platted. This is the aerial of this site right here. There is a WQPZ zone running right down through here that I'll show you. It is notable that just off – you see this piece of land right up here. It looks empty right now, but you just recently last year approved an 80-home subdivision on that piece called Varena Landing. You may remember it. But it didn't include a zoning change. So, actually, in very short order, you will see development right north of this across that piece of land. Also, I would note that this street right here is duplexes, basically, that are adjacent to it to the west. Again, no change on 2025; 2025 already designates this as Low Density Residential, and that is what we're proposing tonight. But it is very notable that this is a rare one. We're doing a down-zoning. That is not something you usually see. Usually we're here arguing for an up-zoning in intensity; this is a down-zoning. This is already zoned RM-6 across a big part of it on the upper right – you see that. So the red outline is the zoning change request and you see that is brown, RM-6 where you could do a full-blown apartment complex on that if you wanted to as a matter of right right now, and then it is RM-2 in the sort of mustard yellow. So we are down-zoning that piece to a PUD as R-1, Single Family. It's a PUD because we're asking for smaller lots than R-1, which allows

for 6,000 square foot lots; this is taking it down to a little over 4,000 square foot – more of a patio home concept, but single family lots – not a duplex or multi-family concept. This is the site of the 10.5 acres at the top that is being rezoned, and it is basically an entry street off of East Lindsey down to a stub for potential more development, although that will take some work, and then two cul-de-sac streets right off the side here. A total of 43 lots. When you put that over the 10.5 acres that's being rezoned, that is a density of only about 4.1 units per acre, which is really quite low of a density, particularly for a down-zoning from RM-6 and RM-2. So the density is really quite low. Maximum impervious – we're continuing at 65% per lot, same as R-1. Building coverage 50%. Setbacks have changed a little bit from R-1, again, because we're going to a smaller lot concept. So still 5' sideyard setback, but we've skinned down the front and rear setbacks slightly to allow for that smaller lot size. Minimum lot width 40. Five foot sidewalk along East Lindsey Street and then, of course, sidewalks throughout the entire addition. There is a WQPZ on this. You see it basically lined out right here. It is expanded actually out in this location to include the detention basin; that was through the work of the engineering with staff who requested us to go ahead and incorporate it into that WQPZ, but you can see no other improvements of any kind shown in the WQPZ, so that is honored. Site plan – same, really. A typical – this is really just a sketch to show you that a house can fit on it and that's a pretty big house at 2,200 square feet. That is the plat. Now I've shifted on you – north is to the left in this drawing, just so you can see it better, but this is what I told you in that, basically, all of this is really some pretty heavily contoured land with WQPZ running all through it, so none of that is being proposed for improvements right now. We'll see later on if that becomes something. We are stubbing the street out just in case in the future there becomes additional lots, but right now that is not in the realm. That's the context again. You see this is the duplexes right here, Varena Landing is right across the street at the top. This will remain all raw land. Two streets; 43 lots. And as staff told you, these are deep lots because there's a power line running right through that; the home would be in the front and just simply back yard going all the way back. That's the extent of it. Again, a down-zoning. Quite rare that we're doing that, but down-zoning for this property and, as staff noted, the proposed zoning and use is less intense than what it currently allows for as a matter of right. That's it. I'm happy to answer any questions you have, and I thank you very much for your time.

2. Mr. Knotts – Where does this drainage go? Does it move toward Lindsey or away?

Mr. Rieger – South. So away from Lindsey.

Mr. Knotts – And it's picked up at the south?

Mr. Rieger – Yeah. You can see it will go, if you look at this one, Commissioner Knotts, it goes a pretty long way before it ever even leaves this property, and then it goes on down – you see that sort of tree line down into there. Eventually all the way on down to Dave Blue Creek and then eventually on to Lake Thunderbird.

3. Mr. Peacock – Is there any detention planned?

Mr. Rieger – Yes, Commissioner. Detention is right here – right in this edge piece right there. The WQPZ was extended out – if you follow my pointer there – to cover the detention basin, which is right there.

Mr. Peacock – And do you have an approximate square footage on the houses, so far, what's being proposed?

Mr. Rieger – We don't at this point. That will come probably later when we get through the cost of the construction and the development.

Mr. Peacock – Thank you.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Nouman Jan moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-38 and PP-1920-11, the Preliminary Plat for TURTLE CROSSING, A Planned Unit Development, to City Council. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Matthew Peacock, Erin Williford, Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-38 and PP-1920-11 to City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

O-1920-39 – AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 13-108, IN ARTICLE 1 OF CHAPTER 13 (LICENSES AND OCCUPATIONS); AMENDING ARTICLE XXXIV, SECTION 13-3401, IN CHAPTER 13 (LICENSES AND OCCUPATIONS); 422.7 (RO, RESIDENCE OFFICE DISTRICT), 422.9 (O-1, OFFICE INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT), 423.2 (C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT), 424.1 (C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT), 424.2 (TC, TOURIST COMMERCIAL DISTRICT), 424.3 (CR, RURAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT), 425.1 (C-3, INTENSIVE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT), 426.1 (I-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT), 428.1 (M-1, RESTRICTED INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT), 429 (MUD, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT), ALL IN ARTICLE XI OF CHAPTER 22 (ZONING ORDINANCE); AND AMENDING SECTION 450 (DEFINITIONS), IN ARTICLE XIV OF CHAPTER 22 (ZONING ORDINANCE); ALL IN ORDER TO UPDATE CITY CODE LICENSING PROVISIONS AND THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO ALLOW FOR THREE TIERS OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA PROCESSORS AS ALLOWED BY STATE LAW, AND TO ADD DEFINITIONS AND OTHER RELATED PROVISIONS; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Annotated Ordinance

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Beth Muckala reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports this request and recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1920-39.

2. Mr. Peacock – I saw on the Tier II that you allowed baking. Did I read that properly? The addition of extract to a product and allowing them to bake it on-site.

Ms. Muckala – Yes. Concentrate or an extract. Concentrate includes a lot of different types. But, yes, baking would be included.

Mr. Peacock – Really my question is what kind of hurdles does this create with the Health Department in regards to food handling and that sort of thing?

Ms. Muckala – Well, they're still going to have to have their normal licenses. They're going to have to get a State Processor license in order to do this, and they're going to have their Tier II license here, and I do believe there are State Health Department licenses required for food handling. So those would still apply.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Erica Bird moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-39 to City Council. Erin Williford seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Matthew Peacock, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	Nouman Jan
MEMBERS ABSENT	Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1920-39 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-1.

Item No. 10, being:

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF
None

* * *

Item No. 11, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.


Norman Planning Commission