

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

JUNE 10, 2021

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 10th day of June, 2021.

Notice and agenda of the meeting was posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <https://www.normanok.gov/your-government/public-information/agendas-and-minutes> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Erica Bird called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Erin Williford
Mark Daniels
Steven McDaniel
Erica Bird
Lark Zink
Sandy Bahan
Michael Jablonski

MEMBERS ABSENT

Nouman Jan
Dave Boeck

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Logan Hubble, Planner I
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist
Beth Muckala, Asst. City Attorney
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer
Jack Burdett, Subdivision Development
Coordinator

* * *

CONSENT DOCKET

Item No. 2, being:

TMP-168 -- APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13, 2021 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

*

Item No. 3, being:

COS-2021-15 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY MCGREGOR RANCH, L.L.C. (MACBAX & ASSOCIATES) FOR JOHN DALTON RIDGE FOR APPROXIMATELY 143.487 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 60TH AVENUE S.E. AND E. POST OAK ROAD.

*

Item No. 4, being:

COS-2021-16 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY MCGREGOR RANCH, L.L.C. (MACBAX & ASSOCIATES) FOR IMHOFF ACRES FOR APPROXIMATELY 19.504 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF STATE HIGHWAY No. 9 AND 132ND AVENUE S.E.

*

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

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

Sandy Bahan moved to approve the Consent Docket as presented. Erin Williford seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Erin Williford, Mark Daniels, Steven McDaniel, Erica Bird, Lark Zink, Sandy Bahan, Michael Jablonski
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Nouman Jan, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to adopt the Consent Docket, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 3, being:

COS-2021-15 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY MCGREGOR RANCH, L.L.C. (MACBAX & ASSOCIATES) FOR JOHN DALTON RIDGE FOR APPROXIMATELY 143.487 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF 60TH AVENUE S.E. AND E. POST OAK ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Certificate of Survey
3. Staff Report
4. Greenbelt Commission Comments

This item was adopted as part of the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

*

Item No. 4, being:

COS-2021-16 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY MCGREGOR RANCH, L.L.C. (MACBAX & ASSOCIATES) FOR IMHOFF ACRES FOR APPROXIMATELY 19.504 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF STATE HIGHWAY NO. 9 AND 132ND AVENUE S.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Certificate of Survey
3. Staff Report
4. Variance Request
5. Greenbelt Commission Comments

This item was adopted as part of the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

*

Item No. 5a, being:

O-2021-46 – IDEAL HOMES REQUESTS REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROXIMATELY 79.43 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ¼ MILE EAST OF N. PORTER AVENUE ON THE NORTH SIDE OF TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Preliminary Parkland Exhibit
4. Pine Creek PUD Narrative with Exhibits

and

Item No. 5b, being:

PP-2021-12 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY IH HOLDINGS, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR PINE CREEK ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR APPROXIMATELY 79.43 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ¼ MILE EAST OF N. PORTER AVENUE ON THE NORTH SIDE OF TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Transportation Impacts
4. Preliminary Plat
5. Preliminary Parkland Exhibit
6. Pre-Development Summary
7. Greenbelt Commission Comments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Lora Hoggatt reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. One protest was received, which amounted to 1.9% of the notification area.

2. Mr. Jablonski – Can you tell me what kind of floodplain is in this tract, and when that was last assessed?

Todd McLellan – That floodplain that goes through the center of that development is a tributary to Little River. That was last studied in 2013. They are not encroaching into the floodplain with this development; they're staying on the east side of it. It also happens to be the edge of the Water Quality Protection Zone, that they're going to do engineered solutions to help filter the storm water.

Mr. Jablonski – Is this 100-year floodplain?

Mr. McLellan – Yes.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, representing the applicant – Behind me is Richard McKown, which I think everybody knows, Zach Roach, the Development Vice President for Ideal Homes, and Chris Anderson, with SMC Engineers. We're happy to answer all the questions you have tonight. Let me take you quickly through and highlight a few things. On the left is the existing 2025. This is the community master plan that was adopted in 2004, and said in 2004 what they want these properties to be, and on the left you will see they want this property to be that light yellow zone, which is single family residential, basically; it's called Low Density Residential in 2025. We are not asking for any change at all. So, in effect, we are asking you to zone tonight into what 2025 said as a community they want this to be; we are directly in line with what 2025 asked for. On the right is the zoning, and zoning is basically A-2, which was done when it was annexed into the City, so it has never been changed since it was annexed. You can see all around it is pink, which is PUDs. What we're asking tonight is for the same thing – a PUD. This is the aerial – Lora showed you that; I won't waste your time on that, except for I would just show you Red Canyon Ranch is immediately next door. We probably would have done these projects in unison, if we

could have had the land next door to it at that time, but we didn't. So here it is in context, the homes next to Red Canyon Ranch. Red Canyon Ranch is the same developer, basically. This is the development over here – 96 homes. You can see a main entry drive along Tecumseh Road right here coming into the development, and then it loops around for all 96 homes. This is the preliminary plat. Preliminary plat, as staff told you – Mr. McLellan said the WQP Zone and floodplain is all across this left side, basically untouched except for an engineered solution for WQPZ. We are not moving into the floodplain at all. The lots are pretty large – 70 by 130 is the typical lot size – about 9,100 square foot lots. R-1 allows anything above 6,000 square feet, so this is pretty large compared to R-1. Ideal Homes is doing something that Richard McKown is just at the forefront of and bringing the house forward in front of the garage. This is a little detail that I always think we should highlight is this is a great approach that Richard takes to this project, in that he pushes the garage back and brings the setback for the house forward. So when you're looking down the street, we don't just see a lot of garages, but we see homes. We see the frontage of the homes and the entryways of the homes. It's really a great detail that they have been at the forefront of in our market. So that is part of this project. No negative traffic. 65% maximum coverage, which is the same as R-1, so we've accommodated that as well. This is the detail I wanted to show you. Parks Board met right before this meeting; they had a special meeting because they didn't have a quorum previously, so they had a special meeting today to discuss this project, and they approved a private park solution. One of the Commissioners of the Parks Board actually commented how they appreciated the fact that this developer has accommodated the Greenbelt Commission's request, which was to connect Red Canyon Ranch over to the private park solution of this project. You see the red line there is how they're going to do it; the red line will be a 5' paved trail all the way around this development, and then it will connect to the trail system of Red Canyon Ranch right over here, which will connect to the private parkland in that area as well. So if you are a resident in either of these additions, you'll have a really pretty robust trail system that you can walk all around between these two additions. We're pretty excited about that. The greenspace is basically leaving all of this area on the west side and north side to green space, which is the floodplain area, so that will be left alone. In summary, this is supported really in large fashion, I think. The impacts are shown as basically in line with the developments around the neighborhood for many years. It's been lauded for the pedestrian connection between these two neighborhoods. And it fulfills that Greenbelt Commission request. I would quickly highlight the protest that did come in today. I just want to make sure that you're aware that it is up at the very north end – it's a 1.9% protest, and basically the gentleman put in some photos that showed water back in the floodplain area. He is abutting the floodplain area to the north of this project, pretty far removed off the site away from the houses; that was the protest that came in today. Otherwise, we think it's pretty straightforward and we would be happy to answer any questions that you have, and we thank you very much for your time.

2. Mr. Jablonski – In several recent developments around town, the developments have looked like basically clear-cutting the land to bring in houses, and then maybe putting trees back in after the fact. Can you tell me – I don't see it as part of the plan, which is too bad, because what's proposed in a PUD is what it's held to – is that going to be the style of development, where basically the part that's developed with homes is just razed, or where I grew up, they actually took a lot of care to leave as much on the property as possible, and what you have to remove to develop, that's obvious. But looking at Section 420(1), Item (c), it says "Maximum enhancement and minimal disruption of existing natural features and amenities." I think the greenspace is fantastic, but, on the part where the people will be living, what's that development going to look like?

Mr. Rieger – Thank you for that question. It is true that, basically, you have to clear away a significant number of the trees in the main housing area. You have to largely for topographic reasons of stormwater. The only way we can grade this development to do it properly to where the water drains where we want it to drain is to clear-cut those areas significantly so that we can do that. I would remind the Commissioner, too, though that one of the things that happened

quite a few years ago was recognizing that, is that the builders have to put in a new tree for every home when they do that. So every single home site has to have a new tree, and I think Ideal Homes actually exceeds that. I think oftentimes they put a couple in, and corner lots have to have two as well. So there is a mechanism that we have to replant many of the trees in the new housing. If you look back historically in Norman, this is something that in the development community we talk about a lot – when you look at aerials of the City itself, there were actually very few trees. It usually is through developments like this that we have grown a significant amount of the canopy. Also, when we put back in those trees, we have to do it per the specified list of the City of Norman. They have a specified list that we have to adhere to. So when it's red cedars or other trees that are not wanted, they're basically replaced with trees that are actually desired in our community.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Daniels – I'm a former City employee and I'm very well aware of this property. The lift station is to the north – the largest lift station in Norman and it does have a large holding basin for holding wastewater during storm events. That water is pumped down the boundary between Red Canyon and this development – the force main pumps south. I just wanted to make you aware of that, if you didn't know. It's a new lift station and it's in good shape and it will be able to handle this development. It was designed for this development to be in place.

Steven McDaniel moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-46 and PP-2021-12, the Preliminary Plat for PINE CREEK ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development to City Council. Mark Daniels seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Erin Williford, Mark Daniels, Steven McDaniel, Erica Bird, Lark Zink, Sandy Bahan, Michael Jablonski
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Nouman Jan, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-46 and PP-2021-12 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-0.

Item No. 6a, being:

O-2021-47 – MCKOWN FAMILY, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.92 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF 48TH AVENUE N.W. APPROXIMATELY 1,600 FEET SOUTH OF FRANKLIN ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Red Sky Ranch PUD Narrative with Exhibits

and

Item No. 6b, being:

PP-2021-13 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY MCKOWN FAMILY, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR RED SKY RANCH, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.92 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF 48TH AVENUE N.W. APPROXIMATELY 1,600 FEET SOUTH OF FRANKLIN ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan
6. Pre-Development Summary
7. Greenbelt Commission Comments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Lora Hoggatt reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, representing the applicant – Really very simple on this one. Three home sites off 48th. About the only thing I would highlight to you here is that you can see there are homes on similar roughly 2-acre lots just to the southeast and we are not touching anywhere near the floodplain or anything of that nature. No protests. Nobody came to Pre-Development hearing. No comments from Greenbelt Commission. This one is, I think, about as clean as they come. I'm happy to answer any questions that you have. Thank you very much.

2. Mr. Daniels – Which house is yours, Richard?

Richard McKown, 4409 Cannon Drive – It's just off the photo up in the Carrington Lakes neighborhood. Thanks.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Mark Daniels moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-47 and PP-2021-13, the Preliminary Plat for RED SKY RANCH, A Planned Unit Development 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

Erin Williford, Mark Daniels, Steven McDaniel, Erica Bird, Lark Zink, Sandy Bahan, Michael Jablonski

NAYES

None

MEMBERS ABSENT

Nouman Jan, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-47 and PP-2021-13 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF


1. Ms. Hudson – I know Dave is not here tonight, but at several of the meetings he has brought up the visitability ordinance. I just wanted to let you know that it's actually moving forward to Council. It will be on the 22nd.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.



Norman Planning Commission