

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

MARCH 10, 2011

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 10th day of March 2011. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

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

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Cynthia Gordon
Diana Hartley (arrived at 6:47 p.m.)
Tom Knotts
Chris Lewis
Curtis McCarty
Roberta Pailes
Andy Sherrer
Jim Gasaway
Zev Trachtenberg

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

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

* * *

Item No. 2, being:

CONSENT DOCKET

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

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2011 OPEN HOUSE MINUTES AND THE FEBRUARY 10, 2011 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 4, being:

FP-1011-19 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SIGMA NU CORPORATION OF OKLAHOMA (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR SIGMA NU ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF EMERALD WAY BETWEEN CHAUTAUQUA AVENUE AND COLLEGE AVENUE.

Item No. 5, being:

PP-1011-15 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY MOOSE LODGE CHAPTER 1799 (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR MOOSE LODGE ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF CLASSEN BOULEVARD SOUTH OF IMHOFF ROAD.

Item No. 6, being:

PP-1011-16 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY GREEN HILL BUILDERS, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR TECUMSEH MEADOWS ADDITION SECTION 3, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE WEST END OF TECUMSEH MEADOWS DRIVE (SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD AND APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE WEST OF NORTH PORTER AVENUE).

*

Chairman Gasaway asked if any member of the Planning Commission wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. Mr. Knotts asked that Item No. 4 be removed from the Consent Docket. Chairman Gasaway asked whether anyone in the audience wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, he turned to the Planning Commission for discussion.

Andy Sherrer moved to place approval of Item Nos. 3, 5 and 6 on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote. Zev Trachtenberg seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to place approval of Item Nos. 3 through 6 on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote, passed by a vote of 8-0.

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 7, 2011 OPEN HOUSE MINUTES AND THE FEBRUARY 10, 2011 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

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

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

FP-1011-19 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY SIGMA NU CORPORATION OF OKLAHOMA (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR SIGMA NU ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF EMERALD WAY BETWEEN CHAUTAUQUA AVENUE AND COLLEGE AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Knotts expressed concern about the 51 parking spots on the Alpha Tau Omega lot and the 45 parking spots on the Sigma Nu lot all trying to exit through the driveway onto Chautauqua. Mr. Koscinski pointed out that both lots also have access to Emerald Way. Mr. Knotts thinks the Alpha Tau Omega lot should have a dedicated access. Chairman Gasaway commented that those fraternities are close enough to campus that if they tried to park any closer they would end up further away than when they started. Generally, they won't be driving to class and he remembers very few occasions when they all left at the same time during his fraternity days many years ago.

2. Mr. McCarty asked why the drive from the parking lot to College Avenue is to be closed. Mr. Danner indicated that the traffic engineer did not want the traffic to cut through from Chautauqua to College, but the Fire Department needs the emergency access, so they are planning to install bollards that can be removed.

Andy Sherrer moved to approve the Final Plat for SIGMA NU ADDITION and forward the plat to the City Council for their approval and acceptance of public dedications. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the Final Plat for SIGMA NU ADDITION and forward the plat to the City Council for their approval and acceptance of public dedications, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

PP-1011-15 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY MOOSE LODGE CHAPTER 1799 (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR MOOSE LODGE ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF CLASSEN BOULEVARD SOUTH OF IMHOFF ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Preliminary Site Plan
5. Request for Alley Waiver
6. Pre-Development Meeting Summary
7. Greenbelt Commission Comments
8. Greenbelt Enhancement Statement

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

* * *

Item No. 6, being:

PP-1011-16 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY GREEN HILL BUILDERS, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR TECUMSEH MEADOWS ADDITION SECTION 3, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE WEST END OF TECUMSEH MEADOWS DRIVE (SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD AND APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE WEST OF NORTH PORTER AVENUE).

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

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

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY ROCK CREEK LAND, L.L.C., FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ROCK CREEK ROAD APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE EAST OF 36TH AVENUE N.E.

7a. ORDINANCE NO. O-1011-46

ROCK CREEK LAND, L.L.C., REQUESTS REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ROCK CREEK APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE EAST OF 36TH AVENUE N.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Preliminary Plat
4. Design Statement

7b. PP-1011-13

CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY ROCK CREEK LAND, L.L.C. (CRAFTON TULL) FOR TANGLEWOODS ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF ROCK CREEK ROAD APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE EAST OF 36TH AVENUE N.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Development Plan
6. Pre-Development Summary – January 27, 2011
7. Pre-Development Summary – November 19, 2009
8. Greenbelt Commission Comments
9. Greenbelt Enhancement Statement

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Mr. Koscinski reported that the current zoning of the property is A-2. It is in a part of town where the normal density would be one dwelling unit per 10 acres. Based on the 2025 Plan it is an area that is eligible for a portion of the property to be rezoned for RE lots; about 7 lots could be achieved in that area. The 2025 Plan encourages rural clustering, for the efficiency of design, and as a way of preserving open space. The clustering on the western part would allow another 7 lots. The applicant has designed a 14-lot subdivision that works very well with the topography. The applicant is creating a gated community. There will be single-family homes only. They have retained the pond and made it a feature of the subdivision. The traffic engineer has reviewed the location of the intersection and approved it. Staff supports the request for PUD zoning and the preliminary plat. There was a protest filed by one of the abutting property owners to the east, expressing concerns about trespass issues and he is interested in having a fence installed.

2. Mr. Knotts asked about the sewer service for this area. Mr. Koscinski explained that the lots will be served by individual well and septic systems. There will be site constraints on the smaller lots and they will have to engineer them to fit. They will also have to get county approval for the systems. The plat generally complies with the

cluster concept that the 2025 Plan calls for. All the lots are at least 1 acre in size. The plat also reserves four large open space areas where there will be no further development, other than open space uses such as a gazebo.

3. Mr. McCarty asked for a summary of cluster development in RE zoning. Mr. Koscinski explained that standard RE zoning requires 2-acre lots. With a cluster concept in RE, you can take the back acre of the lots and combine them with surrounding lots to come up with common open space. That concept was used for Cobblestone Creek, south of Highway 9, with 2-acre lots where a golf course encumbers essentially the back half of the lots. In this case, the applicant designed a PUD to deal with all those issues. The developer intends to retain Lot 3, Block 3, and retain individual ownership of the Open Space Lot B behind it.

(Ms. Hartley arrived during this part of the meeting.)

4. Mr. Lewis asked what kind of fence is going to be erected. Mr. Koscinski responded that what the PUD narrative says is what will control, because it will be adopted by ordinance.

5. Mr. Lewis asked whether the trails referenced in the Greenbelt Enhancement Statement are actually planned into the development. Mr. Koscinski indicated that question can be addressed by the applicant's engineer.

6. Mr. Lewis commented that this is proposed to be a gated community. The 2025 Plan says that suburban density will be no more than one unit per two acres, and says the development will generally require individual water wells and sewage treatment facilities, however City water should be provided for any development in this area where high quality water cannot be assured. If we approve this, and there is no high-quality water, then we've obligated the City to running water lines to this area. In addition, it says to be granted this increased density cluster development requires installation of a community water system to current City standards, including the provision of fire protection. Homes in this development are a minimum of 2,800 square feet, so they are in excess of \$280,000. He asked how fire trucks and police will gain access to the gated community. Mr. Koscinski indicated the same circumstance exists in Grandview Estates North on the west side of town. The City requirement is that there be a siren operated system (SOS) for emergency access through the gates. The Fire Department would respond to this area the same as they would to any other rural areas of Norman that do not have water; they will bring a water truck and/or find water sources and do what they can to put out a fire. Mr. Lewis commented that it is a great concern to him that there is a potential fire hazard in this development where the City can't fight a fire because of the lack of water that is present.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Kendall Dillon, Craffton Tull, representing the applicant – We're trying to utilize what your plan encourages with a cluster development, especially focused on the rural type of development. Some of the benefits, and one of the reasons the Plan encourages that, is it gives more flexibility in trying to protect surrounding properties, and it is an efficient way to develop property in the sense that it allows you to reduce the amount of infrastructure, which allows you to reduce maintenance costs, and it

allows you to provide more open space and common areas and more preservation areas to accomplish water quality, livability, etc. We've looked at the overall topography of the site and the characteristics of the site and tried to design according to what we believe is a good plan for this site. Since we are permitted to do the cluster development where we can congregate the houses a little closer, still with large lots of 1 acre minimum, we're offering large common areas. To the north is a large common area that wraps around to a separate lot on the east. It is a large open meadow with some native grasses and a real pretty setting. We're preserving all that as an open space. Through the middle of the site you'll notice that we've got another large open space that is a very heavily wooded area. It also contains a drainage way and a large gully. But putting it in open space and leaving all the riparian zones we feel that is a benefit and mitigation in terms of water quality. We also have a pond that we're going to leave in place, not only as an amenity, but we're going to use that as detention for the site so that there will be no increase in runoff from our site. We're reserving 60% of the site as open space. We've clustered the lots predominantly toward the south end and toward the west side of the site. It puts most of the houses in the area that the 2025 Plan considers to be suburban area. That also puts most of the future houses on the site as far away as possible from any existing residents on adjacent properties. We have most of the lots clustered together in the heavily forested area, and we've done that for aesthetics of the subdivision and to offer secluded home sites and have houses that are nestled back within the trees. There will be a landscaped gated entry off Rock Creek Road. The street will wind through with secluded houses on the west and heavily wooded area on the east side. At the end of the street you will be looking out over the open meadow. We believe this is a creative plan and is in compliance and compatible with the 2025 Plan and that it is custom fit for this particular site and incorporates some of the native features of the site. It allows a low density while allowing use of the property. We have submitted a preliminary drainage study to staff and will provide detailed construction plans with the final plat. We have researched the storm water master plan. We are in the upper Rock Creek basin which doesn't have a lot of problems. The plan recommends leaving a buffer along some drainage ways, which are incorporated in the site. The PUD does state that they will make sure that there is a fence around the east, west, and north sides of the property; it also says they can be permitted to do a barbed wire fence, which is their intent. Given the rural nature of the property and the movement patterns of wildlife, they don't want to construct a stockade fence and feel a barbed wire fence serves the purpose for security.

2. Mr. Trachtenberg commented that one of the speakers at the APA Conference last fall discussed best practices in developing sites. He believes this development is an exemplary usage of the cluster concept and shows sensitivity and intelligence in working with the landscape. He asked, based on the existing drainage flows, whether the pond will have water in it year around. Mr. Dillon responded that it is a retention pond and holds water, and it will be an amenity for the neighborhood with fishing and maybe a park bench so residents can enjoy it. In addition, it will have additional capacity to provide for detention on the site.

3. Mr. Trachtenberg asked about fencing on the south side of the property. If it is a gated community, normally gates are part of fences. Mr. Dillon responded that the reason they did not plan a fence on the south is because the residents that expressed

the most concern were on the north and the east, and also because the site is very heavily wooded on the south. They have allowed the trees to serve as the protection on the south. Mr. Trachtenberg asked whether residents of this development will be restricted from cutting trees on their lots. Mr. Dillon indicated that may be addressed in the covenants. There is nothing expressly written into the PUD that prohibits that. The intent of the development is to preserve the property as much like it is today as can be done. They expect that the people who are going to buy and build in the development will have the same vision for the subdivision.

4. Mr. Lewis said he applauds the developer for the large amount of open space. He asked if there is a plan for the open space: what type of trails they're going to connect into the greenbelt system, etc. Mr. Dillon explained that they do not have a detailed plan for amenities. The trails they envision are a nature path. They envision some sort of gathering area, such as a picnic table with a covered area, some park benches around the pond and some trails, although not necessarily paved, that would serve as a walkway around some of the forested areas and the pond that maintain the natural feel.

5. Mr. Lewis asked whether the water on this site has been tested to ensure a quality water system in the development. Mr. Dillon indicated he is not aware of any specific water testing. There are numerous well sites that they have reviewed the log reports from the Oklahoma Water Resources Board. They know generally the amount and quality of the water that will be available and are comfortable with the data.

6. Mr. Lewis asked about fire and police protection when the gates are closed. Mr. Dillon explained that the gates will be equipped with the standard entry so that the gates will open for emergency vehicles. It is a Rural Estates development and those issues are concerns for everybody in those types of developments. Ms. Messner added that this will be a private road and the police do not regularly patrol private roads in Norman. Since it is not a public street, the police would not go out there until they were summoned.

7. Ms. Pailes asked about the placement of Lot 9. Mr. Dillon responded that they felt it would make a really nice lot based on the characteristics of the site and would accomplish their overall objective.

8. Mr. Trachtenberg asked whether the trails will only be for use by the residents, and not part of the public trail system. Mr. Dillon responded affirmatively.

9. Mr. Knotts asked whether cross-fencing will be allowed. Mr. Dillon said it is not addressed by the PUD. They would like to not necessarily exclude it at this point and address it within the covenants and restrictions.

10. Mr. Lewis asked about the added cost of developing the property with the private drives. Mr. Dillon said it will be covered in the covenants and restrictions. They have the ability to make a payback or pro rata share for the development of the private driveway serving the four lots. The costs of the driveways end up being marketing issues and the driveway is part of the building costs. He believes there is somebody already very interested in building on Lot 9.

11. Mr. McCarty asked whether they have talked to the family that submitted the protest letter. Mr. Dillon indicated that Mr. Marriott contacted them this afternoon about the letter. Mr. McCarty asked if the property is currently fenced. Mr. Dillon said they believe part of it is fenced, but not all of it. Mr. McCarty asked if the existing fence would be removed by the developer. Mr. Dillon responded that if the fence is on the neighbor's property, they would not touch it; if it is on Mr. Marriott's property, they would remove it and replace it.

PARTICIPATION BY THE AUDIENCE:

1. Ron Iglesias, a neighbor at the north end of the property and next to the Crawfords – There is a fence there now and the Crawfords wanted a privacy fence. He asked, if there is going to be a barbed wire fence, whether the developer will take down what is left of existing fences and build a clean, continuous fence. Mr. Dillon responded that their intent is to have a nice, well-constructed fence around the property. If a fence is outside their property, they have no right to do anything with it. They will work with adjacent property owners.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Zev Trachtenberg moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1011-46, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat for TANGLEWOODS ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development, to the City Council. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1011-46, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat for TANGLEWOODS ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-1.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:

CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY BRIDGEVIEW UNITED METHODIST CHURCH FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD APPROXIMATELY 980 FEET EAST OF 48TH AVENUE N.W.

8a. RESOLUTION NO. R-1011-89

BRIDGEVIEW UNITED METHODIST CHURCH REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LUP-1011-8) FROM FUTURE URBAN SERVICE AREA TO CURRENT URBAN SERVICE AREA FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD APPROXIMATELY 980 FEET EAST OF 48TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report

8b. ORDINANCE NO. O-1011-47

BRIDGEVIEW UNITED METHODIST CHURCH REQUESTS REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, WITH SPECIAL USE FOR A CHURCH, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD APPROXIMATELY 980 FEET EAST OF 48TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

8c. PP-1011-14

CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY BRIDGEVIEW UNITED METHODIST CHURCH (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR BRIDGEVIEW UNITED METHODIST CHURCH ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD APPROXIMATELY 980 FEET EAST OF 48TH AVENUE N.W.

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

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Mr. Koscinski reported that this area is currently being rapidly planned based on availability of new sewer and water lines. J&J Addition was the first, followed by Redlands, Whispering Trails and Foxworth Additions. The tract that surrounds the subject property will be before the Commission in the near future, as well as some across the street to the north. This area was anticipated for development and is designated for future residential use. Staff supports the Plan change. The applicant is asking for R-1 zoning which is fully consistent with the Plan, but requires Special Use for a Church. The applicant owns 30 acres. There really is nothing currently developed in the area, except an old radio/TV station immediately to the east of this property. There is a major pipeline that runs through the property and impacts this development. The applicant

has clustered most of the church buildings north of the pipeline, with recreation uses south of it. There were no filed protests on this application. Staff supports the Plan change, the rezoning, and the preliminary plat that accompanies it.

2. Mr. Lewis asked why the applicant wants to rezone when the existing zoning doesn't require a special use. Mr. Koscinski responded that there is a difference in setbacks and sign requirements between the two zones; R-1 allows the buildings to be closer to the road and allows signs to be closer to the road. A-2 has very large setback requirements, and most churches object to those in the long run. The dark blue on the plans indicates the first phase of this development, but if they don't develop the church, R-1 zoning is consistent with the 2025 Plan and the surrounding area. The towers on the adjacent property are pretty far from any property boundary. Any possibility of interference in the church's audio system from the radio/television towers is not an issue staff can address.

3. Mr. Trachtenberg asked whether the radio station is actually in operation. Mr. Koscinski said he believes it is, but is not sure.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Tom McCaleb, SMC Consulting Engineers, representing the applicant – The applicants want to rezone the property for the reasons Mr. Koscinski suggested. The location of the pipeline on the property restricts the use of the lot; it is a Conoco high-pressure pipeline. They have met with Conoco and have their concurrence and have given them a specific easement for the pipeline. The angle of the pipeline is not conducive to rectangular buildings. The rezoning reduces the setback from Indian Hills Road and allows them to move the buildings closer to the road. This has been a cooperative effort between several land owners, including the church, in the planning and development of this area. This will be a phased development, shown with potentially four phases; it will depend on the growth of the church. The architect and church have met and have developed the current site plan.

2. Mr. Trachtenberg asked whether the recreation facilities will be for use by the community or only for the church. Mr. McCaleb indicated the plan is currently to restrict the use to the church.

3. Mr. Lewis asked if the reason for the rezoning is the setback. Mr. McCaleb responded that A-2 requires a larger setback from Indian Hills Road; R-1 requires a 25' setback, whereas A-2 requires a 50' setback.

4. Mr. Lewis asked if there is a timeframe for construction to begin. Mr. McCaleb said that when they first met they were planning to start construction in April. The biggest obstacle is waiting for installation of the sewer line; it is expected to be done by the end of April. The applicant is ready to proceed. Once the Council approves the preliminary plat, they are ready to process their final plat. There are some site issues that have been worked out. They have made several adjustments to their plans to fit the conditions of the site.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Curtis McCarty moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1011-89, Ordinance No. O-1011-47, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat for BRIDGEVIEW UNITED METHODIST CHURCH ADDITION, to the City Council. Chris Lewis seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1011-89, Ordinance No. O-1011-47, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend approval of the Preliminary Plat for BRIDGEVIEW UNITED METHODIST CHURCH ADDITION, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 9-0.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

1. Ms. Pailes noted the inclusion of the Greenbelt Enhancement Statements in the information provided on certain items. She found that some of them contained misinformation. She feels this is very important, because once an area is developed, the opportunity for greenbelt enhancements is lost. Ms. Connors explained that the Greenbelt Enhancement Statements are filled out by the applicant, and staff has no control over how thorough they are. The Greenbelt Commission has been concerned about some of the submittals. Staff has been preparing staff reports on each item for the Greenbelt Commission to try and identify the nearby parks and some other elements. Staff will not be distinguishing between public and private parks. The Greenbelt Commission's comments are also included in the information provided to the Planning Commission, right before the Greenbelt Enhancement Statement; they are a recommendatory body. Mr. Koscinski added that the public park in Highland Village has not yet been developed and is not yet accessible by road; it is separate from the existing private park.

* * *

Item No. 10, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from the Commissioners or staff and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m.


Norman Planning Commission