

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

AUGUST 11, 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 11th day of August 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

Diana Hartley
Tom Knotts
Curtis McCarty
Roberta Pailes
Andy Sherrer
Jim Gasaway

MEMBERS ABSENT

Cynthia Gordon
Chris Lewis
Zev Trachtenberg

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 JULY 14, 2011 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 4, being:

COS-1112-1 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY MICHAEL AND DEBRA SPEARS (VMI INSPECTION, INC.) FOR SPEARS ACRES FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF EAST INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND 84TH AVENUE N.E.

Item No. 5, being:

FP-1112-2 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY TERRA VERDE DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR GREENLEAF TRAILS ADDITION SECTION 4 GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF 12TH AVENUE N.W. AND APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE SOUTH OF TECUMSEH ROAD.

*

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

Andy Sherrer moved to place approval of Item Nos. 3, 4 and 5 on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to place approval of Item Nos. 3, 4 and 5 on the Consent Docket, passed by a vote of 6-0.

* * *

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF THE JULY 14, 2011 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

This item was approved as submitted on the Consent Docket by a vote of 6-0.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

COS-1112-1 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY MICHAEL AND DEBRA SPEARS (VMI INSPECTION, INC.) FOR SPEARS ACRES FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF EAST INDIAN HILLS ROAD AND 84TH AVENUE N.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Norman Rural Certificate of Survey
3. Staff Report

This item was approved on the Consent Docket by a vote of 6-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

FP-1112-2 – CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED BY TERRA VERDE DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR GREENLEAF TRAILS ADDITION SECTION 4 GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF 12TH AVENUE N.W. AND APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE SOUTH OF TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Final Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Revised Preliminary Plat

This item was approved on the Consent Docket by a vote of 6-0.

* * *

Item No. 6, being:

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

6A. RESOLUTION NO. R-1112-4

THE TECUMSEH PROJECT, L.L.C., REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LUP-1112-01) FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO OFFICE DESIGNATION FOR 5.33 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD AND EAST OF ASTOR DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. NORMAN 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

6B. ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-1

THE TECUMSEH PROJECT, L.L.C., REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE PUD ESTABLISHED BY O-9798-24 TO ALLOW BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL AND MEDICAL OFFICES ON 5.33 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD AND EAST OF ASTOR DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative
4. Preliminary Site Development Plan

6C. PP-1112-1

CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY THE TECUMSEH PROJECT, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR TECUMSEH PROJECT, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF WEST TECUMSEH ROAD AND EAST OF ASTOR DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Traffic Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan
6. Request for Alley Waiver
7. Pre-Development Summary
8. Greenbelt Enhancement Statement
9. Greenbelt Commission Minutes – 3/21/11

*

Mr. Sherrer asked to be recused from discussion on Item Nos. 6a, 6b, and 6c.

Diana Hartley moved to accept Mr. Sherrer's recusal on Item Nos. 6a, 6b, and 6c. Roberta Pailles seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to accept Mr. Sherrer's recusal on Item Nos. 6a, 6b, and 6c, passed by a vote of 6-0.

Mr. Sherrer vacated his seat and left the room.

*

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Mr. Koscinski reported that the first item is a Plan change from Low Density Residential to Office designation. The tract is on the south side of Tecumseh at Astor Drive. The accompanying rezoning is a PUD Amendment, so they are fairly specific in what they would do with this property. They originally asked for a Commercial Office designation, but the application was subsequently amended to a PUD Amendment specifically for professional office use only. The tract is pretty much surrounded by development in the immediate area. The site itself is vacant. It lies directly across the street from St. Mark's Church. The project will line up with the two church driveways to minimize traffic interference. Further east, the immediate corner is still vacant, but across 36th are some new commercial businesses which have sprung up partly in response to the hospital that opened fairly recently. The tract will abut an open space pipeline and park before you reach the residential area to the south. To the west is also single-family residential. Astor Drive is the major entrance off Tecumseh Road into the Cascade Estates neighborhood. There was a significant protest on the application. The protest does not technically affect the Planning Commission recommendation. When it goes above 50% it does require a super-majority of the Council, but not of the Planning Commission. The Plan change requires that two actions occur that precipitate a change. One is that there has been a change in circumstances resulting from development in the area. Obviously the hospital bought this land a few years back, but they've only recently opened the hospital, and since that hospital has been opened you've seen some of the new businesses spring up out there and we've had a lot of interest from doctors and businesses looking to locate near the hospital. I presume that is probably what precipitated this project. The price of land in the area is escalating and I'm sure the developers have chosen to try to take advantage of that. Second, there must be a determination that the proposed change would not result in adverse land use or adverse traffic impacts. The traffic engineer has determined, based on the data that was submitted to us, that Tecumseh Road can handle the additional traffic that comes from the Tecumseh Project. When the review of this project started, staff had suggested that there be an access point onto Astor Drive, and that was removed at the request of many of the residents of the neighborhood. So all the traffic is focused onto Tecumseh Road from this project and the driveways will line up with the driveways from the church. There has been some detailed consideration of how the traffic would flow in and out of the project. One of the driveways is programmed to be right-in/right-out only. From a zoning perspective, they are proposing a PUD, which would limit the use to only professional offices, such as doctors, dentists, lawyers, optometrists. It is not a retail district and does not allow for any retail

use, other than some truly incidental things like an eye doctor can sell glasses. The applicants have proposed additional landscaping to try to improve the appearance of the project, specifically along Astor Drive where they have trees and a continuous shrub barrier. One of the concerns from the neighborhood was appearance, and the PUD mandates that the buildings be single story, other than some incidental storage perhaps, with pitched roofs, masonry exteriors. There will be a lot of residential elements to the buildings. There is one additional open space that will be created. There is a piece of park land that has not yet been dedicated, so the public park will increase in size as a result of this proposal. They are proposing one phase for the final plat, although the lots could be developed together or independently, or combined at some point in the future. Staff supports the request for the Plan change, the rezoning, and the preliminary plat.

2. Mr. McCarty asked for clarification of what fits in the professional office category. Mr. Koscinski explained that it allows virtually any type of office use: accountants, medical, professional. There are a few unusual uses that the O-1 district will allow, one of which is a school, museum, and things like that which are technically allowed but probably would not occur in this area. The closest to a retail use would be an art gallery. Libraries, music conservatories. Very low traffic uses. Not anything that runs late at night or around the clock.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Tom McCaleb, engineer for the applicant – This project has been in motion for a while. We had a Pre-Development meeting on March 24, and have met with the architect and neighbors. At the Pre-Development meeting is when we were informed of the concern of some of the neighbors. It was a very intense meeting. After that, we changed the plan, because that application was CO, and we withdrew that CO completely and went back to the PUD, which we thought would be better for everybody and give the neighbors some guarantees or some security with some of the concerns that they had. We've met several times since then in Mr. McKinney's office, and the client has met individually with several people on numerous occasions. So there have been extensive meetings that have taken place. The PUD was put in place to give some guarantees to the neighbors of what this is going to be like. It is not a contract, but it's close. So we're confined with the document of the PUD. This plan that you see before you is the illustration of the site plan, and this is called the Preliminary Site Development Plan, which is required for the PUD documentation. In the beginning, with the initial CO application, we had an access point onto Astor Drive and we prepared a traffic impact analysis to show how the traffic was going to work. We did the TIA and turned it in to show the reasons why it was done. In that document, we had the connection to Astor Drive. The meeting with the neighbors indicated that they did not want that connection. Our meeting with staff indicated that the access point was a good way to take care of sanitation needs and emergency vehicles. Again, the neighbors did not want that traffic there – did not want that access point, so we re-did it and we came up with Traffic Plan II. In Traffic Plan II we put together the consensus of how it would work if we did not have that access to Astor Drive. With the assistance of the client, and with Rick McKinney, we worked out how to take care of the sanitation needs and to make sure that we could take care of them in a logical fashion that didn't mess up the City's sanitation routings. We were able to eliminate the Astor Drive connection completely. On top of that, we were able to produce a landscaping plan

and create vertical landscaping and a mass landscaping to add additional buffer to the neighbors to the west. We're offering that in the PUD and we will do it. As you can see, there are four lots and only four lots. You also see the driveways on Tecumseh Road. Initially we had the west driveway as a full-access driveway and we had the east driveway as a full-access driveway. Staff was concerned about the proximity of the west driveway to Astor Drive intersection with some future traffic issues and asked us to reconsider that access, so we have. That driveway now is a right-in and right-out. It is not full access. So that was added to the traffic report and the City has endorsed that application and you have the City's approval of the traffic design. So we satisfied what we thought were some serious concerns with the neighbors: no access on Astor Drive, and in and out on the west drive, and a full access on the east drive only. Our only access to this piece of land is on Tecumseh Road. On the west, we have a heavily landscaped area to act as additional buffering. On top of that, there is an irregular tract of 1.9 acres that will be deeded to the City as additional park land. Adding this piece will make the total park land over 5 acres. Staff has asked us to plat this little piece into the final plat of this tract as a lot and block that will be granted to the City as a lot and block. All the landscaping will be incorporated as you see, and you see a heavy buffer on the perimeter around the entire tract. That buffer is in the PUD document to be installed in Phase I completely, no matter what lot is sold or what order they're sold. It will be irrigated. It will be owned and operated and maintained by the property owners association and it will all be done in Phase I. All the ingress/egress for sanitation will be designed to work for circulation as lots sell in any order. There will be four lots, and only four lots – there could be less lots, but no more than four. We will comply, and the PUD so stipulates, with the lighting restrictions of the new lighting ordinance. There will be shut-off lights. It is in the document. As I said, it will be over 5 acres of parkland when it's completed. We are modifying Astor Drive so there will be no connection whatsoever with the development.

This is the third amendment on this Cascade PUD. This was started in November of '97. The applicant at that time was Mr. Clagg and Mr. Newcomer, in '97. That's when we started Cascade. It has evolved in seven different plats. Those plats have taken place over a period of time and they've all been done and they've all been built. Cascade included almost 107 acres – that was the totality of the PUD in the beginning. Of the 107 acres, we're down to 5. This is all that's left. The PUD itself is addressing this tract. All the rest of the PUD has been built and is in place and it's very close to what was projected in '97, as far as open space, how many lots we were going to build. The only thing that's significantly different is the amount of right-of-way that we projected. The right-of-way that was projected in the beginning was about 6 acres and we wound up having about 23. In that right-of-way we had some common areas. So a lot more right-of-way was put in this project over the evolution of the time. If you net out the right-of-way for the tract, the amount of open space is almost 23%. That's a lot. So there's a lot of green on this whole tract of land and this is the last piece. The park land is there and we're going to add 1.9 more acres to that park land. If you've been out there, you'll see the play equipment is already there and being used. This park is used by the neighbors and they are concerned about it. We understand that. So we're not here to try to make life miserable for those folks; we're trying to do something that's just the opposite. You saw the flume a while ago – the drainage is in place. All the property would have to be raised to go back to that drainage flume and discharge back to the east and detention has been accommodated. The detention

plan has been reviewed by the staff; it's in place. It also has been approved by staff. So we've got detention in place. We've got the traffic in place. And it's ready to go.

A significant thing about the PUD application is that we are compliant to the O-1, not the CO; there is no commercial, no retail. It's offices. And in the O-1 district, as you know, you can get special uses to add to it. The PUD is written to say that won't happen. We have eliminated that from ever happening. We are not going to ask for any special uses. It's going to be this use.

The applicants for this project are these folks: Mickey Clagg, Ben Newcomer, Sean Bauman, Scott Bauman, and Dr. Tom Connally. All these gentlemen are respected citizens of Norman and have added to the quality of life in Norman in their presence and in what they've done. That's the applicant. Pretty nice guys. Here's the story. As a matter of record, the applicants did submit a final plat for single family residences on this same tract. Our firm submitted the final plat called Cascade Addition Section 8 on July 6, 2007. The Planning Commission approved it August 9, 2007. The City Council approved the plat September 11, 2007. It went through the whole deal. It was a few lots and has been approved. During the process, there were certain neighbors who called about that application and they were concerned that they didn't want it to interfere with the park and they didn't want it to interfere with their kite-flying options. The client determined that professional offices would better serve all entities, including themselves and the neighbors – to give it a distinctive buffer line right on the park land. So that's what we've done. The first submittal of CO was 5.3 acres. During discussions at the Pre-Development meeting, as I said a while ago, the client was informed by a large neighborhood group that commercial rezoning was not acceptable, and discussion was intense. That no longer is on the table. There is no commercial on this application – none. The client withdrew the CO zoning and prepared the PUD application. It was submitted June 8 of this year and that is the PUD that is before you tonight. What would this PUD do? It will guarantee to the neighbors the following items: 1) all perimeter landscaping will be done at the beginning, no matter which lot will be built on first; 2) no driveway will be installed on Astor Drive; 3) only two driveways will serve the project; 4) the west driveway will be a right-in and right-out; 5) the east driveway will be a full-service drive; 6) all sanitation service and emergency service will access from Tecumseh Road; 7) the southwest corner will be landscaped to offer additional buffering; 8) all landscaped areas will be maintained by an association; 9) there will never be more than four buildings constructed, and only constructed within the area designated on the PUD – there could be fewer buildings, but never more than four; 10) there will not be any commercial or retail – only professional offices compliant under the O-1 Office District restrictions. In conclusion, the client has heard the concerns of the neighbors. He has revised the complete plan. He has solved traffic and drainage issues. He has not been able to satisfy all the wishes of all the neighbors and never will. But please understand, the land will be developed. It will not remain in the agriculture state.

2. Rick McKinney, McKinney Partnership, 3600 West Main – It's a pleasure to talk about the design of the site plan and the buildings themselves. Tom has already introduced this site plan, and I think he's done a fine job of describing the features, and he has mentioned that we will have four buildings. The four buildings would have probably a maximum built-out area of 40,000 feet spread over the four buildings. The actual footprints of the buildings will fit within the building areas, but the actual design of the buildings will be done by each group that buys each building. Some of the

features that I would like to re-emphasize here are the zoning and the office nature of the project, not having any commercial. There has been discussion that we may have a retail strip center, a 7-Eleven, things like that. That is not the case. That will not happen. We are requesting professional, medical and office space. The buildings themselves will be single story. We have kind of a low-slope roof of a 6:12 pitch, which is less than most of the homes that are there now, so the overall height of the buildings will be no higher than 27 feet. That is written into the PUD as far as the maximum height, and I'll display that a little bit later in some of our elevations. The exterior materials of the buildings will be at least 80% masonry – brick, or stone, or cast stone. I also have some elevation concepts of what we are envisioning. And I think one thing that is very important is the landscaping – the developer has agreed to landscape the entire perimeter at the onset and irrigate it and maintain it and put the bond on that from the very beginning before any lots are sold. Then the balance of the landscaping, on the interior, will be developed by each individual lot owner and developer, and then all of the landscaping eventually would be under one common POA – property owners association – that would facilitate and upkeep the maintenance to a level that everyone would like to see. So you'll see a consistent quality of landscaping and plantings throughout the entire development eventually. The landscaping plan, as I mentioned, in general we are indicating one and a half times the amount of landscaping required by the City of Norman. These would be of the variety of trees and sizes that are required in the landscape code – Chinese pistache, red oaks, silver maples – trees that are preferred and requested. You can see around the perimeter these trees are actual counts that exceed the minimum allowed requirements of the landscape ordinance.

This is a concept elevation. It indicates some of the masonry materials, and we are indicating either a split-faced stone or a ground-faced stone, rock, masonry veneer. The roofs will be a 6:12 pitch, maximum 27 feet high. There will be an allowance of up to 20% stucco on the buildings, if that would be desired. We've specified the glass. We've specified the window framing system and color and finish that would be consistent. The entry doors to all the buildings would be consistent. The light fixtures around the entire facility would fully comply with the latest lighting ordinance for the City of Norman and they would be consistent. We would require every developer of each lot to use the same type light fixtures, so there would be continuity there. In addition, one thing that's very important, there will be an architectural review committee, which will review all designs and must be approved before any building permits will be issued, and those will be held in strict accordance with the PUD document, which is all these materials that have been called out, and I'll talk about that a little bit later. Also the roof materials will be consistent. They will be consistent with the neighborhood. It's a weathered wood shingle, which is the predominant material in the neighborhood, and that will be the required roof material for all the buildings that are built. Finally on the roof structures – this again kind of shows the scale of the roofs that would be on these buildings. This is a 27 foot height. The top elevation is just a schematic view of the Tecumseh Road elevation. This is one entry. Over here would be another entry and those, again, line up predominantly with the Catholic church across the street. Over on the left and on the right you see the property lines, and over here is Astor Drive. Down below on Astor Drive we're showing, again, the maximum building height, low-profile brick signs on Tecumseh, and then there would be a continuous solid hedge as well as ground landscaping and trees along Astor at least 3 feet high that would screen cars along Astor. One thing I wanted

to point out is the mechanical units – originally we said we would allow sloped roofs and flat roofs. That was a concern of the neighborhood and we understood that, so we have retracted that. All the buildings will have sloped roofs and the larger building on the west side will have a recessed area within the sloped roof. This building is at Journey Office Park at the corner of Tecumseh and I-35, and it is highly visible from an overpass that goes over I-35. The overpass is 23' high, so we established the eye level of someone that's on the overpass to be about 26-27' high, and we have set the height of the roof on this building to where there are actually mechanical units all along the top of this building, but they're recessed down inside so you cannot tell that there's any recess or mechanical equipment on the roof. Any other mechanical systems that are on the ground would be screened with masonry enclosures. This is the maximum building area plan. This shows the maximum area of which a building can be placed on each of the four lots. That is not the building size; that is the allowable building perimeter of where a building could be placed. The gray area is common area. The green space – Tom mentioned the existing development in the 100 acres around the property is approximately 23%. Our open green space is at 27% on this property right now. These next four slides indicate how – we call it a phased development plan. In order to complete the circulation and allow for each lot to function on its own, possibly before each other lot is purchased, in this case Lot 1, the pink area would be developed by the lot owner and the blue the developers would step up and complete both entry drives off of Tecumseh as well as the balance of the parking around Lot 1 in advance of Lot 2 being purchased. Lot 2 is very similar; the pink area would be built by Lot 2 developer and then the overall developer would provide the blue area to allow proper circulation and safety. Lot 3 – same story. Lot 4 – similar. In all cases, emergency and waste management vehicles can circulate through the property before all the lots are built out and it will function fully.

As far as the narrative, as Tom touched on earlier, the setbacks will all be defined. On the south area of the property, we have the park land and then there is an oil line/gas line easement that runs continuously along the south property line of our development, and then the nearest residential is to the south and it's 100 feet away from the nearest building, across the pipeline easement to the fence line.

Again, if we could emphasize a few features of the PUD development – and it is not O-1 zoning; it is a PUD development with O-1 criteria. So we are complying with that. And it is O-1 office use – no commercial – no strip center – no convenience stores – and we have deleted the allowance for special uses that are allowed in the O-1 zoning, so those would not be factored in, and there's no residential or apartments that would be built as well.

3. Sean Rieger, attorney for the applicant – I will go into just a little bit more detail on a few other points and then we will conclude tonight. I think you've heard a lot about how well and how much this developer has worked with the neighborhood. I want to give you a little more detail about that. What you see is a slide from the Pre-Development hearing back on March 24, and you see a little sign on the lower right there that was posted in the neighborhood that said owners want to rezone that land to commercial – sign the petition. We're seeing that as a recurring theme in this project of opposition is the word commercial. We even saw it recently this past week in an email to the neighborhood that said they're still calling it commercial office. It's very important that everybody understand that commercial is gone from this project – period. It's nowhere in the vernacular of anything that's being proposed. It was taken

out after this Pre-Development hearing. And I want to read just a few of the minutes – you have them – you’ve seen them in your packet. But I want to read a few of the minutes from that Pre-Development hearing on March 24th, and there were really three points that were highlighted that were the major points of the neighbors at that time. One, the neighbors’ comments, they were particularly concerned about the proposed curb cut and driveway on Astor Drive. Well, as you’ve seen now, we took care of that and here is now – you’ll see them side by side as Tom and Rick have shown you – the curb cut on Astor Drive was completely taken away. They also said they were concerned with the driveway on Astor Drive – the adjacent neighborhood would be subject to cut-through traffic. Again, we’ve removed that driveway right there. Not only have we removed that driveway, but changed the driveways on Tecumseh Road so that the main entry point is as far away from Astor Drive as you can get, with only controlled access on the other access point. And then they said the neighbors were concerned whether the parcel could be used as a convenience store in the future if the lots don’t sell as professional offices. Well, as you’ve heard, and I know you all know this, because we’re here every month doing this, but they can’t use this as a convenience store – as a retail operation – as a restaurant – none of that, without coming back through the entire process again. The neighbors would be notified again twice – served legal notice – before any of that could happen, and you would have to approve of it – City Council would have to approve of it. It won’t happen. And the PUD specifically excludes those kinds of operations. So the protections are there. The protections were put into place after the Pre-Development hearing. We’ve had great success with Pre-Development hearings. This is another one where we heard the responses, and I point every one of them out, and the developer has reacted to every single one of them in the plan. Again, I’ll just highlight them – the drive onto Astor eliminated; substantial landscaping; the PUD controls; they aligned the drives. All of this is now in place as a matter of law in the PUD and goes forward with it.

Let’s talk about the O-1 office zoning in detail. What does that mean? Well, this district was really put forth for this reason, and I want to read to you very closely the opening paragraph of this district – this is in the City of Norman Zoning Ordinance. And it says: “This District is intended to provide a place for those types of institutional and office activities that require separate buildings and building groups surrounded by landscaped yards and open area. Land, space and aesthetic requirements of these uses allow them to be located at the perimeter of residential neighborhoods.” At the perimeter of residential neighborhoods. “This district can be an effective buffer between less intensive residential area and the retail, wholesale and industrial areas of the community.” It’s set up for this very purpose. As we talked many times, we need buffers. We need step-down zoning from the corner of 36th and Tecumseh over to Cascade. It’s helpful and efficient to have step-down zoning. Right now we don’t really have step-down zoning. We go straight from commercial to residential; there’s not a step down. Step-downs are helpful and that’s exactly what this was put forward for. What are the uses? We talked about it a few minutes ago. Doug told you. You see them right here. Realize, too, that a lot of these uses are contingent upon the size of the site. This is a small site. This is only a 5 acre site. You’re not going to put a large assembly hall on a 5 acre site. Art gallery – laboratory – libraries – music conservatories. The main gist of O-1 is right there, under 7. That’s what it’s used for time and again. Professional offices: dentists, architects, attorneys. Those types of uses. That’s the only allowed uses you have is right up in this area. Shops and stores are only that are incidental to the uses. Sometimes you’ll see an optometrist selling eye glasses –

something like that. Not a retail store. You see the special use at the bottom. Not only does our PUD specifically exclude them but, as you know, special use doesn't just come as a matter of right with that zoning category. If my client wants to have a special use, one, the PUD excludes it. But even if it didn't, it would still have to come back through this process. It would have to come through the entire process, notify the neighborhood twice again, go through you, go through Pre-Development, go through the Greenbelt Commission, and then through two hearings of City Council before any of that would ever be allowable. So that is excluded. And you see those special uses there.

I want to read just a couple more points from – Rick highlighted the PUD, but I want to detail to you again how extensive this PUD goes. I don't know that I've seen a PUD this extensive in a long time. As you know, a PUD legally becomes the zoning ordinance. What this PUD says is that this category will be the use – O-1 – but it goes a lot further. It says not only will that be the required uses, but you, building owner and property developer, have to comply with all this. I just want to read a few excerpts from that sheet. This becomes the law. This isn't a guideline; this isn't a covenant that can be privately enforced only. This is a law that Code Enforcement and Susan and Shawn O'Leary's department can enforce as a matter of law. Doors. The law. Exterior entry doors shall be a two-light French door style – wide style with a single horizontal rail, dark bronze anodized finish. Have you ever had a zoning code that said that? That becomes the law. That becomes what they have to build to as a matter of law through the zoning district. That's how detailed they have gotten into this PUD. The roof pitch. The color of the shingles. The granular surface. All of it is written into the PUD, and it's written in there for a reason. It's written in there so that these neighbors can rely upon that assurance. They don't have to just rely on Mickey Clagg's word. They can. I'll assure you of that. But they don't have to, because now they have the law. They have the law in writing that says he has to do that. That's substantial protection. With a PUD you get great benefits, but as a developer I can tell you with a PUD you also get tremendous restraint. A PUD gives you great flexibility to write your own zoning ordinance; it also locks you into exactly what you write. It locks you in.

Lets kind of zoom on in to the aerial so you see a general character. You're familiar with this area of Norman, of course. You see the I-35 corridor on the right. That red dot is the district. And as we zoom on in, you really see what Mr. Koscinski talked about as the change of the Norman Regional Hospital – that large facility on the right. It's really in its infancy. Obviously, hospitals are built for use of a long time – decades – fifty years or more. Well, that hospital certainly in not going to just stay in its current condition – its current state. There's another entire phase planned for that hospital. Most of that facility right there is controlled by the Norman Hospital Regional Trust Authority. Who knows how long that will stay in place? But there are significant restrictions on that 90 acres of site right there. So, really, in a lot of ways, that site is not just open on the free market to anyone. There are significant restrictions you've got to comply with if you're going to be there. There's a few other sites, but we need many around a large hospital. More importantly, we need substantial different styles and uses that are available for all the different uses that go around a hospital. You want many choices. If you don't have many choices, you have a monopoly and that gets expensive. This will add to the choices, add to the availability, add to the options around this hospital, which is a figure piece of this entire area. As we zoom on in, I want to illustrate again – you remember we talked about step-down zoning. This entire corner right here is all intense commercial. That's intense commercial. That's not office.

That's intense commercial. This could easily turn into CVS here or Walgreen's over here, Crest, Whole Foods – who knows? Who knows what all that will be? We're going to see intense activity. Step-down zoning says we want to step down away from that and bring it slowly into a buffer area and then into the residential areas. That's what this is. You then see across the street, too, the large parking lot of St. Mark's Church – a wonderful institution in this location, but I would urge you to consider that large parking lot certainly will be much larger than – you see it's almost as big as the entire site here. We're certainly not going to be that large in our pavement. And then you see this – and actually I'm going to go back. What I really want you to start noticing between these slides is a massive buffer area – this park and that pipeline. I'm in front of you a lot and I rarely have that kind of buffer area. How many times do we talk about we're going to have a 20 foot buffer – we're going to have a 50 foot buffer – we're going to have these kinds of dimensions? We have a huge buffer in this location. You see that large buffer there and you see this large park area here that we are widening over here at the tip to give it some more visibility and access. A huge buffer. We simply don't have that very often.

I want to talk about this developer's track record on a project that he did many years ago – the Quorum. Now the Quorum is a different project legally. The Quorum, I believe, is straight zoning. I don't believe it's a PUD. Done many years ago. It's not under the same restraints that we will be tonight. But let's talk about how closely the concept sketch aligns with what was built. Look at that sketch. Now, sometimes people will show you concept sketches and they'll say it doesn't have a tree here – it's missing that. This one probably is missing a tree, maybe one here and there that's died over the last 20 years. I don't know. But I want you to look at that. Look at the buildings. Look at the layout and look at those trees and then look at that. It's all there. There's the trees. There's the building layout. There's the interior garden. It was all built just exactly as it was shown by this developer. Not a PUD. Not the same restrictions that you have under this one, but it matched the concept. Did the outside look like it was supposed to? That's what was shown, that's what was planned, that's what was built. Again, it matched. And, again, they don't have anywhere near the restraints that you do here. We're, by law, confined to the color of the mullions we have to match. Before Susan can issue a building permit, we've got to match that. We've got to match the mullion color, the wood color, the roof color – all of it has to match before we can even get a building permit.

I want to show you a little bit of the area right now. That's St. Mark's across Tecumseh Road – the large parking lot with the trees. What's the choice here tonight? The choice here is really you're going to have the frontage on Tecumseh Road be, perhaps, the current residential lots. I'm going to show you in just a minute how it's really a little bit of an odd layout if you do that. But those lots, as you see in many cases, will back up to Tecumseh Road, and so will their fences. We've had a lot of problems over the years with that alignment on major arterial roads because, unfortunately, as much as we try, the POAs and the users have a hard time keeping that a consistent aesthetic. It's no different here. If you look at the fences around the park, there's a number of them have fallen in disrepair. That's likely to happen on Tecumseh Road if we simply build up along the street. But here we have the option to do something different. We can do an office park that doesn't have those fences along Tecumseh Road. This is what I really hope you'll look at very closely. This is the current layout of the preliminary plat – 14 small lots – 6,000 square foot lots – and you see the size of these lots over here? Much smaller than what you have in adjacency.

But what I really want you to look at in the photo – do you see those red lines? If you build that preliminary plat like that, you're building a fort. See that little red line around that? You're going to have a little fort of wood stockade fence on a little pod of residential stuck out on Tecumseh Road in the middle of this area. It's an isolated piece. It's by itself. If you go the route of the professional office park, you've broken that up. You don't have the fence stockaded all around it, and you've brought in some visibility and some view corridors into the park area. And you certainly have beautified Tecumseh Road more than that would do. As Rick talked about, we talked about this tremendous separation – it actually is 126 feet. I think Rick got us that earlier today from the closest building to the closest house. If you talk about other areas of town and we're talking if we can find 20 or 50 feet of buffer, we're doing pretty darn good. 126 is incredible. And so these developments tend to be very, very good neighbors. I just want to close with some examples around Norman of professional office parks – professional office buildings – garden style – residential style – that are next to some very high-caliber residential additions. This one – 36th Avenue N.W. at Brookford Drive. You probably remember – I think it's Jack Combs Insurance and Talley Dentist office. You see these facilities right there? Those are professional offices right there on 36th Avenue. I don't see 126 buffer around them, but I do see a house right there that's worth a million bucks. A million dollar house right next to that professional office park. I may be wrong – I don't follow the police scanners, but I don't think there has been a tremendous problem in that location. I think it has been a good adjacency. I think it has been a good neighbor, and I'm quite confident the property values in this area have not declined with those professional offices right next to them. And those are two stories and flat roofs. Do you see all that? We don't have that here. We're one story, low slope, 27 foot tall max. I want to show you another example: High Point Building on South McGee and Highway 9. It has been there many years, but actually recently we've seen development just to the east of this across the street. Again, kind of a garden style professional office building that has been there a long time. See that house right there? That's a million dollar house. It has not affected those property values. The Hunt Club was built – sold out pretty quickly. It has been a good neighbor. There's no 126 buffer around that site. This is The Trails Office Park down on Berry Road. You see Berry Road coming off here. This is a building that was just built – good neighborhood – good addition – property values intact. Professional office park adjacent to you and immediately abutting up against it. And this is Northwest 24th at Palmer Circle. You see these buildings. These are actually quite large two-story, flat roof. I think there may even be a three story building in this location. You see these Westport homes that were put right in here – all of them sold out, no problem, good property values. And this is another one off North Porter. This neighborhood again doing quite well. Professional office buildings, medical buildings right up against it. Cambridge – another neighborhood that has always been very proud and doing very well. We are certainly not a storage facility, but you see the office up front here at the outset with a residential character.

And so I hope you will see tonight that this applicant responded substantially to the concerns they heard from the neighborhood at the outset. They changed everything that they heard about in Pre-Development to the tee. They've put substantial restraints upon themselves, right down to the mullion color of the windows and the French doors of the entry doors. And they've gone to a use that has no more commercial – purely office – and that has historically been a very good neighbor next to residential. We urge you to approve this tonight. We look forward to being good

neighbors with this neighborhood. This developer has a track record of that and they're proud of that. We're happy to answer any questions that you have.

4. Mr. Gasaway asked if the offices will be 4-sided architecture, so that one side is not obviously the front and one the back with the dumpsters, etc. Mr. Rieger responded that this is very much 4-sided architecture. Circulation is around the four sides with entry points on multiple sides. There is not just a bare back of the building with HVAC compressors and things like that. The architecture is compatible and consistent around all sides.

5. Mr. Gasaway asked if this will comply with the new lighting ordinance in terms of full cut-off fixtures. Mr. Rieger responded that is specifically written into the PUD and is actually more aggressive than the lighting ordinance. The lighting ordinance allows you to go beyond the property line at .2 footcandles for 10 feet; the PUD says zero – they can't go beyond the property line.

PARTICIPATION BY THE AUDIENCE:

1. Keith Brewster, 3921 Ripple Avenue – First, I want to say that I am speaking for myself. There were a group of us who have had a number of email conversations over the past few months, and this sort of represents all of our opinions, but I must say it's my own because we didn't do quality control at the end. I live at 3921 Ripple Avenue, and I've lived there for 14 years and been a Norman resident for 20 years. My property backs up directly across from the park and this property. I want to start off with this first slide and show – we've heard this word buffer thrown out here and I really think it has been misused and it's been misapplied. We have a commercial use going on along 36th, and if you look at the 2025 Plan every commercial use in this part of town – on the west side, north, even Main Street with the exception of the one property kind of far off on 48th near Cambridge that he mentioned – all of the commercial use is contiguous with 36th Avenue NW. And we see that same thing borne out here. As they show, there's commercial use on both sides of the street. This happens to be owned by an orthopedic company, so it can't be just anything. The property across here is also a bank and orthopedic. So it's more office than, say, on the east side, which is retail. But we do see a boundary here which has been brought up in the Porter Avenue discussions, and in the study that's been done, and they talked a lot about this line between the commercial and the residential. And the current line runs across here and we have basically 12 properties within Cascade Estates that are affected by that. If you go ahead and look at their proposal, we now more than double and close to tripling the number of properties that are directly across from the property in question. This is an office, but this business about office and commercial – I know there's a legal definition about that, but, let's be honest, offices – medical offices you're going to have the same traffic. I believe there were 1,000 vehicles per day in the traffic study – that number was not thrown out tonight, but I believe I saw that in the report. A thousand vehicles per day running in and out of this, and this is just changing – as you go along Tecumseh Road you want, as a resident of this area – Castlerock, our area – you want to be stepping down into a residential area. We come here. There's a 300+ foot boundary of parkland then we go to office. This is an island. It is not a buffer. Now our park, which is a neighborhood park, we would envision this was always sold to be – this is going to be cloistered thing. People will walk there. We will just have like the neighborhood people there. It's a City park but, if you look at Brookhaven, you look at

Castlerock – these parks are used by the neighbors. You know the people in the park. You know who they are. Now we have 1,000 vehicles per day in and out. Who are these people? That's a concern to us. If they're coming there for a doctor's appointment or they're coming to buy something – like eyeglasses, which, by the way, I go to my optometrist – half of my money goes to retail. It goes to buying eyeglasses, contacts, that sort of thing. So this whole distinction, I think, is blown out of proportion and we're just bringing in something different character than what was originally planned.

So let's talk about the original plan. We have never seen this shown tonight and in the documents. This was the original plan that was from 1998. 2001 the preliminary plat was finally approved. So we're talking around 2001. During that time, then, this 107 acres of land was developed, people were sold lots, 300, and now we're just down to the last 12. So this is 5% of a huge project. And all of a sudden they want to change it and everything else has been sold. So that's a sticking point with a lot of people, and I think a lot of others have more clear stories on that. I'll leave that to them. But they went ahead in 2007 and they put this plan together. And you saw this plan presented today. You saw the problems pointed out with the plan. This plan did not just fall in their laps. They didn't just take over someone's bankrupt property or anything. This was their own plan. If there's something wrong with it, why did they create it? It just floors me, because they went against everything that was in the original plan. Larger lots. This plan has 8-9,000 foot lots. Now they're going down to 6,000 foot lots and they come in today and they criticize 6,000 foot lots. Well, just go back. You want to put a fence? Well, we could put a masonry fence all around here and that would be your boundary along Tecumseh and have some open space around this cul-de-sac. Now there's a few odd-shaped lots here, but again, that was their plan. I don't know why they changed it to this. Now this plan lasted exactly 18 months. Now you say that was done four years ago. Eighteen months after this plan, we had a company formed – we had a loan from a bank – we have people now going after commercial use – I'm sorry, office. Well, it was commercial then, now it changed to office. So I just thought it important to tell the whole story.

We didn't talk about it tonight, but in the documents we talked a lot about how the traffic in the area was going to really cut down on the marketability of these lots. So I explained this in my letter. I think you all have the letter. I don't want to spend a lot of time about numbers and details of property values. But there is no evidence that traffic has had any impact on the sales of lots in Cascade. And we see here exactly the intended consequence of the planners of the 2025 Plan – keep the commercial and the offices over here. We run 14,000 vehicles per day over here and it drops down to 7,000. Why? Because people are going to the neighborhoods, people are going to the school, and beyond that there's really nothing. There's another neighborhood going in. This is going to come up; we understand that. But we're not going to see the 1,000 pop that we're going to see with this project. So what does 1,000 mean? Well, in the last six years, from 2004, we've gone from 6,000 to 7,000. So in one shot we're going to jump six years worth of growth if this project goes in. Now east of 36th Avenue this is the rate, and we understand that. That's because of all the factors that they mentioned in their report. You have the hospital, you have the Tecumseh Road East going all the way to 12th Avenue. Those people are just coming to I-35. They're not going to 10-mile flat.

So is this really needed by the citizens of this city? This area has a new hospital, but we also have 233 acres – not just the 96. We have the 96 there and we have 233 total. On the other side of I-35 we have 250 mixed use from the University North and it's

in the best interests of the City to keep these sales going, because it's our community hospital, it's our community TIF over there. Then one last thing – and before I jump to this, I want to make a statement. I think the developers have done a great job in Cascade. The green space is great. I was promised – and I think that's part of why it sold well and got good solid prices. But there were some details when you look at concept versus reality. And they're trying to say this is our concept, and I know they're trying to codify things but it's really hard to codify every single thing about a building. You say the door – well, then there might be something else that didn't come out right. And if you look at what has happened in Cascade it hasn't gone quite as well as those other projects that were shown. The concept was have this with a nice cap on the newel – didn't appear. Where is the other side of the entry? It has now totally been eliminated. And then the bridge never happened. I don't know what happened there. So let's look at this design over here that we just saw earlier, and this is a nice design, but look at the trees and then when you actually look at it from the ground view. So a lot has been done to screen this stuff from the west, but I'm looking at this from the south and this is what I'm going to be looking at. We kept asking for it – there's no pony wall, no row of shrubbery, no berm to screen the visitors to the park and the residents who have to look at this every single day. Thank you very much.

2. Bonner Slayton, 4001 Ripple Avenue – I don't have one of those million dollar homes next to the development. I don't see that happening soon. Years ago my family and I decided to move to Norman. I'm a public school teacher here in Norman and we saved, borrowed, begged – we didn't steal – and we found what we thought was a perfect house in Cascade Estates, and I've been happy since then and I'm very happy that I've reared my children there. One of the things that I like about the neighborhood is that it is a family neighborhood. It's a great place to have family values. I don't see how this project is going to help me. And one of the things I am concerned also is about looking out my back door facing this from the south – facing it toward the north and looking and not seeing the view. I'm very, very concerned about that. I've watched for years developers come in, promise to do something, and then they actually don't follow through. It's great to put trees up. It's great to put shrubbery up. But what's it going to be like for 5 or 10 years down the road? I can honestly say that's one of my concerns is to look at that. But as far as I'm concerned, I'm against this proposal. I don't think it does anything to help our family values. I don't think it does anything to help our families and our neighborhood, so I would ask you to vote no. Thank you.

3. Robert Morey, 4009 Teton Lane – My property is actually directly adjacent to the west of this proposal. I don't have a nice expensive presentation. Sorry. I'm just going to come up here and share my experience and share why we bought this. You guys hear a lot of promises. I know you do. I can see it just from this one meeting. A lot of promises to do things. Well, me and my family – we've been living here since '96. Purchased this property from our initial one as an upgrade, and we bought into the promise – to the dream of owning a larger home near a grade school and a park. I have younger children. I wanted to be able to, one, walk to the school and also be able to get my children to the park safely. One of the major concerns I always had is that, when they did this proposal, the original dream I bought into was residential. This was a residential piece of property. This was a neighborhood that was going to be built up all the way around us with neighbors – not businesses, not office complexes, not

medical. None of that. I bought into it. My property actually you can look out the back window. This will be their parking lot is where they're going to build. I have a lot of concern about the fact of the increased traffic – the cut-through traffic on Astor Drive will absolutely increase. We have a lot of small children in the area, as stated by many of the other people around here. There's a lot of people walking and running. There's a grade school that is less than a – about a block and a half away from the others. All of this increased traffic will put these children and other people at risk. So my concern is that the increased traffic – the auto/pedestrian issues that's going to happen there. The use – I appreciate the decrease in the use of Astor Drive that obviously will cut down the cut-through from the back end of it, but we know it's going to happen. There's an office complex there. We know they're going to cut through that area. Not going to be looking. And you have small children in the area. So I would ask you to oppose this. I'm not going to take a long time. I did write a letter. I know you guys have that. But my request is this, please don't make our neighborhood a better place to work than it is to live. Thank you very much.

4. Yumi Davis, 4113 Teton Lane – I can say I'm not a big fan of public speaking and I think some of my neighbors were feeling the same way, so they asked me to give them the opportunity to stand and just show their support. So if you guys want to do that. Thank you.

We're actually here in support of keeping our neighborhood residential. I wanted to address a few things that were shown earlier. I saw on the Powerpoint presentation that they had a sign that we had presented for our petition signing and it said commercial, but I wanted to clarify that originally this was brought as a rezoning and then they changed it to amendment for the PUD, so that's why it stated commercial. Also, they brought up some minutes from the preliminary meeting and I wanted to address that as well, because those were literally our initial concerns. You know, obviously we came to the preliminary meeting and we didn't have the opportunity to really think about what was going on. Like I said, those were our initial concerns because we didn't know what the plan was until we came to the meeting. And on their side, I feel like they had an opportunity to prepare and really calculate what they were going to say and do in order to move forward. So I just don't want that to be used against us. They brought up the fence, and I can't say that I know what the developer's initial plans were, but around the perimeter of the neighborhood all of those fences are bricks, so I'm not sure why that particular fence in that one 5 acre or 4 acre area wouldn't be brick fence. But I also want to point out that it's the entrance to the neighborhood and the particular section that I live in and so right now it's half of an entrance. I know that was one of the concerns I brought to them and they assured me that that wouldn't affect my square footage or the price of my home, but I feel like it will deter potential buyers because I think people do look at the amenities of the neighborhood and I'm assuming that's why we have neighborhood pools and parks and things to attract people to the neighborhood. I think this was brought up. I also have safety concerns regarding the commercial area by the park. I walk my kids to the park often. We use that drainage ditch; that's how they ride their bikes because otherwise it's a grass area. Again, I brought this up to the developer, but I have, obviously, a 4 year old and a 6 year old there trying to stay quiet. But when you walk in a residential area, obviously, you let your kids go a little bit ahead of you. It's much different if you're walking in a commercial or office parking lot. So I do feel like that will have a negative impact on the park and just the overall dynamics of the

neighborhood. A lot of people said this was the neighborhood that they had dreamed of. I feel the same way. Our kids can walk to the school. We have watermelon socials. We have 4th of July parades and all the things that we want and I just feel like a commercial area will change that. We did have a petition signing. We offered this at the clubhouse. The clubhouse area is where our pool area is. That wasn't open, so people had to make an effort to come sign the petition. I don't remember the exact number so it was between 2 and 300 – I think you guys have those numbers in front of you. Two to three hundred neighbors come sign and make an effort to do that. We were actually even surprised because a lot of the surrounding neighborhoods came and we weren't prepared for them. We had no idea of their interest in what we were doing, but we were surprised that several of the neighborhoods showed up. I also wanted to point out that, like they mentioned, Roosevelt is about a block away and their official walk to school day starts in the Cascade neighborhood. So it starts at our clubhouse, it walks right by this area, and so, again, I don't want it to have a negative impact on what we already have in our neighborhood. Also, regarding the safety concerns, I know that the developers at one time – and this is an approximate, but I think they mentioned 220 parking spots. So, again, I have concerns whether that's a vacant building or a building with 220 parking lots. I just feel like with residential that's more controlled and I think Keith touched on this a little bit, but, you know, you're at a park with small children and you want to know if there's someone that shouldn't be there that's there. And I don't think that commercial area allows us to really manage that or keep track of that. Regarding the economic development, I know you guys look at the overall plan for the City, and I just feel like there's many other commercial areas nearby that everybody has pointed out. Regarding economic development, I don't think it's about just developing buildings – it's about having residents, having quality employees and small business owners, and those are all in our neighborhood as well, and I feel like we've made an investment in Norman, so I hope you guys will consider our investment in Norman as well.

5. Jon Williford, 3607 Gullane Drive – I'm a few blocks to the south of the proposed rezoning area. If I could just real quickly – just to kind of illustrate my point I want to tell a quick story. I work in an office in downtown Oklahoma City. Two of the individuals that work in my office are strictly criminal defense attorneys. Well, one day one of the attorneys was meeting with a client. The client was driven to the meeting by her son. While the client is meeting with this other attorney, our receptionist steps to the back office for some reason – doesn't matter what. She's gone about five minutes. She comes back, doesn't think anything. The client's son is still in the front waiting on his mother. A little bit later, client leaves. A little bit later our secretary goes to try to buy herself lunch. She realizes at that point that her bankcard that had been in her purse on her desk the whole time had been stolen. Thankfully for her, she knew the gas station where these folks tried to use the card that they just stole out of her purse. So she wasn't out anything because they were able to stop her and catch her. The point of that is – why I think that story is particularly relevant to this is that she was away from her desk for maybe five minutes and a client – a client's son – took that five minute time span to commit a crime. And it's that small of a window, and it's the particular potential clientele that could be brought into this neighborhood, that is specifically concerning to me. I have a 7 year old that goes to Roosevelt. One of the things that my wife and I like about it right now is we let him walk from school to Astor Drive where he is either picked up by my wife or picked up by the car pool. Gives him a little sense

of self-confidence; gives him a little sense of responsibility. My concern is we don't know who is going to be the clients at these offices. We don't know what kind – and there's no way that we can know. There's no way. We don't know why they would be there. We don't know what they might be seeking at these offices, so we can't protect and we can't monitor or can't police that. One of the things that is part of my job – I'm an attorney as well – is I do estate planning sometimes. I draft people's wills. They have small children. I ask them who is going to be your guardian if both you and your spouse die, and as soon as I ask the question everybody says we're not both dying at the same time – that's crazy. That never happens. Well, the problem is, that does happen. And the problem for me is, as an attorney, as somebody who has to think about these things, I have to consider the worst case scenario, and I've got to do what I can to plan for it. It's very similar to somebody who buys a gun to protect their home. You hope and you pray and statistically you're almost never ever ever going to have to use that gun because your home is being invaded or your family is being threatened. But if it is, and if that -- heaven forbid – scenario ever comes up, you're thankful that you took the time to plan for that worst case scenario. You took the time to consider what happens if somebody breaks into my house at night. That's what I would ask for this committee. Consider the unknowns and consider the worst case scenarios that we can't predict and we can't police. If it's residential, we know who lives there. If it's residential, we know whether or not they're on any particular registries or not. We know that the residential community has a community feel. I know who my neighbor is because I like knowing who my neighbor is. It benefits me and my family to know who my neighbor is. For example, the other day my neighbor called me and said, hey, your sprinklers are still going. Turns out we had a broken sprinkler so I had to rush home to fix it. That's part of being in the community and that's one of the things that helps protect the people in that community. And that's one of the things that there's no way we could ever know what's going on inside those offices or with the people that come to visit those offices or with the people who may come to park at the office as a pretext, because they might know that there's an elementary school that gets out in a few minutes. So those are my concerns. And are they likely to ever happen – realistically probably not. But if they did happen, I would feel horrible for not having come and voiced these concerns to all of you. So with that, I appreciate everyone's time and I would ask that everyone on the committee vote no for this. Thank you.

6. Thomas Boyer, 3939 W. Tecumseh – I'm Pastor at St. Mark's. I live around the corner – 3701 Castlerock. I wrote, and I'm assuming that my letter was disseminated to the whole commission. And I will just summarize that briefly and add a little bit more. If it would be possible to oppose more strongly than the letter did, I would. The concept – this is a matter of ideas and I'm very uncomfortable and got more uncomfortable when five citizens' names got put up on the screen. This isn't about people; this is about an idea. And as I have worked with the neighbors, I keep insisting on the civility of this and we focus on the idea. St. Mark Church is where it is because we build churches where people live, not where they shop or where they work. We chose that piece of property because we understood this was going to be a residential area and that's where we choose to be. I'm uncomfortable with the idea of continually changing that. At the meeting recently held at the church, someone tried to persuade me by saying, well, Father, things change. And so I'm sitting here thinking, with all these assurances of what kind of offices these are going to be, I can imagine my successor standing here some day objecting to another change. That instead of professional offices they be allowed

to be – well, I don't know what the opposite is – unprofessional offices. If things change, then they change and then there's no certitude about anything. My point is, we oppose this and I'm so puzzled that if all this professional time and energy and money has been put into this development of office space, why it couldn't have been put into the development of residential space just as creatively and consistently with the original PUD. So I simply object to the idea of changing the PUD. We want this to be residential, and I speak for all of my neighbors as well. We do ask that you preserve this property for its residential use. Thank you.

7. Vicki Hopkins, 4112 Teton Oval – I have been a resident of Cascade Estates for three years when we moved here from Texas. One of the main reasons we chose our house was because of how warm and neighborly Cascade Estates felt. My kids loved having a park in walking distance from our home and our realtor told us more houses would back up to the park. When we questioned that – if it would change or not – she assured us it would not because of the PUD. We felt confident that we had a great place to raise our family. Walking distance to the elementary school. Walking distance to the park. And no businesses nearby. On moving day we sat on my back porch and had lunch. My sister, who was visiting, said it was amazing how quiet the neighborhood was. It was as though the sound had been turned off she said. She looked at how many children and families were out and how many cookies were brought to my door as a welcome and declared that we lived in Mayberry. She was right. We have a watermelon social each August. We have an Easter egg hunt and a 4th of July parade. I feel safe to have my kids play around our block and the surrounding blocks freely. When someone drives on my street, I know who they are. We have an incredible neighborhood watch. When we see an unfamiliar car sitting or driving around, we all email one another to watch out for it and to find out what is going on. Now that car will be able to simply sit in the new business park parking lot. We will not be able to monitor the strangers and dangers at all. No matter what the developers say, it does bring a danger to our neighborhood. I feel like the safe feeling that we have is going to change if the make-up of our family-oriented neighborhood changes. When people drive down my street in the future, they may be patrons of the business park. I will no longer feel safe for my kids to roam and play because strangers have now entered our wonderful home. When we go to the park, I will have to have my kids watch for traffic that will inherently cross through our neighborhood to avoid lights on 36th. Now there is stranger danger. I will always feel uneasy that a stranger could be watching us from the parking lot. In addition to the safety issue, we have a noise factor – cars coming and going, starting and stopping; people coming down our streets. We will no longer live in Mayberry where the sound has been turned off. We will live in a neighborhood that backs up to an office park. The developers keep telling us this is not commercial, because there is no retail store. I beg to differ. It's not houses. People are coming and going. There is a parking lot. There are strangers. It's commercial. Like I said before, we are in walking distance to Roosevelt Elementary. Each day we have children walk and ride bikes to school. Many of us bought our homes because we like the idea of walking to school. There are so many children walking and riding their bikes to and from school on a daily basis on Astor, and now we have a business park to contend with. We have cars and strangers and simply an element of unrest for our children. I moved to Norman from Houston three years ago. I recently went back to see family. At times I was overwhelmed by all the businesses near the subdivisions. Several of my family members live near business parks. In fact, our old neighborhood backed up to a

business park, which is why Cascade Estates was so appealing to us. It's not quiet. It's not homey, and it's simply not Norman. Almost home from my trip, I got off Tecumseh from I-35 and was heading toward the turn into my neighborhood and it just felt so peaceful. I loved turning into Cascade Estates, seeing the park, not hearing anything. People were mowing their yards. Kids were playing. That's the feeling I want to keep. That was a Tuesday in the middle of the day. If they get their way, I would have had to turn at the business park, navigated traffic, barely able to see my neighborhood park and, no, it would not have been quiet. I'm a stay-at-home mom whose home and children mean the world to me. I simply do not understand why they cannot build houses in this spot. They said people would not want to back up to Tecumseh. We have houses that do, indeed, back up to Tecumseh. They have built a wonderful neighborhood, so just finish it. I do not agree with the developers when they say they do not want our neighborhood to diminish in any way. A business park will change the make-up of our home. There is so much undeveloped commercial land down Tecumseh near the hospital, there is not a need nor a demand to put such dangers in our neighborhood. Please keep our kids safe. I beg you to not let them make this amendment to our existing PUD. Please keep this land residential. It is a wonderful neighborhood. Please keep it that way. Thank you very much.

8. Tracey Satepauhoodle-Mikkanen, 3409 Glisten Street – I have lived in Norman for 30 years, but I have lived at Glisten Street for 20. I have moved from a very rural area in Oklahoma to Glisten Street when there was no hospital, there was no I-35 connection, there was no way to get to where I lived except if you went off Robinson Street. I do not understand how there is not a mindset to explain to our children – they don't understand Lexicon, they don't understand legalese – but why we can't make this type of project and development something for our children. If I look at those little children right there, that reminds me of how my children grew up on Glisten Street. They are now 26 years old. One is a police officer and the other is getting ready to start Norman North. If I can't explain to you how important it is to keep our children safe in an environment within which we live and keep something that is recreational – someplace that is separate from home, that is what that park does. It brings all of us as neighbors together. It keeps our children playing together. They practice every day. It is someplace that we can keep as a residential area safe. I was robbed last year of \$20,000 out of my driveway of equipment. The more people that you bring in, the more people that you just don't know who is watching. You don't know how safe you can keep your house – your home. When I looked out my back yard at times there was nothing there and now there's a hospital. There's even a water tower that didn't used to be there. I understand that there's things that need to be developed for progression – that need to be there for a good purpose, but our children need someplace in that neighborhood to go and that park is the place that they go to. Thank you.

9. Phillip Johnson, 4000 Teton Lane – I will represent my family. My home is located directly across from the park. When I look out my front door I see the property that's in question. When we bought our house, we understood that it was more than likely the single biggest investment we would ever make and, of course, we wanted to know what was planned for this area that would be out our front door so we questioned and found out that it would be residential, that was the PUD in place, and that's what was going to happen – that Cascade Estates would be completed with more homes. Since that time, the lots have been decreased and they've changed that plan, and now

we're here again trying to change the plan once more. One of the questions that I have is if these lots don't sell, are we going to be back here in five years trying to change it to a commercial designation? Are we on a slippery slope that just keeps continuing to change year after year if the property doesn't sell? Obviously, we're concerned about the safety issues that have been raised – the school being there so close to the neighborhood and the park right there. But there's also a concern about property value. All of us are home owners and we invest so much into that and we don't want to see anything that's going to decrease that value. And as this process continues to evolve and change year after year, it just seems we're on a slope that just keeps slipping away from us. Thank you for your time.

10. Kenyon Hoggard, 3120 Troon Street – I've been there for a couple of years now. My primary concern is the safety of my son. He goes to Roosevelt. He's 7 years old. My second concern is the looks of the area. But I would like to point out one issue that I've thought of while listening. I understand there have been several meetings like this, and I know we're hearing a lot of very strong feelings on the testimony that people are giving. It was stated earlier that, in order for another change to be made, this entire process would have to be gone through again. My concern is that if we're going through this – I believe I heard this was the fourth meeting like this that we've had on this issue. If that's not enough to dissuade change, then I don't see how any future re-addressing of this issue could possibly prevent further change. Thank you.

11. Susan Wood, 4008 Teton Lane – I'm just here to show support and most everything that I wanted to say has been said. All due respect to the developers, we were told that this property would be zoned residential when we made the choice to purchase our property and to build our home and to make that huge investment, and they're asking us to trust them again. And we did trust them. And we'd like to hold them to that. Thank you.

12. Janelle Borden, 4000 Ripple Avenue – My property faces north and I wanted to address that 27 feet – I'm used to the idea of 10 feet per floor, so I would be looking at almost a three story structure that would be in front of my house facing north. Most of the houses on Ripple, with the exception of one on the northeast corner, are one story. There is one two story house on the northeast corner. There are plenty of office buildings in that general area that have vacant signs. I just think that this property needs to be gone back to residential and make it a neighborhood and not a property that has office buildings and keep the park as it is and please keep this residential. Thank you.

13. Cara Black, 3520 Bright Street – We're on the cul-de-sac and our house would back up to the Building 4 that they've proposed. I have several objections, most of which has been voiced by everyone else here. Primarily the park and the children in the area. Not only the Roosevelt School, but there's also, I believe, a daycare or a Mother's Day Out that's at St. Mark's several mornings a week. On a personal level, I do appreciate some of the changes they've made to accommodate us, one being no entrance onto Astor, the other being that these would be one story buildings, because some of us felt that if they were higher than that they might be able to look into our back yards even with our higher fences. Other concerns I have – I don't like the fact that they would – well, I would prefer this stay residential as we all would. I don't like the

fact that they discussed selling this and building this piecemeal. There's no telling how long this construction would go on. I mean, they might get one building finished and then they'd start with another, so we might be talking about a period of several months – we could be talking about a period of several years. The whole noise of the construction, plus the added noise of having the office park there is not appealing. But, basically, it will impede our view from the back of our house. But when we bought our house it was with the understanding that this was a residential PUD, it would stay residential, and as everyone else here has asked there's no guarantee that we wouldn't be here in a few years asking for yet another change to make it retail or to accommodate different commercial buildings. So I would ask that you take all of the residents' wishes into consideration. Those of us living within the 300 feet and even more of us that are neighbors that don't that have come to support us and come to support the idea of keeping this residential. Thank you.

RECESS
8:15 to 8:28 p.m.

14. Sean Rieger – Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate you accommodating our rebuttal. I'll be very brief. I don't like to go item by item after everything has been said. I think it has been valuable input you've received. But I think you've heard it several times said tonight that there's still concerns about traffic and traffic that would go down Astor Drive and impede through the neighborhood. We feel very confident that's been solved and I simply want you to think about one other thing that hasn't been mentioned tonight is "Don't Hump my Norman." Astor Drive is full of speed humps; they're all over Astor Drive as you go south. I really doubt – severely doubt that many people are going to turn left as they leave this office development on the far eastern edge of it, turn left so they can go down Astor Drive over the speed humps and somehow wind out and get over to 36th. I think they're pretty quickly going to go right over to 36th. So I think we've accommodated those requests very, very carefully and appropriately.

One other point I want to make is that it was mentioned that this is a quiet little end of Tecumseh Road right now. You saw some traffic count information. Maybe now, but we all know ACOG and Central Oklahoma Governments and everybody else, the funding of the state is going to widen Western all the way up to Oklahoma City. It is planned to be one of the major arteries north and south, and Tecumseh Road is planned to be the major artery connecting it east/west across Norman. The day will come, as the hospital builds its next phase, and as Western widens, this is going to be an intense road. No question about it. When you put that little island of small housing out there as a fortress unto itself, it won't be appropriate and it will be undesirable, I think, particularly as an entry piece into this very good neighborhood.

I just want to close on one last point. It was surprising I heard the word stranger so often tonight. You hear that a lot in zonings. You've heard that a lot. But it usually is a fear of change. I remember a Council member recently talked about that, I think, in an addition to the north of this. It was that fear of change. We see it all the time. It's reasonable. We understand that. But strangers are everywhere, and I would hope that we can teach our children that not every stranger is a danger – that strangers are to be welcomed in. There is a City park right there. The City park is open and accessible to everybody. A person can sit in that City park, be them a stranger or somebody they know, all day long and nobody can remove them. It's already there. So if that fear is

already there of dangers of strangers and so forth, we're not changing that. The City park is right there. So I thank you again. I urge you to consider all these comments and I urge you to approve this project tonight.

15. Ms. Connors – One issue that arose was the height of these buildings. I just wanted to clarify that currently in the R-1 zone a structure can be two stories in height, which could be up to approximately 35 feet maximum, and that's the pitch of the roof. But that is an allowed height in the R-1 district, which is the district that these homes are in generally. So 27 feet, up to the top of the pitch, is in fact a one-story building.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Ms. Pailles – This is a question for the developers. I guess there is no structural barrier between the parking lot and the park – there is landscape but no structure. That might be reconsidered. You don't want kids skittering out of the park into a parking lot and it sure happens. Along Porter Corridor where residential and commercial are cheek by jowl, I think a barrier is considered mandatory between the two areas. And it would certainly seem appropriate between the south edge of the parking lot and the park to have a structural barrier of 3 feet – 4 feet – something, and perhaps wrought iron above that so that kids don't chase a ball out of the park and just run right into the parking lot. In general, I usually weigh civic input very, very heavily, because if you can't get listened to here, where can you get listened to? So I'm moderately torn. On the side of the proposed development, commercial or offices, in this kind of situation, tend to make for a better streetscape, because with residential you do tend to have stockade fences abutting the street, whereas if you have a landscaped, very attractive, architecturally sensitive commercial development, that actually tends to be more attractive. There are actually health issues about why you don't really want to put a residence right next to a very large busy street, which Tecumseh now is. So, in some ways, I'm not sure that this is the greatest place to live if it was to be residential. And I also appreciate the effort on the part of the developers to accommodate the worries and fears and concerns of the residents. In terms of the urban fears, I don't know what to say. I don't know that making it residential would in fact make it safer. I understand those fears. I'm not sure how to address that.

2. Mr. McCarty – I'd just like to say we are always challenged with these kinds of requests throughout the whole city, and our job is to try and make the best decision for the city and for the people in the area. Tecumseh Road is going to be a busier road. And, like Roberta just said, not too many people want to back up to major arterial roads. Major arterial roads through Norman and are going to be tying into Western, which is already currently underway. I appreciate all the work that the applicant and the homeowners have done on this project. I believe that they have met some consensus in certain areas. I think that's what's important when we look at these projects, to make sure that they can get to the best consensus possible. I can see tonight that we do have some contention between those areas. I do feel the project that they have proposed is very good and very well planned. They are building them to look as much like residences as possible to fit into the community. They have taken traffic considerations into concern from Astor Road to not cut through out to Tecumseh. They have taken into consideration the PUD being very stringent – roof heights are called out, 6:12 roof pitches. They have done a really good job, in my opinion, of trying to make it consistent with the area. With that said, I'm also kind of concerned about

when there's a misunderstanding in our community when there's a vacant piece of land that that's always what it's going to be. Commercial property – C-1 zoning on 36th Avenue could be rezoned at any time. Those people have the rights that own that land to possibly try and rezone it. We don't know what's going to go in there, but C-1 zoning is definitely a lot higher and more intense than what they're asking for. You could have a 7-Eleven on the corner that's open 24:7. You could have a Conoco. You could have a number of those things. They're not asking for that. They're asking for office space that's typically open 8 to 5. Typically these kinds of places have less of a traffic impact than residential communities, believe it or not. So there's a number of things that I think lend itself to this being a good plan for the area. Like was said, the C-1 zoning on 36th Avenue are large parcels. The hospital land can't be bought and opened into office parks; that's not the intent of it. There's an authority over how that land is used. So, I guess, after reviewing and hearing all the comments tonight, I think this project makes sense. I think they've spent a lot of time in reviewing this, trying to work it out with the community and the people in the area. Again, no one leaves happy at the end of the night if you're against this. But I do think that long-term the values of what you're going to have here are going to be beneficial versus possibly 1,200 square foot homes that could be built on 50 foot lots. I guess with everything said, I am going to support this tonight and I think it makes good sense for the area.

3. Mr. Knotts – When I was out there today looking around, I felt that the proposed project was very in tune with the area. It even is reflective of St. Mark's Church across the street. It really doesn't have a negative impact, as far as I can see. The fact that Tecumseh is going to be a higher traffic area just kind of pushes me toward trying to keep residential away from that kind of development. So I think I will support this project.

4. Mr. Gasaway – I've really wrestled with this issue. I bicycle almost every morning and usually two or three times a week go through this neighborhood. Without knowing, until about a week ago, that this was going to be on our agenda, I often look at that park area and the land to the north of it and most of the time my thought is that's a really unusual piece of property, I wonder what in the world anybody can do with it. And, frankly, I never have a solution and, since it's not marked, I never knew exactly how much was park and how much was available for some other kind of use. And, low and behold, I get the agenda and find out it is on our agenda this week. It's a really tough issue. It's a very odd-shaped piece of property in a very odd and somewhat inconvenient location because of where it is and it makes any type of use really difficult. It's not very well-suited to put in a two-sided one-street neighborhood, because it kind of becomes a fenced in area. It's probably not, in all honesty, all the best area because it is a residential area for office space. It's a very difficult situation. As I bicycle around the area, I go down Robinson to get there and up 36th and I see residential houses backed up to four-lane streets. Some of them were four-lane when the houses were built; most were not. And I see what the back of those areas facing the street looks like and it's not attractive; it's not appealing and it's not something that, if I had to turn there to go into my neighborhood, frankly, I'd be embarrassed at some of the fences and what backs up to those streets. That's not saying anything about those particular neighborhoods, but it's what happens on a busy four-lane street because there are no residences to look at those, they typically get a little more run down on the back side than otherwise. It also reminds me of a slightly different case we

had about a year ago for a house on West Main that was formerly a residence and over the years a pest control agency. They had lived in the house, but operated their business out of the agency. And there was an attorney that came in that wanted to buy the house and make it a law firm. I voted against that because it bordered a residential area. I was very firmly against it because I thought that we don't need another business bordering the area, although to some extent already on two sides it was. It turns out to be, at least in my opinion, one of the nicest looking things on that corner. It was very well-done in a residential style. It's green. It's well landscaped and there's probably several votes I should have taken back over the years but it's one that really comes to my mind that I would like to have that back to vote yes on if I could. And, to some extent, that kind of reminds me of this area. Sometimes when I'm kind of undecided I try and think, well, if that were my neighborhood would I want an office building right there as opposed to some of the other options. In my opinion, I probably would, because I think, from what we've seen from the landscaping and things of that nature, that it will be a reasonably attractive entrance. Now, that being said, I don't live there and we have heard from many people tonight that do live there that do have great concerns. I am going to support this tonight. Again, it's very close in my mind, but I think, at least in terms of aesthetics, it will end up being a pleasing entrance to the area. It will be a pleasing sight from the park which will probably remain a much more open and green look than a six-foot wooden stockade fence.

5. Ms. Pailles – This is just to remind you all, I, too, voted against that proposed business on West Main, hoping that it would remain residential. We were overturned by the Council. So all we do is advise. We don't even consent. We advise the Council, but they will make the decision that is binding. And should you not be pleased with the decision here, you should certainly appear before the Council, because it is their opinion that will count. Again, in terms of your fears, I don't know if perhaps some sort of partially mortar, partially wrought iron fence between this area and the park would perhaps alleviate some of that. It strikes me as some fencing would be appropriate just so you don't have kids running into the parking lot. And that might be something that you want to take up with the developers. That's not something that we can do anything about.

6. Mr. Gasaway – At any point, that condition could be added, either here or at City Council. You all do have a wonderful neighborhood and we certainly appreciate your opinion. However the vote comes out tonight, I hope that all of you will go to City Council. I might just add that all of the minutes from tonight go to the City Council members. Most, if not all of them, do watch Planning Commission, so they are very much in tune with you all's feelings and the facts that have been presented here tonight.

Diana Hartley moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1112-4, Ordinance No. O-1112-1, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend adoption of the Preliminary Plat for TECUMSEH PROJECT, A Planned Unit Development, to the City Council. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1112-4, Ordinance No. O-1112-1, the Site Development Plan and accompanying documentation, and recommend adoption of the Preliminary Plat for TECUMSEH PROJECT, A Planned Unit Development, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 5-0.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION

1. Chairman Gasaway received a letter from Mayor Rosenthal asking for the Planning Commission to appoint a member to the Policy Committee which involves the Community Block Grant Program. It meets on the first Wednesday evening of each month from September through March at 7:00 p.m. Linda Price is the staff member.

Diana Hartley nominated Roberta Pailles, with Andy Sherrer as the alternate. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

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

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

Recording Secretary Roné Tromble announced that the motion passed by a vote of 5-0.

2. Chairman Gasaway noted that September 8 there will be a Study Session following the regular meeting to discuss the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Commission. At this point, it will be a short agenda for the regular meeting.

3. Ms. Hartley commented that she did not speak to the motion, but Cain and Cain law office is the reason she is now on the Planning Commission. She thought it was a great project and a great use of space and an example of how things change over time. With the traffic, it wasn't appropriate for a residence to be on Main Street there any more. It was helpful tonight to hear some of the traffic changes that are proposed for Western and how that will affect the community.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Norman Planning Commission