

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

MAY 14, 2015

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 14th day of May 2015. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Sandy Bahan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Sherrer
Erin Williford
Tom Knotts
Sandy Bahan
Jim Gasaway
Dave Boeck
Cindy Gordon

MEMBERS ABSENT

Roberta Pailles
Chris Lewis

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer

* * *

CONSENT DOCKET

Chair Bahan announced that the Consent Docket consisted of the following items:

Item No. 2, being:

APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 9, 2015 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

Item No. 3, being:

PP-1415-18 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY SHERRY & GERALD GUDGEL (SURVEY SOLUTIONS, INC.) FOR NORTH POINT ADDITION GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF NORTH INTERSTATE DRIVE APPROXIMATELY ONE-HALF MILE NORTH OF INDIAN HILLS ROAD.

Item No. 4, being:

PP-1415-21 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY ARIA DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR BROOKHAVEN OFFICE PARK GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF ROCK CREEK ROAD APPROXIMATELY 500' WEST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

*

Chair Bahan asked if any member of the Commission wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked for discussion by the Planning Commission.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Jim Gasaway moved to place Item Nos. 2, 3 and 4 on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to place approval of Item Nos. 2, 3 and 4 on the Consent Docket and approve by one unanimous vote, passed by a vote of 7-0.

Item No. 2, being:

APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 9, 2015 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

This item was approved as submitted on the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

Item No. 3, being:

PP-1415-18 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY SHERRY & GERALD GUDGEL (SURVEY SOLUTIONS, INC.) FOR NORTH POINT ADDITION GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF NORTH INTERSTATE DRIVE, DIRECTLY NORTH OF NORTH NORMAN BUSINESS PARK ADDITION.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Site Plan
6. Pre-Development Summary
7. Greenbelt Commission Comments
8. Excerpt of April 9, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes

This item was recommended for approval at a subsequent meeting of the City Council by a vote of 7-0 on the Consent Docket.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

PP-1415-21 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY ARIA DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR BROOKHAVEN OFFICE PARK GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF ROCK CREEK ROAD APPROXIMATELY 500' WEST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

This item was recommended for approval at a subsequent meeting of the City Council by a vote of 7-0 on the Consent Docket.

* * *

Item No. 5a, being:

R-1415-84 – SHAZ INVESTMENT GROUP, L.L.C. AND RIEGER, L.L.C. REQUEST AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO MIXED USE DESIGNATION FOR APPROXIMATELY 760 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF POST OAK ROAD ON BOTH THE EAST AND WEST SIDES OF 36TH AVENUE S.E. (SE ¼ OF SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 8 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST; E ½ OF SECTION 15; AND W ¾ OF THE S ½ OF SECTION 14).

Item No. 5b, being:

O-1415-33 – SHAZ INVESTMENT GROUP, L.L.C. AND RIEGER, L.L.C. REQUEST REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROXIMATELY 760 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF POST OAK ROAD ON BOTH THE EAST AND WEST SIDES OF 36TH AVENUE S.E.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Dave Boeck moved to postpone this item to the June 11, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. Erin Williford seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Andy Sherrer, Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan, Jim Gasaway, Dave Boeck, Cindy Gordon
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailes, Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone R-1415-84 and O-1415-33 to the June 11, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 6a, being:

R-1415-101 – CARROLL FAMILY, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM OFFICE DESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF TECUMSEH ROAD ON THE EAST SIDE OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

Item No. 6b, being:

O-1415-39 – CARROLL FAMILY, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT TO THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, APPROVED IN O-9900-2, AS AMENDED BY O-0506-58, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND EAST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

Item No. 6c, being:

PP-1415-22 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY CARROLL FAMILY, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR CARROLL ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED NORTH OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND EAST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Postponement Memo
3. Postponement Request

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Jim Gasaway moved to postpone Resolution No. R-1415-101, Ordinance No. O-1415-39, and PP-1415-22 to the June 11, 2015 meeting of the Planning Commission. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to postpone passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

RPT-1415-50 – PRESENTATION OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

1. Ms. Connors briefly reviewed the Annual Report of the NORMAN 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan for calendar year 2014.
2. Mr. Boeck – You mentioned, and I remember when we voted on, the ability in A-2 zoning to put special trailer houses for care. One of the things that comes up in looking at aging in place is having the ability to be flexible and maybe put care units in R-1. You know, if you've got someone – a senior living in a house or a family that's living that wants to move the mom in – have the ability to put a separate but modular housing unit. Has there been any discussion about that?
3. Ms. Connors – In order to do what you want to do, we need to make some major changes to the zoning code. I think one of the challenges in Norman is that you allow that for a mother-in-law's quarters, but we have students and you can't distinguish who would live in those units. So I think there will have to be a lot of discussion before we figure out how to move forward.
4. Mr. Boeck – And the reason I bring it up is, obviously, that's my focus and interest in my profession. But we had some people that stayed with us for a wedding a number of years ago. They had retired – both faculty from the University of Wisconsin. They ended up in the Rio Grande Valley down in Texas and the reason they ended up in the little community that they had was because that community allowed those kind of units to be put into single-family residences so that a care giver could stay with a senior family or a young family could have – and that's just something we need to address. Because with 12,000 people a month joining the ranks of the over-55 crowd – and that's most of us as baby boomers.
5. Ms. Connors – I understand. We just have to find language, if possible, that would restrict that to that kind of situation, as opposed to allowing those second quarters and then allowing students or anyone else to move there. That's a challenge.
6. Mr. Sherrer – You talked about Center City. I look at the 2020 Plan was adopted in 1997. The 2025 in 2004 and here we sit in 2015, ten years away from 2025. What's the timeline? I know the Transportation Plan needed to take precedence. Where does that fit within the next ...
7. Ms. Connors – I'm sorry. I used a different terminology. The Comp Plan is in the budget. That's the same thing as the Norman 2025.
8. Mr. Sherrer – Right. So it's in the budget.
9. Ms. Connors – For 2016, this coming fiscal year.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

1. Mr. Knotts – I have a point I'd like to throw out. I received three months of Planning Commission minutes and we're seeing more and more of these items being postponed and postponed. I guess there's a question here – I think they are resultant from the dual application – dual track situation and I'm wondering if these postponement and reinstatements cause additional time for the Planning Department and those studying them, and should there be some compensation from those people that dual track this stuff?
2. Ms. Connors – By dual track, are you talking about the fact that we now allow Pre-Development and Planning Commission to be submitted at the same time? I don't really think – and certainly these two tonight, that isn't the problem. We've had several meetings on the Shaz Investment Group development – lots of pre-development meetings just with staff. Even still, when it got to us, we felt that we couldn't support it the way it was submitted and so we had suggested them skipping a couple months, but we don't have any way to postpone it out several months, and this is the way the applicant has handled it, month by month. I do believe it will be at your June agenda. So I know that can get problematic, but we really let the applicant ask for the postponement. I think that's preferable to the staff asking for postponements.
3. Mr. Knotts – It just seems to me that – this only points to it – whether it's caused by it, but we've had multiple others in the last four or five months, and having all three of those minutes – seeing that it was here, it was here, it was here, and continues to be postponed – seemed to me like there might be some additional ...
4. Mr. Sherrer – Have any of those postponements been caused by that, in your opinion, Susan?
5. Ms. Connors – Well, no, I don't believe it has. We've always had a short period of time between application, even when they were separated, from the time it was submitted for Planning Commission to this meeting is 30 days. There are just some times we can't work everything out. The details aren't submitted until the application is submitted, so sometimes we think it's going in one direction, we get the application, and then there are issues to resolve. And that really seems to be more just trying to get through those issues and going back and forth. Very infrequently does an applicant want to have us recommend denial. I would say never.
6. Mr. Knotts – I had one other point, since everybody has really missed me. 180% of the multi-family – and if anyone has been following the water problem in Norman – of course, recent rains kind of mollify that. But Midwest City is really putting the brakes on our water plan. It seems to me that we need to engage at least with the development community to be cognizant that if we run out of water – we don't have a plan, I don't think. When I read it, it had so many contingencies, and here right at the beginning of that, the contingency is blown.
7. Ms. Connors – And hopefully, given that we'll update the Comprehensive Plan next year, we'll be able to look at all those things and get a better handle. As everyone knows, we should have updated it several years ago, no doubt, and things kept happening so that it moved into the future. But I think it will be a good thing for the community to go back and revisit that.
8. Mr. Boeck – Obviously, there's the pressure to grow. But there's also the pressure of can we provide water for everybody that we grow into in the next five, ten, fifteen, twenty years. And other cities have a lot more of a problem than we do. But still, it's an issue.

9. Mr. Sherrer – Well, there was a water supply committee that did give the recommendation, and you both are familiar with that. I think you have to let that be a part of the comprehensive plan to actually know exactly where we stand before we jump to a conclusion just based on one city's reaction.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

ADJOURNMENT

Tom Knotts moved to adjourn. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion. There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.



Norman Planning Commission