

FLOOD PLAIN PERMIT COMMITTEE MEETING
201 West Gray, Building A, Conference Room D

*Monday, October 19, 2015
3:30 p.m.*

Minutes

PRESENT: Shawn O'Leary, Director of Public Works
Susan Connors, Director of Planning/Community Development
Scott Sturtz, City Engineer
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development Manager
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Sherri Stansel, Citizen Member
Neil Suneson, Citizen Member

OTHERS PRESENT: Joe Willingham, Storm Water Engineer
Rachel Warila, Staff
J.W. Dansby, Engineer from Dansby Engineering
Steve Day, Applicant

The meeting was called to order by O'Leary at 3:30 p.m.

Item No. 1, Approval of Minutes:

O'Leary called for a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting of August 17th, 2015. A motion was made to approve minutes by Scott Sturtz, and it was seconded by Sherri Stansel. Approved 6-0 with Neil Suneson abstaining. It was noted that seven members of the committee were present and a quorum was established.

O'Leary then announced the re-submittal of Floodplain Application No. 559 that was originally heard on July 20th and postponed and now the floodplain permit committee has the additional information requested from the applicant. He then introduced Joe Willingham,

Storm Water Engineer for the City of Norman who would be filling in for Todd McLellan, Development Engineer for the City of Norman.

Item No. 1, Flood Plain Permit Application No. 559:

Willingham introduced applicant Steve Day, and the applicant's engineer J.W. Dansby to the committee representing Dansby Engineering, PLC then delivered the Staff Report stating that this floodplain permit application submitted by applicants Steve and Judy Day was for the construction of a proposed 2-story addition to a single story house located at 1429 Quail Hollow Court.

The existing house is approximately 1900 square ft. with slab on grade construction built on approximately 0.3 acres in 1979 in the Crossroads West Section 3 Addition. The property is located on the south side of Brookhaven Creek. The rear portion of the property is located in the floodplain but the existing house is not.

The new addition will be 2 stories with a footprint of approximately 20 ft. by 15 ft. for a total of 300 square ft. and will have conventional footings and a slab on grade. The elevation of the new floor slab will be at the same elevation as the floor of the existing home which is approximately 1156.0 ft. Part of the proposed addition will be in the Brookhaven Creek floodplain.

A new air conditioner compressor unit will also be installed but the exact location has not been determined at this time. If the unit is installed within the floodplain it will be elevated a

minimum of 2 feet above the BFE on a stand. A free standing deck may also be constructed in the future and will be elevated to allow water to flow below it. The deck is not included in this application; if the applicant decides to move forward with the deck a new floodplain permit application will be required.

According to the floodplain ordinance, if the total cost of the addition exceeds 50% or more of the market value of the original structure, then the entire structure must be upgraded to meet current floodplain standards.

This application originally came before the committee on July 20, 2015 and at that time the committee voted 7-0 to postpone the application until additional information was provided to the committee including slope protection measures and cost, profile and cross section of the creek channel, and BFE no rise calculations. Since that time, staff has received the additional information from the applicant's engineer.

According to the appraisal performed by Tracie Reel Real Estate in May of 2015, the cost of the addition is approximately \$68,800 and the market value of the existing house is approximately \$140,000, and since the value of the addition is 49.1% of the value of the existing structure, this project does not meet the 50% substantial improvement threshold of the ordinance. The new addition will not have to meet the current floodplain ordinance requirements, which would require the new addition to be elevated 2 feet above the BFE. At the proposed addition location the BFE is 1155.7 feet, which is approximately 0.3 feet below to 0.7 feet above the ground elevation in the area based on GIS contours, and that there is a possibility that a Letter of Map Amendment could be obtained for the house to remove it from

the floodplain and then flood insurance could be purchased by the applicant at a lower premium.

Willingham then stated the applicable ordinance sections included fill restrictions in the floodplain, compensatory storage requirements, substantial improvement, and no rise considerations and he outlined how the applicant met each ordinance section.

O'Leary then asked Willingham for a clarification of how the applicant is fulfilling the applicable ordinance sections. Willingham explained that for the substantial improvement it does not exceed 50% of the market value of the home but that it is very close to this amount and also based on the information received this project does not meet the substantial improvement threshold for sections B1A and B5 of the floodplain ordinance. He also noted that in Section 4 it states that fill material will come from within the floodplain at the rear of the property so compensatory storage is provided there; so the project will meet that requirement. For the no rise consideration it states that the project will not cause a rise in the base flood elevation (BFE) and so it meets this ordinance requirement.

O'Leary then stated that in the Staff Report under the Background section that the elevation of the new floor slab is the same elevation of the floor of the existing home which is approximately 1156.0 and on one of the slides it shows 1155.7, so he wanted to clarify if this was correct. The floor slab is one foot above the BFE.

O'Leary then asked if there were any other questions, comments or a motion. Suneson then made a motion for approval. Connors then seconded the motion. O'Leary then asked if there was any further discussion for Application #559 and there was none. Approved 7-0.

Item No. 2, Miscellaneous Discussion

O'Leary then stated that this was the only application of the day as there were no other applications, and that one application was pending for the November 2nd Floodplain meeting.

A motion was then made to adjourn the meeting by Scott Sturtz which was seconded by Neil Suneson. Approved 7-0.