

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

JULY 25, 2018

The Board of Adjustment of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Conference Room D of Building A of the Norman Municipal Complex, 201 West Gray, at 4:30 p.m., on Wednesday, July 25, 2018. Notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Municipal Building at the above address and at www.normanok.gov/content/board-agendas at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Item No. 1, being:

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Andrew Seamans called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 2, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brad Worster
Curtis McCarty
James Howard
Andrew Seamans

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mike Thompson

A quorum was present.

STAFF PRESENT

Wayne Stenis, Planner II
Susan Connors, Director, Planning & Community
Development
Anais Starr, Planner II/Historic Preservation
Officer
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Elisabeth Muckala, Asst. City Attorney

* * *

Item No. 3, being:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JUNE 27, 2018 REGULAR MEETING

Brad Worster moved to approve the minutes of the June 27, 2018 Regular Meeting as presented. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Brad Worster, Curtis McCarty, Andrew Seamans
NAYS	None
ABSTAIN	James Howard
ABSENT	Mike Thompson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to approve the June 27, 2018 Board of Adjustment Regular Meeting Minutes as presented passed by a vote of 3-0-1.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

BOA-1718-16 – RYAN AND HILLARY PITTS REQUEST A VARIANCE TO THE 7,000 SQUARE FOOT LOT SIZE REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW FOR THE ADDITION OF A GARAGE APARTMENT ON PROPERTY ZONED R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 1414 GEORGE AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Application with Attachments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Stenis reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. He distributed copies of a site plan. We did not receive any letters of protest or support.

Mr. McCarty asked whether he should do zoning first. Mr. Stenis replied that he was advised by staff to go for the variance first. Ms. Connors added that any motion should include that it's conditioned on the zoning being amended. It seemed better to come to the Board first, because the zone change needs to go to the Planning Commission and then City Council, and we thought City Council should hear the entire thing.

Mr. McCarty asked the total square footage of the existing house. Steve Skinner, the contractor, said it is 891; 136 on the covered area additional, for a total of 1027.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

Blaine Nice, representing the applicant – I apologize. I had thought I sent Wayne that site plan earlier and apparently it didn't go through. This is over at 1414 George. I got the application for rezoning and staff said, "Wait a minute." When we first looked at this, I was told the lot was the proper size. Then Wayne discovered at some point that it was short by 60+ feet, and so we were going to have to do this. I still have the zoning application pending. Staff asked me to go to the Board of Adjustment first, so that's what we did. As I said, 62.5 feet. That's the overall area there. You are probably familiar with this. That's the front of the residence and it actually has sufficient parking for more than one car there. As part of this construction we would ask to add a driveway and it would still be within the coverage. It would go on the back and, of course, you've got a copy of that. This is the back yard looking from the back porch. It is a little bit narrow, but it goes way back there. That is looking from the back of the yard towards the property. As you can see, there's a dumpster there; they're doing extensive work on the inside of this. They're going to make it a lot nicer. That area is in transition. If you go around there, it's got some unique properties – ones that really need a lot of work; some that are still in great shape. This is overhang from the neighbor next door. That's the garage you just saw. This is their driveway in the back. This garage apartment is going to – I don't think it will be any different than anything back there, other than it will be an independent living space. That's right across the street – that's currently OU's woodworking shop. Next to the woodworking shop is that convenience store that's been there forever. This is just down the street looking at the intermural fields. Then that's

the duplexes that he mentioned that did get rezoning and were allowed there. This is over on McKinley; that was a bed and breakfast that was approved some time ago but was never used. This is behind the applicant's property and it shows you what's going on. Then there's apartments across the street. And this is down the street. There were no letters of objection. Actually, I've got a letter of support from ABLE. As I said, this neighborhood is in transition. OU has purchased I want to say 20+ lots – 12+ lots over the years. They own a lot of property. We do know we have to get the zoning, and Council may not do that. I know Susan probably has an opinion to that, whether or not this is spot zoning or not. We'll have to deal with this issue. But the clients, as a matter of right, could have a studio apartment there now; they just couldn't have a stovetop. They want to do that because they want to come here on game days. They're not renting this out; it will be their use. We certainly understand you making this approval conditional on the zoning because, obviously, we have to have both. But I think this neighborhood is in transition and I do think that we'll deal with the rezoning issue. I do think we've met the four requirements. I understand that, yes, the one that we can still use the house because I said, as a matter of right, we could have a studio apartment, so I don't think – the only thing is we want to be legal and don't want to mislead and put something in there and then have – a lot of people put stoves and things later. Steve Skinner, the contractor, is here and he's got more information about the building itself. We'd ask that you approve.

Mr. McCarty asked what the existing impervious surface is on the property with the driveway in the front. The house with the addition is only 23.3%. Mr. Skinner said the driveway is about 30 by 9, so another 270'. There is a wood deck out back, but it doesn't count against us. Mr. McCarty said they're going to be way under for sure; currently the house and the proposed addition is 23%.

Mr. Howard asked about adequate parking and access to parking. I understand that driveway is a single drive. What's your plan on access through there? Mr. Nice responded that the design hasn't been finalized, but it's going to be just one car in the back and probably one in the front. Mr. Skinner added that the plan right now is to continue that drive through near the fence to the little garage apartment, which is going to have a single garage bay and a location to turn around. So the parking would be stacked parking. Their intent is to not live in that building; they're just using it as basically a tailgate house. So they want to have a place to come down. They'll probably street park or, more than likely, park at OU's woodworking shop, where they parked last season when they used the house for that function.

Mr. Howard noted that, if the property ever changed hands, then that intended use is gone.

Mr. Nice noted the agenda has another variance for 500 feet and that's for a duplex. I'm not trying to criticize staff or anything – I understand their comments. As I said, we may not get the zoning, but that's something we'll have to tackle.

Mr. McCarty – I drove by there and looked around and there's definitely a lot down on the corner is all R-2. So there's one lot between the two. They took two lots and made it into R-2, and then there's one lot and then this property. Mr. Stenis clarified that they took five lots and made them into two so they could have the square footage. Then they had come before the Board because they had built too much paving and you allowed some of that to remain, but they had to take out some.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Brad Worster moved to grant the Variance as requested to the minimum lot size to allow two dwellings on the 6,937 square foot lot, contingent upon the property being rezoned to R-2, Two-Family Dwelling District. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Brad Worster, Curtis McCarty, James Howard, Andrew Seamans
NAYS	None
ABSENT	Mike Thompson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to grant the Variance as requested contingent upon the property being rezoned to R-2, Two-Family Dwelling District, passed by a vote of 4-0.

Mr. Seamans noted there is a 10-day appeal period before this decision is final.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

BOA-1819-01 – JAMES AIKEN APPEALS STAFF'S DENIAL OF BUILDING PERMIT #18-2454 FOR EXPANSION OF THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 434 ELM AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Application with Attachments
4. Aerial Photos from 1997-2017

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Stenis reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

James Aiken, the applicant – I am the managing member of the LLC that owns the house. I also was a resident there from 1961 until about 1973. I grew up there, have personal knowledge and also a great deal of emotional investment into that neighborhood. I understand the reason behind the Core Area regulations, and I support them in general. This case, I note that in this block, extending from the beginning of the 400 block of Elm to 436 Elm, there are 15 dwellings and 8 of them have either parking in the front yard prior to the regulation being enacted, or wider access for the driveway. In other words, this is a single car driveway. There are some in that area that have double. I would accept that, as well. What I'm trying to accomplish is, one, to maintain as much as possible that character of the neighborhood and that character of the house. I really loathe the idea of putting concrete in the front yard. My dad preached about that. No parking on the yard. But this is a rent house now and there are three adults there – sometimes four – and it falls within the regulation that requires that no more than three non-related adults are permitted in the house. It does fall within that. I enforce that. But you've got up to four or five cars there and when we'd do that when we were growing up and we'd have three or four cars, but we could park along the street. You can't do that now. So with the regulation as it is, with this house, and again, there's 8 houses or 8 dwellings there that have more parking. The tenants would have to go in 1, 2, 3, 4 – however many cars and if number 1 wants to get all, then all three behind them have to get out, and it's just a significant inconvenience. So what we have done is just to ask for what I believe is a minimal amount. Again, I don't like it, but I'm trying to solve a problem of providing some convenience to the tenants while preserving as much as possible the character of the house and the neighborhood. So that's what I'm attempting to do.

Mr. McCarty – So I'm a little clearer on your site plan we have, basically you're trying to add just this area here.

Mr. Aiken – Yes. The existing drive is gravel and it would be concreted. When we moved there in 1961 it was a gravel driveway.

Mr. Worster – The drive is 11 feet wide, and you'd be adding an additional 16' wide? 26',

so that could get 3 cars side-by-side?

Mr. Aiken – Yes. It's not noted here, but we would redo the sidewalk as well. It's crumbling; it needs to be done regardless.

Mr. Howard – If I were to equate this to a commercial parking lot, you have the aisle where the cars drive down and you have the actual spaces that people would pull into. What I'm looking at is your aisle right here, and then you'd have diagonal parking right here.

Mr. Aiken – Yes. Plus one could be put into the aisle. It would block that one, but an extension of that drive would solve that problem.

Mr. Worster – It looked like there was a garage in the back, or a building in the back. I guess staff's comment was you could pave the whole side and stack vehicles there, it's just impractical.

Mr. Aiken – Correct.

Mr. Howard – Have you looked at any other materials beyond concrete?

Mr. Aiken – I would love to. There are some composite materials. There's one on Park Drive and – I don't know for a fact – I think it's been done since the driveway regulation, because I don't remember it. I'm very familiar with that neighborhood; I grew up there, but I also lived back in the neighborhood since I moved back in 2003, and walk along Park Drive a lot. It's a neat looking composite – I call it composite, but it's like brown granules – I haven't actually gone up, but it's a soft type of surface. I'd love something like that.

Mr. Howard – We do have some very specific regulations on the type of surface. I didn't know if you were looking at maybe pavers or something like that, which could lend itself to some of the materials you were talking about also.

Ms. Connors – Could I just add, Mr. Chairman, if that happens, you need to get that approved by the City Engineer. They have to go through their whole process.

Mr. Aiken – If that were the difference between approval and not, I would absolutely pursue that avenue.

Mr. Howard – Do you anticipate any landscaping along these areas?

Mr. Aiken – As far as vegetation, I had not planned any. We would put barriers of some sort along the entire driveway and extended parking area. The house is fine, but the yard looks terrible because cars are in the yard. Weeds have grown up around them. We would enforce that. We would put barriers there so that they couldn't park in the yard beyond the paved area.

Mr. McCarty – There are a lot of houses in the area that have long stacked driveways. It seems like a lot of people figure it out. I guess I have a question for staff. Has the Board of Adjustment approved concrete in the front yards like this before in the Core Area? I can't recall one, but I've only been on here three or four years.

Ms. Connors – I can't recall a lot of these going forward to the Board at all. I don't think that we've found any.

Mr. Stenis – The ordinance was adopted in 2005. There haven't been that many.

Mr. McCarty – I know a lot have been concreted because there was gravel already there and they had to be concreted because gravel doesn't meet the ordinance. I don't recall anything like this.

Ms. Connors – We have to read this section of the code very carefully, because there are some instances where that parking area in the front yard can be expanded. So there are some places where that's happened legally without the Board being involved, because it met the standard. If there's no way to get to the back yard and there's no alley access, then there could be a widening of the driveway in the front yard.

Mr. McCarty – This one has room enough to get down the side to the back yard. It doesn't have any alleyway.

Ms. Connors – There's no alley.

Mr. Aiken – But it can't into the back yard; there's a structure in the way and the back yard itself – it would be difficult to put functional parking back there because of the size.

Mr. McCarty – There's a garage or something further back.

Mr. Aiken – Right.

Mr. McCarty – But it's a good ways.

Mr. Aiken – Yes. You can fit five or six cars. But, again, it's not practical.

Mr. Howard – I'm looking at an aerial view of that neighborhood on both sides of that one block and noticing that, where they did have an opportunity to do the drive they do have parking in the back, but I'm noticing some where it looks like they had an addition that blocks off the back yard and so they were able to widen that drive.

Mr. McCarty – So your main objection is this is just inconvenient for the renters?

Mr. Aiken – Primarily. Yes. Again, to get around it right now, although it's under code enforcement right now. They have been warned. I've been warned and so then I started the process to expand, and here we are. But up until now, they have been parking on the lawn.

Mr. McCarty – I saw pictures with cars in the front yard and that's definitely a problem.

Mr. Aiken – Part of this would be to put barriers so they would not be able to do that.

Mr. Howard – I had a question for staff. I hate playing the games of "what if", but if the gentleman decided to add an addition to his house and he ended up blocking that drive from being able to get to the back, would he then at that point be able to apply for the variance at that time? For parking in the front yard. That would be accepted administratively, wouldn't it?

Ms. Connors – If the structure met the requirements of this section of the code and there wasn't any possibility of rear, side or alley access, then there could be expansion of parking. There's also still the impervious surface coverage and the width of driveway limitation. So there are other limitations.

Mr. Howard – The reason I brought that up – again, I'm looking at an aerial view of some other houses in the area that seem to be fairly new or newer – like there might have been some renovation and additions put on there. That's why I was asking the question.

Ms. Connors – This block of Elm has seen some changes, some that the neighborhood is not very happy about.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Mr. McCarty – My concern is just that this is the first time we've dealt with this since 2005. I'm concerned that are you starting a trend and people then wanting to widen their driveways in the front yard going further. I own property over there and I know what he's dealing with. I get letters, too, if people are parked illegal. It's in my lease; I can't control the students. Are we perhaps starting something that then everyone starts doing and then we have this real ugly scenario where this was done once and then we're perhaps up against it further down the road? That's my biggest concern. I think for the nature of the area, most of the homes in that area are used for rental property but, again, it's something that we don't want a trend to begin that everyone's paving their front yard for convenience. I would love to have some of my properties paved in the front so you could have the convenience of not having to pull through, but, at the end of the day, is it really that big of an inconvenience?

Mr. Aiken – I understand. I think one of the differences about this house, as opposed to some of the others, is the size, the number of bedrooms. There are seven bedrooms in that house. That's not to say that there's seven tenants, but there could be, if that were a single family as opposed to three unrelated adults. The ratio is such that there could be five, six cars in there, as opposed to two or three, and there's several two or three bedroom houses in that area.

Mr. McCarty asked if he has considered moving the garage and rebuilding it and moving concrete back further? There is 42% coverage with your proposed area. Mr. Aiken responded he is trying to get away from tandem parking as much as possible. Because, again, the issue is that if you've got tandem parking with three or four cars, then that first one in line has to depend upon three or four others to make room for them to get out.

Ms. Connors – I would request, if this were to be approved, that we be very specific about the dimensions of the additional parking area based on his drawing, so that there wasn't something else brought in – not just saying that there's parking in the front, but that we give it actual dimensions.

Mr. Seamans – I would hate to live in the house if I had four teenage kids driving cars. If that ever comes to that situation where you've got a family living there, it's a horrible layout and there's no alley access and there's not a side driveway that they could share with the neighbor.

Mr. Howard – To me it begs the question of is it a good ordinance or not. I don't mean

that in a negative way. We see landscaping and parking regulations for commercial areas where we're fairly vigilant on maintaining those. I think screening is another option that should be considered in some of these zoning and parking regulations. But, that said, we don't have that here. I feel pretty clear as to what is required and it's not a justification to this point to me to make that change.

Curtis McCarty moved to grant the Appeal to approve BOA-1819-01, with concrete area in the front that's a maximum of 27' wide, with one lane going to the street that is 11' wide, and the additional area being 16' wide by 32' at the longest point and tapered down to 17.5' as presented on the hand-drawn site plan. James Howard seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	None
NAYS	Brad Worster, Curtis McCarty, James Howard, Andrew Seamans
ABSENT	Mike Thompson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to grant the Appeal, failed by a vote of 0-4.

* * *

Item No. 6, being:

BOA-1819-02 – WHISTLER SIGN COMPANY REQUESTS A VARIANCE TO THE 35' HEIGHT LIMITATION FOR A DIGITAL OFF-PREMISE SIGN ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 501 N. INTERSTATE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Application with Attachments

Mr. Seamans noted that the applicant has requested postponement to the August meeting.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Curtis McCarty moved to postpone this item to the August 22, 2018 meeting, at the request of the applicant. Brad Worster seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Brad Worster, Curtis McCarty, James Howard, Andrew Seamans
NAYS	None
ABSENT	Mike Thompson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone this item to the August 22, 2018 meeting, passed by a vote of 4-0.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

BOA-1819-03 – OKLAHOMA REALTY REHAB, L.L.C. REQUESTS A VARIANCE TO THE 7,000 SQUARE FOOT LOT SIZE REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A DUPLEX ON PROPERTY ZONED R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 303 E. HIMES STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Application with Attachments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Stenis reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes.

Mr. Howard asked about the location of the drive coming off of Himes; it seems awfully close to that intersection. Ms. Connors responded that, at this point in time, all you're acting on is the variance to the lot size. They need to come back if they want to get a variance to the parking language.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

Gene McKown, Managing Partner in Oklahoma Realty Rehab – As you all know, I don't do this kind of jobs. After I built a homeless shelter here in town, this is one of the units that's in the homeless shelter and it fit together to be a cost-efficient duplex. Right after I built the homeless shelter, I married a lady that's 65 years old. Her Social Security check is \$500 a month and she is really passionate about there's not a decent place in town that people can live – all the places that single women on Social Security can live in are really run down. They're old and not kept very desirable. So we looked at 50 lots in town trying to buy lots, and you'd think as long as I've been in business I would know better than to buy one without coming in here to see if it would fit. It fit everything except it was 10' too shallow. It's big enough to put four units on. It's big enough to put two duplexes on and I came down to get a building permit and realized it didn't have enough square feet. What we're going to do with this lot, if you grant us permission to do it, we're going to build a duplex and do a focus study on it – I've not ever done anything quite this affordable in my life – and see if there's a market for single women for a 650 square foot duplex. If you look at the plan, it almost meets NADA requirements for accessibility into the bathroom, into the house. If you look at where it's at, it belonged to the medical center and I bought it from the medical center that's there. It's probably as safe a place as you could put a 65 year old lady living. If we find out of our focus study that it works, I'm going to build it just like you see it on a 3 or 4 acre site where I can get 12-14 duplexes in a PUD. I'm going to answer your question, James, that you brought up. I've already applied for next month to see you again and see if you'll grant me a variance to put the parking in front. I just want to see if this is a viable product for the town. Most of you know I'm a bleeding heart. I built the homeless shelter here and I'm building a new campus for the Salvation Army right now. At 74 years old, projects is all I'm working on. They kind of give me the back seat at the office – I don't do much there. This is a focus study is what it is. I would like for you to consider in my next month's appearance before

you there's about a 100 year old pecan tree in the back yard, so I don't want to bring parking off the alley. But I understand about the Core situation here. If I have to bring it off the alley, I will probably sell the lot because my desire is to find out, one, if there's a need. We would furnish one of these and I've had a number of women come to the office that fit the description and have modified this set of plans half a dozen times since I started doing it to get the things in it that they would like to have that would be comfortable for them. So I'm telling you all that story. I think the variance to build a duplex on it is has been granted pretty consistently. I shouldn't have told you I'm going to be back next month again. I've already paid for both variances and I'm going to ask you to approve my lack of square footage. If you look at how much of that lot I have covered on that site plan, you could turn around and put one behind it. I mean, it's a big old lot and these are little bitty units. We're trying to see if there's a market here for people. Behind where I go to church, there's a 3-acre site that's got some great big trees on it. It would be a great location for something like this and I could put a PUD in that. So I'll answer any questions you have. I tried to cover the whole field there while I'm here.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

Mr. Worster commented that originally when the addition was developed, that lot met the zoning requirements that were on the lot in 1954 – when the addition was platted in 1902. So 6500 feet before; lot is 6500 feet now. And the minimum lot size was adjusted to 7000 well after that. Mr. Stenis stated the 6500 was put into effect in 1954 and this was platted much earlier. Mr. McCarty commented it was platted before statehood. Mr. Stenis agreed it was about five years before statehood, and it wasn't annexed for another 30 years.

Brad Worster moved to approve the Variance as requested. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Brad Worster, Curtis McCarty, James Howard, Andrew Seamans
NAYS	None
ABSENT	Mike Thompson,

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the Variance as requested, passed by a vote of 4-0.

Mr. Seamans noted there is a 10-day appeal period before this decision is final.

* * *

Item No. 8, being:

BOA-1819-04 – C.A. McCARTY PROPERTIES, L.L.C. REQUESTS A VARIANCE OF 2' TO THE REQUIRED 5' SIDE YARD (NORTH) SETBACK FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW GARAGE ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 540 S. LAHOMA AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Application with Attachments
4. Letter from the Historic District Commission

Mr. McCarty noted that he needs to be recused from this item.

Mr. Worster moved to allow Mr. McCarty to be recused from this item. Mr. Howard seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Brad Worster, James Howard, Andrew Seamans
NAYS	None
ABSENT	Mike Thompson,

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to allow Mr. McCarty to be recused, passed by a vote of 3-0.

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Stenis reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. We did not receive any letters of protest or support.

Mr. Seamans noted that the location map in the packet is for a different site.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

Curtis McCarty, the applicant – I have before you a request to reduce the side yard setback from 5' to 3'. There is an existing carport on the site. I texted a photo to a couple of you. The existing carport is right on the property line. What I am requesting is to build an enclosed garage, which has been approved by the Historic District Commission, and the date was mentioned. I'm proposing that it is set at 3' off the property line, versus 5', mostly for access into the garage, so when you're coming down the side you're not having to swing over too far to get in and out of the garage. That is my request before you. The existing carport would come down and a new structure built and permitted to meet the requirements of the building code. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Worster asked if it will have a 2' overhanging soffit on it. Mr. McCarty said it will have an overhang. The overhang will have to match the house, because it's historic, so the

roofline and pitch and the roof overhang will be as close as possible to the existing house. If you're not familiar with the historic district, they're very precise on what it looks like and how it has to be built, so I have to build it to match the existing house as close as possible. I think Anais could agree with that.

Mr. Seamans – So the same soffit, fascia board, fascia angles. Mr. McCarty responded that, obviously, the house was built in the 20's so exact products aren't really available. But what was approved was to use Hardi soffit and a Hardi fascia, which is a smooth product instead of the textured because the house has a smooth product. The outside will be real stucco just like the existing house. The soffits on the existing house are rather long. I think it would be probably 2'. It probably would be shortened a little bit – the house is 2.5 stories above ground, so if I had that large of a soffit, it could look funny. I'll try and make it look relatively correct to the size of the building. Ms. Starr added that the Commission prefers the location where he's proposing it. We wouldn't want him to move it too far, because in that neighborhood the rhythm is to have the garages at the end of the driveway. That's the historic rhythm.

Mr. McCarty stated that the building code requires anything less than 3' to be fire-rated construction on that side. At 3' also it's more safe. There is an existing structure on the other side of the fence that's really close to the property line. It's been there probably since the house was built. We're trying to get some distance from that as well for fire.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT:

James Howard moved to approve the Variance as presented in the site plan dated 12-30-17 with a 3' wide side yard. Brad Worster seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Brad Worster, James Howard, Andrew Seamans
NAYS	None
ABSENT	Mike Thompson,

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the Variance as requested, passed by a vote of 3-0.

Mr. Seamans noted there is a 10-day appeal period before this decision is final.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT AND STAFF

Ms. Connors – This is my last meeting. I'm retiring and my last day at the City is August 17.

Mr. Howard – Congratulations, but at the same time I'm a bit sad. I'm not sure if I'm ready.

Mr. McCarty – I just want to say something. I've worked around Susan since she got here, and actually was on the committee that interviewed her. I really appreciate your time that you've given the City and what you've done. It's been a pleasure to work with you. I was a Planning Commissioner when she was here, and I'm now on the Board of Adjustment. We're very lucky to have somebody like you that came here. So I just want to say thank you for the time you've given the City of Norman. Good luck in your endeavors.

Mr. Worster – I would echo that, and say you've had some very large challenges thrown at you over the last few years, but I think you've handled them all quite well, with grace. You and I have disagreed on some things in the past, and I'm fine with that. I just defer to you being right. I do wish you the best. You'll be missed.

Mr. Seamans – Thank you, again.

* * *

Item No. 10, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objection, the meeting adjourned at 5:44 p.m.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 22nd day of August, 2018.



Board of Adjustment