

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

SEPTEMBER 10, 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 10th day of September, 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
Roberta Pailes
Erin Williford
Tom Knotts
Sandy Bahan
Jim Gasaway
Dave Boeck
Cindy Gordon

MEMBERS ABSENT

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
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Kathryn Walker, Asst. City Attorney
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

O-1516-11 – NORMAN COMMUNITY CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A CHURCH, TEMPLE OR OTHER PLACE OF WORSHIP FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT AND LOCATED AT 1801 NORTH PORTER AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Plan
4. Pre-Development Summary
5. Staff Report Addendum (distributed at meeting)
6. Exterior Appearance Variance Site Plan (distributed at meeting)

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee – The Norman Community Church of the Nazarene is requesting a special use for a church, temple, or other place of worship at 1801 North Porter. This is the existing zoning; it is R-1. This is the subject tract. This is the existing land use, currently the church and the parking lot are there. And this is the church itself.

I'm going to go back through just a little bit of background with this proposal. There's two lots on this. The front lot is 15.2 acres and is platted. They own a rear lot, which is 15 acres as well, approximately, that is not platted. The special use is requested for the front lot only with the existing church on it currently.

In August of 1961, this portion of land was annexed by the City of Norman. At that time there was no zoning classification given to it, so under right it just went straight to R-1. In November of 1977, there was an adoption of Ordinance O-7778-22 which removed the church by right from R-1. Then in February of 1996, a plat was submitted to Norman for the church. The location map provided by staff at that time actually showed the property zoned as A-2. It went forward. They had the final plat. The plat was approved and filed of record September 16, 1997. They went ahead and came through for a building permit, received that building permit under the A-2 zoning. It was a mistake at that time. It should have had the special use for the church under A-2 because of what had previously taken place. So they built the church. Now they're coming forward. They want to expand. So we're bringing them into conformance. It is zoned R-1, so a church can be allowed with that special use. So that's just a little bit of background history for this application.

So this is the site itself. This is looking to the south from the north parking lot. This is looking to the north at the monument business with the cemetery directly behind it. The cemetery. This is to the west with the R-2, two-family zoning to the west. This is to the southeast. This is directly east. So the 15 acres includes the site itself where the church is, and then they own an additional 15 acres behind that that abuts up to Sutton Wilderness. This is looking south on Porter. And north on Porter.

You received tonight a supplement in your package because with the special use they are requesting a variance to the masonry requirement. I'll go through the additional buildings. The first building is a youth center that they're going to build on the north of the lot with a basketball court and volleyball courts. There is an existing cell tower here. This is a bus barn. So, as you can see on your site development map, the red is where they're going to provide 80% masonry and the yellow is where they're going to provide 48" of masonry façade at the base of each building. This is an addition to the existing church, which will have the masonry on the north façade, as well as the addition for offices on the south. In the future, they plan to build a new sanctuary that will front Porter and they will have masonry on the west, north, and south sides. That is an addendum to the special use that will be attached as a special condition with the special use.

Staff does support Ordinance No. O-1516-11 and I would be happy to answer any questions.

2. Mr. Boeck – Do they currently have a variance on the masonry requirement on the existing building?

Ms. Greenlee – This is the front of the building, which is the masonry and then this is the rear building that's attached to it. But that's the sanctuary. They want to match what is the existing masonry right now.

Mr. Boeck – So when they're only going up 48 inches, where is that line?

Ms. Greenlee – You have the site map and an addendum to this for the variance.

Mr. Boeck – Well, that's why I was wondering what they had, 'cause those classroom wings that they've got now, the masonry goes all the way up to the soffit.

Ms. Greenlee – Yes, on the sides.

3. Mr. Boeck – Now, refresh my memory, or our memory, on what the current code says in terms of masonry coverage. Is it on all sides?

Ms. Greenlee – Yes. 80% of all sides, exclusive of windows, glass, doors, and roofs. So it will be 80% here, here, here. Anything facing Porter that can be seen is going to be 80% masonry. But here will be the 48" from the base up and here. And this building isn't going anywhere. Obviously, they're keeping this and adding here.

Mr. Boeck – Well, from the aesthetic point of view, I really don't have a problem with the center building – the current building that's existing there when they add those two wings. It's that youth center there. They have full masonry on the west wall and then turn the corner and only have 48 inches of masonry and the rest metal building. I have a problem with that.

4. Ms. Pailles – Is that correct, that the part that is not masonry will be ribbed metal building?
Ms. Greenlee – Yes.

5. Mr. Sherrer – I would second that. I agree with Commissioner Boeck. I think that would be worth consideration as it moves forward if it does, in fact, based on whatever the applicant chooses to do. I think that would be a wonderful consideration to have that be considered as a part of the package as it relates to the youth building. Originally, I thought about the other areas, too, but I think that those with the metal building they are, I don't see an issue there. But I do think that having that one building be also considered for a little higher than 48 inches would make some sense.

6. Ms. Connors – If I just might comment. We did hand out some suggested conditions of approval with the map. On item (b), if you wanted to amend the 80% -- and we haven't heard from the applicant yet, but you could add Building 2 also required on the west and south sides would also have the 80% masonry. We could incorporate that into the item (b) of the conditions.

7. Ms. Gordon – Wouldn't that be item (c)?

8. Ms. Bahan – Just change the 48 to 80.

9. Ms. Connors – Yes. We would just say the west and south facades.

10. Mr. Knotts -- Is there a fence around this?

Ms. Greenlee – No.

Mr. Knotts – I see the property line delineated.

Ms. Greenlee – No, there's not a fence currently. There's not any fencing proposed. If they did decide to do that when they submitted for application for a building permit, that would be something that would be looked at. But there's nothing submitted.

Ms. Connors – They can build a fence. We don't issue permits for fences, so they could build a 6' fence – I think they can build up to an 8' fence without a permit on the side and rear yards.

Ms. Greenlee – Yeah. Not in the front.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

The applicant's representative was available to answer questions but did not make a presentation.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-11 to the City Council, amended to include the conditions recommended by staff in the addendum to the staff report, with condition (c) to read: "The proposed accessory buildings as shown on Exhibit A.2: "Building 2" will have 80% masonry on the west façade and south façade, "Building 3" will have 48" of masonry at the base of the north façade, and "Building 4" will have 48" of masonry at the base of the south façade." Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

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

YEAS

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

NAYES

None

MEMBERS ABSENT

Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1516-11 as amended to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *