

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

**JUNE 14, 2012**

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 14<sup>th</sup> day of June 2012. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions> twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chairman Andy Sherrer called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

\* \* \*

Item No. 1, being:  
**ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dave Boeck  
Jim Gasaway  
Cynthia Gordon  
Diana Hartley  
Tom Knotts  
Curtis McCarty  
Robert Pailes  
Chris Lewis  
Andy Sherrer

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &  
Community Development  
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner  
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development  
Manager  
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary  
Kathryn Walker, Asst. City Attorney  
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst  
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator  
Scott Sturtz, City Engineer  
Shawn O'Leary, Director, Public Works  
Susan Atkinson, Planner I

\* \* \*

Item No. 8, being:

**ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-41 – COMMUNITY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A SCHOOL FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED I-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 3106 BROCE DRIVE.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Development Plan
4. CCS Plan
5. Pre-Development Summary

**PRESENTATION BY STAFF:**

1. Ms. Hudson – The application before you is for Community Christian School for a special use on property currently zoned I-1. CCS purchased this tract just to the west of their existing school on Broce Drive. It is going to be the high school. They're going to add additional classrooms, and they're adding a parking lot which will cross over into the lot to the east to allow for student and visitor parking. There are two businesses across the street to the north, one a carpet business and the other an office building. There was a letter of protest constituting 4.2% of the notification area. Staff recommends approval of this special use. With the internal parking lot, we don't feel there will be any adverse impacts on adjacent property owners.
2. Mr. Lewis – Was there a traffic study done on this? In looking at the notes, it seems that we're going to increase the number of students immediately by 100 with the high school; eventually it would be 400. It's my understanding right now traffic is an issue in that area, and the protest letter we got from Armstrong Companies – it seems that might be a negative impact. I'm wondering, has there been a traffic study performed?
3. Ms. Hudson – I do not know, but I feel the applicant can answer that.

**PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:**

1. Tim Johnson, Johnson & Associates, 1 East Sheridan in Oklahoma City – We are the engineers for Community Christian School and have been for 20+ years. As the staff has reported, the existing school campus was allowed to be a permitted use under the old regulations of I-1. The current regulations of I-1 require the special use permit, which is why we're here. To answer your traffic question, we have not done a specific traffic impact study at this point. You're correct in that eventually there will be more students. The initial plan is to move the high school students out of the existing building into the new building at their current number of students, which is about 100. That's 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grade. So that allows more room for the younger students – junior high and below, which, obviously, they don't drive cars, but there will be a little more traffic on the drop-off time. From a personal experience, I've had six kids graduate from this school, so I've done a lot of dropping off and picking up. The school has done a very good job with regard to organizing that. I can tell you 20 years ago it was chaos. We've worked real close with the neighbors to keep from blocking driveways and things like that for the very short period of time – that doesn't occur at the same peak traffic time that you would under a normal traffic impact study is going to happen in the 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. and the 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. would probably dovetail with morning traffic peak. But being an industrial tract, the local traffic is very low. The traffic for the school is about from 10 'til 8:00 to 10 or 15 after 8:00 in the morning. With regard to the new building, we are not anticipating increasing the number of cars that would exit out onto Broce Drive. Our exiting strategy would still continue to take them out to the frontage road out our south driveway – south of the existing building and the farthest east driveway onto Broce, where we control access and exiting there to be right turn only during the exiting hours of the school. So the impact, I think, to the neighborhood would simply be a minor increase in pick-up and drop-off traffic during those periods of time. We do a lot of traffic engineering work and we just have not requested or have not done a study for this.

As mentioned, the new building that has been acquired is looking at a remodel to convert it from what it is today to a classroom setting. The bulk of the addition at the south end of the building would be for a cafeteria, theater room, general gathering places, as well as additional classrooms. We are not increasing the drives onto Broce. We will be providing detention for the increased runoff that we would be creating for both the parking and the building addition. Mr. Armstrong did send a letter to the City; we received a copy of that late yesterday. I was successful in getting hold of Mr. Armstrong this morning and we talked twice today. I also sent him an email with regard to response to his comments. His concern about the special use permit, as he indicated to me, was he didn't want it to negatively impact uses that are permitted on his property. We did some research in the codes and ordinances; we talked to staff and confirmed that we would not diminish any of his current uses that are permitted in the I-1 with the limited C-2 uses that are permitted under that I-1 use. So I conveyed that to him and I'm not sure – I haven't seen him yet tonight, so if he's here, I'd be happy to give him the floor. I think with the site plan you have in front of you, that pretty much explains everything. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

2. Mr. McCarty – Well, my biggest concern reading this is that we've got a start of a 100 person addition to it and eventually 400 and there's been no traffic study. I frequent that area quite often around the 3:00 to 4:00 time when kids are being picked up and it's chaos. It's very dangerous turning out of those areas trying to get onto Broce if you're in that area doing business. So that's a big concern of mine and I'm just curious why there hadn't been one done.
3. Ms. Pailles – I noticed there's spaces for buses. Does the school have buses? That cuts down on traffic.
4. Mr. Johnson – Yes, they do. They keep them parked down on the gymnasium property to the north. They're only here to transport kids to PE on occasion.
5. Mr. Lewis – It looks like in phase 2 the ultimate build-out of parking spaces is going to be 160. Can you give me an estimate of what is there now?
6. Mr. Johnson – I should know that off the top of my head. It's about 120, I believe, counting the lot to the north.
7. Mr. Lewis – So we're just going to increase by about 40 automobiles just for parking there?
8. Mr. Johnson – I'm sorry, no. The increased parking would be about 50 spaces, so our total will be 160 – so about 110.
9. Mr. Danner – By our engineering standards, a traffic study is required with a preliminary plat. This property is already platted. Thereby it could not be required by us.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

1. Gail Armstrong, 1418 Aspen Lane – I did turn in a protest letter not understanding. I talked to Susan a while ago and I talked to Mr. Johnson today. Where I was concerned was school zonings and church zonings change what you can do next door. So I would hate to go down the road a ways and all of a sudden say, oh, you can't have that type of businesses in here because you're next door to a school, next door to a church. The special permissive use, Susan tells me, stays with the land. Right? Not with the use. But if they ever decided to vacate this property, then would it be only for a school?
2. Ms. Connors – Well, the special use doesn't expire, so it stays with the land until somebody requests a different use for the land. Now someone could still redevelop it industrially. The I-1 zoning does not change; the special use is a layer over that, but it doesn't expire.

3. Mr. Armstrong – With the questions I got answered today, I can withdraw my protest. I understood that I'm not going to get zoned out.

4. Mr. Lewis – Being a very large business owner in that area, or land owner in that area, do you have concerns with the amount of traffic that is going to be there? We have concerns that have been vocalized with the traffic study not being done. But I'm wondering if you have concerns with traffic.

5. Mr. Armstrong – We own the next two buildings to the west. It has been worse than it is now – back about five years ago. I don't know what exactly took place. They used to block our driveways and go around the corner, but evidently they've self-disciplined themselves on how to park around the street. I was glad to see it looked like they were going to add some parking, too.

6. Mr. Lewis – So, even though we're going to be increasing parking spaces by about 40 or 50, we're going to have about 160 in phase 2 – about 400 students coming and going, traffic is not going to be an issue for you?

7. Mr. Armstrong – Well, they can only park singly along the road, so if they can't park, they're going to have to find a solution themselves. That's all I can say. They can only park on one side waiting on the students to dismiss about 3:30 or 4:00.

8. Mr. Lewis – So it's not an inconvenience to you?

9. Mr. Armstrong – It hasn't been. We did have a complaint or two probably five or ten years ago and they've handled it pretty well.

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

1. Mr. McCarty – I'll just make one other comment, and maybe he can answer this, about the school. But 100 high school students – the majority of them drive a car. We're adding 67 parking spaces and that's it. So if you have 9<sup>th</sup> graders, they won't drive. Sophomores through seniors will be the majority of the time. If it hits 400, I have – where in the world would all these people park, or are they not allowed to drive to school? So this traffic thing is really kind of bothering me and how this is, because I have been in that area quite a bit and the people start lining up all the way down Broce and all the way around to Bart Conner. It's real congested at, like you said, off traffic time, but it's a problem. So I'm just curious how that works with your school.

2. Mr. Johnson – To answer your first question, the number of parking spaces that we're providing on this plan meets or exceeds the design criteria for 400 students. I can tell you that none of the students or staff are permitted to park outside the campus. That's an internal rule. The only time that ever happens is if there's a special event, like they have a fair once a year, sometimes presentation. But usually that's done at the gym. With regard to Mr. Armstrong's comment about why things have gotten better, the City did come out a couple of years ago and have restriped Broce from the intersection of I-35 back about 500 or 600 feet and created a third lane, so that traffic – that street is wide enough for three lanes of vehicles, including trucks. By doing that, because it's not striped anywhere else, that helps direct the through traffic on through and the parked traffic to stay in that far right lane that turn in that driveway. Mr. McCarty is correct that the short period of time before pick-up parents get there a little bit early and they'll park at the curb. They're very courteous about not blocking driveways. There are signs up – don't block the neighbor's driveway, signed by Mrs. O – she's the Gestapo of the school. I think just the parents have learned to run the trap properly. As I've said, they've tried to be good neighbors. They've talked to a lot of the neighbors and my kids have all grown up

there. I've been involved in the school for 20+ years and the good news is it's grown to the better. They're trying to do a very good job and trying to be a good neighbor. Obviously, there's a need for a private Christian school in this part of town, because our waiting list for our elementary is very long.

*Chris Lewis moved to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-41 to the City Council. Diana Hartley seconded the motion.*

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1112-41 to the City Council passed by a vote of 9-0.

\* \* \*