

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

**DECEMBER 14, 2017**

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 December, 2017. 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 Erin Williford called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

\* \* \*

Item No. 1, being:

**ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sandy Bahan  
Nouman Jan  
Chris Lewis  
Neil Robinson  
Erin Williford  
Lark Zink (arrived at 6:33 p.m.)  
Dave Boeck  
Tom Knotts  
Andy Sherrer

MEMBERS ABSENT

None

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  
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer  
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer  
Drew Norlin, Asst. Development Coordinator  
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator  
Jeff Bryant, City Attorney

\* \* \*

Item No. 11, being:

**O-1718-22 – JACKROCK, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 428 W. JOHNSON STREET.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. SPUD Narrative

**PRESENTATION BY STAFF:**

1. Janay Greenlee reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports and recommends Ordinance No. O-1718-22. We did receive one protest letter, which constitutes 1.8% of the property within the notification area.
2. Mr. Boeck – It's currently being used as an office?
3. Ms. Greenlee – They are using it as their office.
4. Mr. Lewis – If we approve this special use – whatever it's called – then the driveway will actually be a north-facing driveway driving into the south in an established neighborhood and they don't plan on changing that onto an east-west facing drive-in, so that we're not encroaching into that neighborhood.
5. Ms. Greenlee – That's correct. Actually, they came in for an expansion of their driveway and got a permit.
6. Mr. Lewis – We're going to have a business, then, right next to a residential R-1 development.
7. Ms. Greenlee – On the east side of this is R-1. The north side is R-1.
8. Mr. Lewis – So on Johnson Street this will be the only commercial available property that's actually doing commercial on that entire street.
9. Ms. Greenlee – That is correct.
10. Ms. Connors – Just to add to that, I'm pretty sure that the Public Works Department would not allow a curb cut onto Flood. We have someone here that could speak to that, but we wouldn't want another curb cut into this property off Flood. It would be too close to the intersection and wouldn't meet our standards.
11. Mr. Lewis – I would say if there were access off of Flood Avenue, where we have many commercial developments, I would be in support of this item. However, when we're encroaching on a neighborhood and we are bringing in commercial development right next to a residential property, this is one of those items where I find value in it, however I can't support it because I wouldn't want to be the neighbor there on Johnson right next to it.
12. Mr. Boeck – That's why I asked the question – it's already being used as an office. It's not like it's all of a sudden going to be an office; it's been an office.
13. Mr. Lewis – Again, if it were facing Flood and I considered it a commercial property, then I could support it. But since it's facing the north-south area and it's in that neighborhood specifically, it seems like we want to keep neighborhoods intact and stop the encroachment of commercial property into a neighborhood.

14. Ms. Greenlee – The office use – that is probably the only type of use that staff could support at this location. It's not a commercial – like a C-1 or C-2 use. It is a professional, 8 to 5, not there on the weekends, and not living at the residence. So it is kind of a lower impact type.

15. Mr. Robinson – If this house burns down or a tornado destroys it or something, and it's rebuilt, would it have to be rebuilt as a single family home, or could it be rebuilt as an office.

16. Ms. Greenlee – It is stated in the narrative that they have to abide by the R-1 regulations, so it could only come under a single family house and it would have to have the setbacks and coverage same in R-1.

17. Mr. Sherrer – That's the same if they chose to relocate, it would go back to the ...

18. Ms. Greenlee – It'd go back, yes, to R-1. That's stated in the narrative.

19. Ms. Williford – Did I read correctly that there are not an overwhelming number of cars with this business? It's the employees and maybe one or two customers that come to fill out a lease.

20. Ms. Greenlee – Correct. Four cars during the day, and then maybe one or two customers that would come to sign a lease.

**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-1718-22 to City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.*

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

YEAS	Sandy Bahan, Neil Robinson, Erin Williford, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Tom Knotts, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	Nouman Jan, Chris Lewis
MEMBERS ABSENT	None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1718-22 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-2.

\* \* \*