

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

OCTOBER 8, 2020

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session via Video Conference and in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 8th day of October, 2020.

Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <https://www.normanok.gov/sites/default/files/documents> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Lark Zink called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT
via Video Conference

Dave Boeck
Sandy Bahan
Erin Williford
Erica Bird
Mark Daniels
Steven McDaniel
Tom Knotts
Lark Zink

MEMBERS ABSENT

Nouman Jan

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT
(in person, unless otherwise noted)

Jane Hudson, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist
Beth Muckala, Asst. City Attorney (video)
Carrie Evenson, Stormwater Program
Manager (video)
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer (video)
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer
(video)
Nathan Madenwald, Utilities Engineer
(video)

* * *

Item No. 7a, being:

O-2021-8 – BLEW & ASSOCIATES, P.A., ON BEHALF OF AMERICA'S CAR-MART, REQUESTS A SITE PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE SITE PLAN ADOPTED IN ORDINANCE NO. O-0304-33 FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 512 NORTH INTERSTATE DRIVE

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Overall Development Plan
4. Pre-Development Summary

Item No. 7b, being:

PP-2021-1 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY WIREGRASS DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. (BLEW & ASSOCIATES, P.A.) FOR NORMAN CAR-MART FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.98 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF NORTH INTERSTATE DRIVE APPROXIMATELY ½ MILE NORTH OF MAIN STREET AT 512 NORTH INTERSTATE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Overall Development Plan
5. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Lora Hoggatt reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. We received one protest letter representing 1.8% of the notification area.
2. Mr. Daniels – So if we approve this, do those special conditions go away?
Ms. Hoggatt – Yes. They would be gone. It would just be subject to development of the site plan that they submitted that goes with their preliminary plat.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Jorge DuQuesne, Blew & Associates (via video) – This is the Car-Mart that we're planning on developing. The Lot 2, Block 1, that is a conceptual one for future. What we're doing is to meet City standards, we're proposing a shared access drive on that lot. The Car-Mart itself sits 50' away from the actual gas line. We're going to have a building and a detail shop and a future expansion right behind the main Car-Mart building that you can probably see on this. It will be just a standard parking lot. We're going to have most of our display property up in the front. The detail shop is used for mainly cleaning of the cars. We will have a few offices inside that detail shop. This parking in the back is for employees; it is going to be protected by a pipe rail fence so we don't expect any customers to go into the back area over there. We are showing a fence in the back to kind of screen from the residential area; we don't really want anybody in that product area anyway. But if you have any other questions, Timothy Allen is on the call; he is with Car-Mart; he is their representative. I am with Blew & Associates. If you have any questions, we will be here for you.
2. Ms. Bird – Can you just confirm the space from the back of the shop to the property and that measured distance? Is it 57'?
Mr. DuQuesne – 37'.
Ms. Bird – Do you have an approximate height for your building that's going to be there?
Mr. DuQuesne – It's a one-story building. Timothy Allen may have the height. I don't believe it's much more than 13-14'. Like I said, it's a one-story building back there. Not exactly sure on the height.

Ms. Bird – As far as lighting in the back behind the building and by the employee parking, are you going to have any mounted pole lights that you're intending to put in there?

Mr. DuQuesne – Well, we'll probably have security lighting, but we will definitely make sure that it's pointed away from any residential areas. We don't want the lighting intruding into their back yards.

Mr. Boeck – We have a lighting ordinance in Norman that is zero – it has cutoff at all property lines. It's been in use for at least 6 or 8 years. So no building can have any light overflow in someone else's property.

Mr. DuQuesne – Perfect.

3. Mr. Daniels – It looks like a substantial fence in the back. I just can't read any of the text. Is that a masonry fence, or just a chain-link fence, or wooden fence?

Mr. DuQuesne – I think we're proposing a wood privacy fence.

Mr. Daniels – I'll ask the Planning – is there any requirement of type of fence, from the Planning staff, in this situation?

Ms. Hoggatt – They have to have at least a 6' stockade fence. So it doesn't have to be masonry, but it does have to be at least 6' tall between the commercial and the residential.

Mr. Daniels – Would the applicant be willing to put a more substantial fence back there to appease the people in the back – the residential area? I'm just throwing that out.

Mr. Boeck – Why would they have to do that? What we require is a 6' fence. Why are you asking them to do more than that?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Ms. Bird – I intend to vote yes on this one, because it looks like there's going to be a pretty good buffer. I'd like to just be conscientious of any poles for the people in the back yards, that they're not going to see – even if it's not technically having a light spillover or something that's going to show in a residential back yard a big light pole. But, otherwise, I think that there is some good mitigation for sound by keeping the cars closer to the front end, and I plan to vote yes.

2. Mr. Boeck – Since we have restaurants to the north and car dealerships to the south, I was often wondering what was happening with that piece of land. There's lots of examples of our new lighting ordinance that have gone in since that happened. The City does a good job of policing that. If you look at even the 7-11 on the corner of Robinson and Flood, you have ample light on the site but it's dead cut-off on the property lines. It almost looks low key just because of the design of those kind of things. I'm assuming that the City will do what they've done on other projects and enforce the lighting so the people behind won't have that issue. But I'm supporting it.

3. Mr. Knotts – The main problem for residents, which I am one, is the loud speakers. I'll support this because they are not putting in – they've already stated in their comments that there will be no exterior public address systems that can be heard. I can hear Big Red and across the interstate at this point at my house. Kudos.

Erica Bird moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-8 and PP-2021-1, the Preliminary Plat for NORMAN CAR-MART, to City Council. Steven McDaniel seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Dave Boeck, Sandy Bahan, Erin Williford, Erica Bird, Mark Daniels, Steven McDaniel, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Nouman Jan

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-8 and PP-2021-1 to City Council, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *