

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 13, 2014**

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Conference Room D of Building A of the Norman Municipal Complex, 201 West Gray Street, on the 13<sup>th</sup> day of February 2014. 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.

Vice Chair Sandy Bahan called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

\* \* \*

Item No. 1, being:

**ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Curtis McCarty  
Jim Gasaway  
Andy Sherrer  
Cindy Gordon  
Sandy Bahan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dave Boeck  
Tom Knotts  
Chris Lewis  
Roberta Pailes

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &  
Community Development  
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner  
Janay Greenlee, Planner II  
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development  
Manager  
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary  
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney  
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II  
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator  
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer

\* \* \*

Item No. 5, being:

**LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C. – SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE N.E.**

**5A. R-1314-46 -- LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C., REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION, HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION, AND COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION, TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION AND COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE N.E.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report
3. Pre-Development Summary
4. Excerpt of Planning Commission Minutes – January 9, 2014

**5B. O-1314-21 -- LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C., REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, PL, PARKLAND, AND C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT; AND FROM RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, AND RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, TO C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AND FROM R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE N.E.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative
4. Preliminary Site Development Plan
5. Open Space Exhibit
6. Phasing Plan

**5C. PP-1314-8 -- CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY LANDMARK LAND, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR MONTORO RIDGE ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, (EXCLUDING THE COMMERCIAL PROPERTY AND RURAL AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY FROM THE PUD), FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF TECUMSEH ROAD AND 12<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE N.E.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Preliminary Plat with Contours
4. Staff Report
5. Transportation Impacts
6. Preliminary Site Development Plan
7. Preliminary Site Plan
8. Open Space Exhibit
9. Phasing Plan
10. Pre-Development Summary
11. Greenbelt Commission Comments

**PRESENTATION BY STAFF:**

1. Jane Hudson – The first application for this proposal is for the Norman 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan amendment. This is the existing Land Use and Transportation Plan in that area. As you can see, it does have low density residential, medium, high density residential and then the commercial at the corner. As proposed, the new land use for the PUD area would be the low density residential and then the commercial designation will stay intact.

Then the second application for the area is the rezoning request. Rezoning to a Planned Unit Development, amending the C-1, Local Commercial District with Special Use for a building

in excess of 35,000 square feet and an automobile service station, and then an additional expansion to the A-2, Rural Agricultural District. This is the existing zoning. As you can see, the hatched area will become the Planned Unit Development for the larger lot, single family homes. Then in the southeast corner there is a well site which has the existing oil well. That will expand slightly to the west, creating more of a buffer there for the single family homes that would be on the west side. Then up in the corner, the commercial district will expand slightly to the south, taking in some of the RM-6 and RM-2 area, and then slightly shifting east giving a little bit of that area over to the PUD development. This is the existing land use in the area. Essentially, it is surrounded on all sides by single family development. In addition to that, on the southeast corner at 12<sup>th</sup> and Tecumseh there is a mini-storage facility there denoted with the red buildings.

This is also for the preliminary plat. It just designates the plat location.

These are a few slides of the area. This is the site itself, which would be on the southwest corner of 12<sup>th</sup> and Tecumseh. This is another shot of the area looking south. In the distance there was the oil well; you can see how buffered it will be from the single family homes. On the north side, which would be the northwest corner of Tecumseh and 12<sup>th</sup> is Red Canyon Ranch. This is also the single family development there. The northeast corner is undeveloped at this time. This is the mini-storage area with single family to the south of that. This addition wraps around the church.

This proposal will accommodate 67 larger lots for single family homes. There is a pipeline that runs along the east side of this development up toward the commercial area and then north. The PUD narrative acknowledges that fences will not be placed along the easement, but they can cross the easement, and they will also have to leave access for those employees or inspectors to be able to get in there and inspect those lines. The area has developed with residential and commercial in recent years and, in addition to the expansion and improvements on Tecumseh Road, staff recommends approval of Resolution No. R-1314-46, Ordinance No. O-1314-21, as well as the preliminary plat PP-1314-8. The applicant is here with a presentation and to answer any questions.

#### **PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:**

1. Tom McCaleb, engineer for the applicant – This drawing will probably be the basis of everything I've got to say. That's the preliminary plat. You know where it's located. You kind of know some history of this tract of land. It's been zoned since 1984, and there are several different zoning classifications. We are trying to develop this land and we turned in an application in September to have this as a PUD with septic tanks and large lots. It was trying to copy Montecito, which is on the east. After turning it in, we met with staff and staff was of the opinion that this area would not lend itself to septic tanks. So they were requiring that we provide public sewer because public sewer is available. So with that requirement, we went back to the developer. We did a cost analysis to see how that would work out. After the analysis, after review of the site, and with those issues that were brought up by staff, we brought it back. We resubmitted this tract of land as a different PUD. We still want to keep the rural area. We're doing the PUD mainly to keep no curbs, and the streets, and the bar ditch section. Other than that, it's standard single family – big lots. The lot sizes vary from 0.48 acres to about 1.6 acres. So they vary from half an acre to over an acre and a half. There were several issues we had to contend with. Jane mentioned some of them. Pipeline, which is right yonder. Plains pipeline, and we've modified it and we're going to put it in this configuration here. We also are rezoning a piece of land for the oil well. This piece right there is the A-2 land that we're rezoning back from R-1 to A-2 to give the separation from the house to the oil well. That's about two acres. We're adding some area to the commercial and taking away some area from the commercial to make sure to get to the area that works with the single family layout. So, essentially, that's our application.

The issues for sanitary sewer I explained. All the lots will be served with sanitary sewer systems that will drain back to the west. This corner, which is not part of the PUD – that's just straight zoning. We're just leaving it alone. So its existing zoning is in place; we're just modifying the size of it. C-1 was sewerred to a line that's coming across going to the Red Canyon Ranch

project. So the sewer is there, it's available, and we're connecting to it. Standard sewer connections; no septic tanks.

The water lines – there's a 12-inch water line on Tecumseh Road and we're tying to that line, but there's a pressure zone in here that we're having to modify because it's two different pressure systems. So we're adding a sustaining valve right here to separate those two systems. Also, we're going to take the water line and we're going to loop it and we're going to tie it in to the Shadowlake Addition in that street. And we're going to loop the water line and tie it into the water line in The Vineyard Addition. So all the water lines will be standard water lines and will be looped and a pressure zone will be identified.

Storm sewer – drainage – the tract has got some pretty good undulations. We're going to try not to tear up any more than we have to. That's the purpose of making the large lots. But we've got to comply with the standard drainage ordinance, which we're doing. This is a large buffer we're leaving as it is and making it an open space. You see those contour lines – that represents drainage. On the west side of this road, that's our detention pond. We've also established in this area a revised WQPZ – Water Quality Protection Zone. We've had to initiate and prepare a design for an engineered solution for the WQPZ and we've done it. Those dashed lines that you see there represent that protected area – the WQPZ there and there. We're also going to add that to our open space solution for the whole project. We've got about seven places that we've identified as open space – medians, this large tract, a tract over here, the WQPZ and there's six places specifically that are identified that add up to about 10.5% open space. So we meet those criteria of the PUD requirements.

We reviewed the traffic situation and it's surprising that this tract of land did not warrant a traffic study. There are no traffic concerns, and we got a letter from the traffic engineering consultants who we hired to look at the traffic and they say that the traffic generated from this development would not be expected to have a significant impact on the street system. Staff has agreed to that. If you look in your staff report, page 5c-9, you'll see their response as well.

We've talked about the oil well issue already. It sits right here. It's a live well and we're going to leave it alone, stay away from it and move away from it.

As I said, we've got six open space tracts. We've got 6.4 acres of open space, over 10% open space area.

There was some concern about the public school area, which is this area that is set aside for the school system. Some concern of how are you going to get to it. There's an existing road coming from Shadowlake that's already access to it. Staff has asked, and we've concurred to add another access point right there. So, with that, if it ever happens, it would have public access. The developer has also agreed to put sidewalks in this subdivision. So sidewalks will be along all the streets that can get kids to the school. So it's a complete system with all those infrastructures. That's my report. I'd be glad to respond to any questions. We ask for your support.

2. Ms. Bahan – Have you talked at all to the school district about their plans for that property?

3. Mr. McCaleb – No, we have not.

4. Ms. Bahan – I know when they did the study several years ago they recommended that another elementary school be built in the northeast part of the area and that would be probably one of the areas they would consider for that. It wasn't in the bond issue this time.

5. Mr. McCaleb – That's correct. There are no immediate plans that I'm aware of. We've tried to figure out a way to get a sidewalk through the tract, but we can't encumber that land because we don't own it. We're doing fee in lieu of now for park land. We've tried to accommodate the school tract – if it ever happens.

6. Mr. McCarty – Did you say you're doing bar ditch or curb and gutter?

7. Mr. McCaleb – Bar ditch. No curb and gutter.
8. Mr. McCarty – So where would the sidewalks go?
9. Mr. McCaleb – They have to go on the lot side of the bar ditch.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

None

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

*Jim Gasaway moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-46, Ordinance No. O-1314-21, and PP-1314-8, the Preliminary Plat for MONTORO RIDGE ADDITION, A Planned Unit Development (excluding the Commercial Property and Rural Agricultural Property from the PUD) to City Council. Curtis McCarty seconded the motion.*

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

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| YEAS           | Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Cindy Gordon,<br>Sandy Bahan |
| NAYES          | None  |
| MEMBERS ABSENT | Roberta Pailes, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck                     |

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-46, Ordinance No. O-1314-21, and PP-1314-8 to City Council, passed by a vote of 5-0.

\* \* \*