

**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  
Robertta 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. 11, being:

**CONSIDERATION OF A REQUEST SUBMITTED BY MB REAL ESTATE II FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BOYD STREET AND MONNETT AVENUE.**

**11A. RESOLUTION NO. R-1112-141 – MB REAL ESTATE II REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LUP-1112-8) FROM OFFICE DESIGNATION TO MIXED USE DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BOYD STREET AND MONNETT AVENUE.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

**11B. ORDINANCE NO. O-1112-44 – MB REAL ESTATE II REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO MUD, MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BOYD STREET AND MONNETT AVENUE.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Concept Design Renderings
4. Site Plan
5. Floor Plans
6. Pre-Development Summary
7. Greenbelt Enhancement Statement

**PRESENTATION BY STAFF:**

1. Ms. Hudson – This applicant is requesting a change to the NORMAN 2025 and rezoning from R-3 to a Mixed Use Development District. The subject tract is at the corner of Boyd and Monnett. The land use is currently designated as office; if changed it will be mixed use. The rezoning from R-3 to the Mixed Use Development District. The applicant has proposed a mixed use development consisting of retail commercial on the ground floor with residential uses on the top two floors. The primary purpose of mixed use development is to create an environment which promotes a mix of housing and commercial retail type uses on the ground floor within a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood, creating walkability. Although this request is not consistent with the 2025 Land Use Plan, it is in line with what is going on in Campus Corner as far as developments and pedestrian activity. There was a protest at 4.8%. Staff does support the rezoning request for mixed use and the Land Use Plan change. The applicant is here and has a presentation for you.

**PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:**

1. Barrett Williamson, 1230 Camden Way, the architect for the project – Good evening. Hopefully we'll make your job real easy tonight. Josh gave up tickets to Loud City to be here to run this Powerpoint for us, so we'll get through this as quick as we can. This is one of the first new buildings proposed in the Campus Corner area in decades. I think the other most recent is the 401 Lofts that are east of us, which I wouldn't necessarily call part of Campus Corner. We're excited to share our concept with you tonight, and we intend to set a very high standard for Norman's future core development. Let's go to the first slide. Here are some fast facts. The existing R-3 zoning allowed or required a 15' setback along Boyd, except for the 25' sight triangle. It also allowed 3 stories. With MUD zoning, that allows a 0' setback, which creates more of a street wall, more of an urban core feel. We're proposing 3 stories on the front and rear of the property; it allows up to 6. We didn't feel that that was appropriate scale for the development between the Campus Corner area and the railroad tracks, and we'll go into that in a little more detail. It requires two different unit types on the residential, which we've designated as lofts and flats. The lofts are two-story units; the flats are single-story units. It requires a 20% open space; we're proposing approximately 35% open space, which is

exceeding the requirements of the zoning. It also, with the third story – stories 3 through 4 require an additional 5' setback along our north property line, which we have complied with. We wanted to enhance the street wall. We wanted to articulate our building façade to make it the correct scale for the development, so it's more of a residential scale. We wanted to take advantage of natural lighting and want to use quality materials. This is a site plan. I think it's probably in your packet, but you do see some dashes on there over the parking area. The parking area is completely covered, with the exception of the parking that's off of the alley. One of the things that we wanted to do is get light and air circulation down into the covered parking so that it didn't feel dark and sequestered. One of the other things I wanted to demonstrate – we've got really great developer past performance on this project. This very same team did the Sooner Textbooks – basically five facades along Asp and this is the quality of the project that we propose to do going forward. I want to talk a little bit about some precedents. How many three story buildings are there on Boyd Street? So we started down on the west end. This is the Chouse here, and we're going to work our way east. Newman Hall – 3-1/2 stories. The University obviously exceeds 3 stories. President's House. Whitehead Hall, and it's 3, 4, and 5 stories. Campus Corner, 2 stories. There's our office, we're proud to say. Across the street, Engineering Building. And then Casablanca and you can see the Energy Center in the distance, which will be right across the street from, and then this is our property here. This map currently shows the existing stories along Boyd Street between University and the railroad tracks. If you look up at the top of the graphic – at the top is like an elevation of the buildings. So if you start on the left-hand side, working your way right, we've got 3 stories, which is Whitehead. There's Campus Corner with 2 stories. The pink buildings are across the street to the south, which are the University buildings, and then the yellow building with the 3 is our proposed building. This is a view from our building looking toward the northwest, just to give you an overall idea of how it relates on the site. A view from the southeast. East/southeast as you would go onto Monnett. Looking from Monnett toward the southwest. This is the relationship of the project to the property immediately to the north. This is from the north. One of the things that we made a conscientious effort to do in respect to the neighbors to the north was to not create a long, blank, 3-story façade. We've got a deliberate gap to where we can get winter light down onto the neighbor's property. It's not in the ordinance that we have to do that, but we felt that being a good neighbor that that was important. It also creates light and air and open space for our tenants as well. A little bit later we'll get into a 3-D model that we can show you how the windows and everything are oriented to not have any balconies or anything like that looking down over the neighborhood to the north. The zoning allows 30 units per acre in the mixed use development. We're slightly over that – we may be at 31, but we felt that that was appropriate for this type of development and the development going forward. I know the Planning Commission is going to be wrestling with that issue. I think there's some much higher densities being proposed. We really felt like this was all that the site would hold. We also think that these kind of developments are the future. They promote walkability. They create more energy and street life. People that will be living here won't necessarily be wed to their cars. They'll be able to walk up and down Boyd, Campus Corner, Legacy Trail, over at the University, and so on. This type of project sets a very high standard for future development. I think really importantly it establishes a precedent for the appropriate scale and character of building along the Boyd Corridor. The articulation of the façade, how we tried to break the façade into four separate mini-facades, helps to adjust the scale down to a more pedestrian level. It's also in the zoning ordinance that the facades shouldn't be some big blank slate. It's got clear glazing for the retail sections. Again, that's something that's going to promote the walkability of the area. Kind of as a conclusion, these were some things that we felt were important that we feel like our development addresses very successfully. Now I think we'll go to the 3-D model. One of the things that we were conscientious of in developing these on the north side of the property, was to have the bedrooms toward the property owner with balconies toward the center of the project that would face east and west – the idea being that we wouldn't have people hanging out yelling over the balcony at the neighbors – although we don't expect that kind of tenant because this will be about \$1 to \$1.25 a square foot per month, so not everyone will be able to

afford to live here. It will be upscale and high quality. I think that's something that we took into consideration that we weren't necessarily required to do. One of the letters of protest, of which we received three – in the early models, and at the Pre-Development hearing, we did not have this landscaping shown. We do feel it's appropriate. I believe it's required. It just wasn't anything that we had graphically shown. But we do intend to take advantage of that to try and mitigate the view and some of the noise to the property owner to the north. Now I would like to specifically address the items on the letters of protest. The first one was from the property owner at 914 Monnett. Water runoff and drainage. We actually have less paved area than we would if this was a parking lot. The drainage is required by the code to be directed away from the adjacent properties. The drainage will be developed by a registered civil engineer. So we don't feel like that is something that will impact that neighbor negatively. There was a comment about trash and traffic and noise. Boyd Street being an arterial street with relatively high traffic volumes, there is an inherent amount of noise from that, but we don't feel like we're going to be adding significantly to. Again, the separation, consisting of the combination of landscaping and a privacy fence, will screen the parking lot. They also made a comment about why not just closing in the parking garage. One of our reasons for that is to improve the air circulation and visual security. We don't want it to be a dark place that people don't feel welcome coming into. We want it well-lit and safe feeling. One of the protestors – and this was the same property – mentioned that privacy and said that will be a thing of the past. Well, I don't think it's really fair for us to not develop a project – it's been vacant for many years – just to promote a neighbor's open space. So, regardless of whether this is actually approved or not, something is going to happen with this land. Even if an 8' tall house was built there, their view is going to be blocked. There was a concern about construction traffic and parking. First of all, it's a short-term issue. We don't expect that the construction will be over a year. The construction vehicles will park on the site. Under rare circumstances, there will be temporary disruption of traffic for the off-loading of large equipment and materials. I don't think this is really an unusual thing. It happens on a daily basis on the alley behind our office on Campus Corner. But it will not be nearly as frequent as Campus Corner, because you don't have the beer trucks back there every morning. Deliveries for the future retail business will be via the alley or off of Monnett for large deliveries, similar to the Campus Corner alleys. With the retailers being small, niche retailers of approximately 1,000 feet each, we really anticipate that the majority of the deliveries will be made by small vans with boxes under 12' tall, so many of the deliveries can be actually made into the parking lot. There was a concern about the hours of operations for construction. We don't anticipate that to be but from 8:00 to 5:00. There could be times when it's 7:00 to 4:00, but kind of your typical 8-hour construction day. The last concern expressed by this property owner was on the condition of the infrastructure. The condition and maintenance of the alley – not to point fingers – but that's really the City's responsibility, not ours. Our project will not increase the need for additional maintenance of the alley. Being on the south end of Boyd, we don't anticipate that the tenants that live here, or people coming to shop here, are going to drive 300 feet down an alley when they could take Monnett or Boyd or Asp, just because of the convenience factor. The project's design will also upgrade utilities as required. In the event that we need to increase our sanitary sewer size, which we don't anticipate, but if required we'll do that. Another positive thing is that we're likely going to be relocating all of the electrical underground so that if you noticed in some of the photographs – there's kind of some crazy wires going on over there. That was, by far, the longest letter, so I'm very near the end. 518 Macy had a concern about the building height. The current R-3 zoning allows three stories, so we're not proposing anything more than what would be allowed there under the present zoning. The southern view of the property owner to the north will be cut off by the development. Well, again, the lot will develop regardless, so I don't think that's really a valid concern. The resident of the proposed development will look down on adjacent property to the north. Again, let's kind of go up high and do just a quick circle around. We don't have any balconies proposed on the north. We do have basically a fire stair to egress people off the property that will go down to the parking area. It will be secured. You will have to have access to get into that, even though we're showing it with glass rail. It's not something that just anybody can walk up. Go around to

the alley. On the west side we've got balconies. We've got balconies on the east side. We've got balconies on the south side. All of these are basically sub-divided so there's really not any peaking at your neighbor. Again, the gap here on the north was purposely developed to be considerate of the person to the north's light and air. I think their last comment was architectural congruence. The proposed design is based on what we think of as a timeless scale, proportions and massing. This type of façade is found throughout Norman and the Midwest. It is an updated version of that, but we refer to it architecturally as Plains Commercial. It's characterized by large openings that evoke the storefronts of many historic downtown retail buildings, including those in Norman. This style was constructed from the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century through the Great Depression and is adjacent to Craftsman style residences throughout the country. The last letter of protest was from the property owners of 763 Jenkins. They listed a total of nine comments after the Pre-Development hearing, which I believe we addressed. Only the comment that I'm going to address was actually circled as part of the protest, and that was a question on the affect on the alley, the traffic, and the wear and tear. Again, being directly off Boyd Street, we anticipate that the majority of patrons and residents will arrive to the property from Boyd Street. If the project was mid-block, that may not be the case. Many alleys have similar traffic counts in urban areas. Why would a patron or resident take a congested, poorly paved alley in lieu of a well-maintained Monnett or Boyd Street. In conclusion, 4.76% opposed. In essence, what that says to me is that 95.24% approved. We have endeavored to go beyond the minimum requirements outlined in the MUD zoning ordinance. We have proposed more open space than what was required, widened perimeter sidewalks for additional walkability, and conscientiously designed the building forms to give additional consideration of the neighboring properties. We feel we are setting a precedent that will further guide high-quality development along the Boyd Street corridor. With that, I will distribute a handout of this for you and be available to answer any questions.

2. Mr. Lewis – First, I'm wondering how soon you're taking reservations on unit #8. I think it's a wonderful project. My second question really is more just for my peace of mind. If you can go back to the diagram that shows the alley and shows us where the trash receptacle is going to be – is there going to be any type of fencing? So if the wind started blowing, it wouldn't be blowing right into the neighbor's back door.

3. Mr. Williamson – There will be an enclosure around the dumpster. The fence will also help. The dumpster enclosure is actually required as part of the City ordinance, as is the privacy fence.

4. Ms. Pailles – Could we see the western façade? The front there – the bottom is stores. Are the second and third floor along the front façade facing Boyd empty spaces? Is that true? Am I reading that right?

5. Mr. Williamson – They're balconies. They don't have roofs, but they've got walls. So you have a view.

6. Ms. Pailles – Well, here's my deal. The MUD designation I don't technically have a problem with. I have a big problem with how much it crowds that house to the north. And, actually, those apartments could scoot forward by – what? – 25 feet and give the house behind you a little space. Let me just be more specific. The house behind you is really crowded. If you had R-3, you'd have to have a setback of about 25' ...

7. Mr. Williamson – 15' on the side yard, so it would buy them 5 more feet.

8. Ms. Pailles – That's a back yard, actually. Boyd is in the front and that house is behind you.

9. Mr. Williamson – The lots front Monnett. Because if you look at the property to the north, look how close they are to their south property line.

10. Ms. Pailles – But actually your frontage for the stores is really – I won't argue that. It's just how much it crowds that house. I have a real problem with that. We've talked a lot about smart growth. We're having long city discussions on density. And part of the presentation by the staff to orient us all on it was talk about new urbanism, which was supposed to bring forward the virtues of neighborhoods as designed in the 20s and 30s, pre-car. Well, you've got a neighborhood here that was designed in the 20s and 30s, and this totally overwhelms it. It's totally out of scale. It's totally out of architectural congruence and it's looking right into their back yards. So, while the MUD is great – that's a good thing – I find your perching in their side yard to be a little bit much, and you probably have some options. Your second and third floors actually have some wiggle room there architecturally.

11. Mr. Knotts – You have commercial installations here. Where are the customers going to park?

12. Mr. Williamson – They'll park in the parking lot off of the alley and underneath the buildings.

13. Mr. Knotts – So the parking underneath the buildings is not restricted or carded or anything like that?

14. Mr. Williamson – It's part of the new MUD ordinance, but it's shared parking, because the residents are expected to be gone during certain times of the day and then the customers use them. But basically from 5:00 on all the parking is for residential.

15. Mr. Knotts – Including the commercial on the alley?

16. Mr. Williamson – We needed 1.8 per unit, so I've got the calculations. It's 1.8 times 13, so it's about 24 spaces are required for the residential. I believe we've got 36 proposed in our development. But at nighttime, when the retail is closed, you've got places for visitors and guests to park as well.

17. Mr. Knotts – Well, in that area, I would expect the retail to be open until 9:00 at least.

18. Mr. Williamson – It could be. There's no parking required for Campus Corner businesses. But there are going to be people walking up and down the street that are going to shop at these places, in addition to people just coming by car.

19. Mr. Knotts – Of course, what I'm concerned about, and the reason for my question, is that, if you don't have adequate on-site commercial parking, that parking will wind up on Monnett or any of the other side streets walking in and it's better for the neighborhood not to have that happen.

20. Mr. Williamson – I agree. The parking does meet the zoning ordinance – all the parking calculations. I believe that Jane reviewed those. We went through all those together. One other thing, just to point out, we're not anticipating any restaurants in this retail development. It's going to be retail merchants. So there's not going to be any food service in these, and those do draw cars.

#### **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

1. Elizabeth Jackson, 763 Jenkins Avenue – We met the gentleman when they came to the Pre-Development meeting. Some of the problems – they were kind enough after the meeting to

take our input and I thought they were going to make some changes, because they were all in kind of agreement about the parking on the alley and how you're going to get in and out. But I expected to see some kind of diagram showing that they had taken – actually, there were suggestions – into account. And they were saying that's a good idea. Because these people are going to be trying to back out. There's the other little shopping mall right across the alley where people are parking, and then we have the city services – our polycarts are on the alley, our recycling bins are on the alley. It's a busy alley. And to say – these are just assumptions, I think, that were made – that, oh, people are not going to drive north on the alley; they're all going to go south onto Boyd Street. And if there's traffic on Boyd Street, there's going to be some congestion. But I think that it should be dealt with before any brick or mortar is put down. If you go north on the alley, it's very old. It has been resurfaced, but it's been ages and it gets a lot of wear and tear. We drive down the alley because that's where our carport – we're usually driving down the alley. And we go north on the alley usually, but we can go south. There's a lot of use. There are other – the strip mall that has the comic book shop and the restaurant – they must have 50 parking places that enter and exit – some on the alley, some have the exits onto Jenkins Street. We've lived there for over 30 years and you get used to it when you become a part of the neighborhood. People who are not used to it – people moving in to these nice apartments or the retail visiting those – I think they're going to have problems that they are not really wanting to consider. I agree that there was not enough space between the north side of the building and the neighbor to the north. First we saw about this when we got the mail was that there was going to be no space. Then when we came to the meeting, 10-15 feet – I mean, 5-10 feet. And now they're just saying it's back to 5 feet. And I think that's just pushing it a little bit for the neighbor to the north. I can't think of anything else. I will say it is a beautiful design. I admire the architects for coming up with it. I think it's too large for the lot and should be scaled back and they're going to have to deal with the parking for everybody to be satisfied with it. Thank you.

2. Cheryl Clayton, 503 Tulsa – I live in the core area of town. I agree. I think this could be a nice development. What concerns me about it, and the precedent it's setting, has to do with parking. The way I calculate it, there would be, in fact, the 24 parking places that were needed for the residents, and then I calculated 27 parking places at 1 per 200 square feet for the retail. The 28 covered parking spaces are controlled access, so that really only leaves uncontrolled 8 parking spaces. Living in the core area of town, what you have to appreciate – if you don't live there – is the extent to which the University parking and retail parking, and my neighborhood being The Mont, has pushed itself into the neighborhood. These streets are small. It's really hard to accommodate that kind of parking. Plus, it's the older part of town and it has little one-car driveways, so when you try to get in and out of your driveway and you have people – the people park just bumper to bumper right up to the edge of your driveway. It's just darn near impossible, sometimes, to get out. So I think as we go forward with this – and I think we all recognize we're going to have some higher densities here in this part of town – but we really need to address the parking issue. And if we have to fudge somewhere – and I really hate to say this, because I do love the landscaping and all that – but I'd almost rather see the buffers and stuff go and have adequate parking, because it really does affect those of us who live in this neighborhood. So I hope as you go forward, we will make sure that we have adequate parking. Thank you.

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

1. Mr. Lewis – I want to make sure that I understood you correctly in regards to parking. The parking that is underneath the building is not going to be controlled access. It is going to be open prior to the hours of 5:00 p.m. for the use of the businesses that are there. Is that correct?

2. Mr. Williamson – The controlled access is maybe something that is not fully understood how we're planning on implementing that. We're looking at using a token type lot, so if you're a resident you have a card to swipe, you come in and you park. If you're a customer, you come

in, the gate goes up, you get a token to get out. So it's not closed off to the public during retail business hours.

3. Mr. Lewis – So those parking spaces are going to be accessible.

4. Mr. Williamson – Absolutely. It won't work with 8 parking spaces.

5. Mr. Lewis – I'm trying to be clear because there was some misunderstanding. Those parking spaces underneath the building are going to be accessible by the patrons of the businesses that are in the building as well as the residents.

6. Mr. Williamson – Absolutely.

7. Ms. Gordon – According to the staff report, the summary of the request – and just tell me if this is in line with what it is – it says the target market is young professionals or, perhaps, employees of the University who want to walk to work and have pedestrian access to Campus Corner area, which means they won't be leaving with their cars during the day if that's your target market. Is that right?

8. Mr. Williamson – Some may, but really our target market is whoever has got the money to pay \$1.25 a square foot.

9. Ms. Gordon – Clearly. But my point is that you may have quite a few of those people that choose to live there that could potentially be University employees and may just walk to work and it doesn't free up those parking spaces. Is that a possibility?

10. Mr. Williamson – It is. If you take that same rationale of thinking, if you don't need a car – or if you don't need two cars and maybe you just have one, because in higher density developments where people can walk and get their food they don't need two cars because both earnings partners are not commuting to work.

11. Ms. Gordon – There is no one in Oklahoma that doesn't need a car. I see what you're saying.

12. Mr. Williamson – People who seek out these kind of developments – and there are a high number of those and you can start looking at Bricktown and areas like that – there are people in Oklahoma in the last 10 years that have reduced the number of cars that they own because they live by where they work. I would like to remind and reinforce that everything on this entire block, not just our corner, is zoned R-3. So this zoning, and this ability to go three stories, extends to the north, I believe, all the way to Duffy Street.

13. Ms. Pailes – Would it be possible to cut straight through that parking garage from east to west?

14. Mr. Williamson – It is. Currently it is designed that way.

15. Ms. Pailes – That seems like not a good idea because if people can shortcut, they will, if they want to avoid messing with Boyd or something.

16. Mr. Williamson – Do you mean pedestrians or automobiles? There are gated entrances into the parking lot.

17. Mr. Boeck – You can ram those gates, and judging from the gate success stories or issues around Campus Corner there's no gates left.



18. Mr. Williamson – There's a gate on my lot. I would say we park right behind Campus Corner and that alley is absolutely busier than the alley between Monnett and Jenkins and has probably more parking in it. It still has a lot of people's garages and access. That alley works, as does the controlled access parking that I rent. I live in that environment.

*Chris Lewis moved to recommend approval of Resolution No. R-1112-141 and Ordinance No. O-1112-44 to the City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.*

19. Mr. Gasaway – I'm kind of a preservationist at heart, so when we do projects in existing core area neighborhoods, I like to give them a significant amount of thought. As I'm prone to do when I think, I ramble a little bit. So I have some rambling thoughts about the project. First of all, a lot of these projects are coming up in the campus area and it makes me a little sad but, as a city, we're still not prepared with specific recommendations on what we feel is appropriate in these areas, both in terms of density and height. We're just starting a study that I think will be very beneficial. This one certainly is a lot different than the one we had last month. It's significantly different. But still, I think it's something we ought to think about highly. One advantage to this property is it's already vacant. We're not tearing down any houses. That would be of large concern to me, but it's been vacant for many years. So we're not destroying any property. If this project is done correctly, it could be a fine example that will set a standard for some of these other developments that people are wanting to do in this area. If it's not done well, it will be exactly the opposite – something that we're stuck with for 50 years. It looks like it's a pretty good example of something that is a good blend of campus itself – of the University – and of Campus Corner. I realize it's a little large, but I think with the campus and Campus Corner there, this is probably a good fit for that niche. A few concerns that I have. One, it has been mentioned, it does impact the house to the north, and I think that should always be a concern. Probably my biggest concern is that it, to some extent, opens up some spillover onto Monnett. I hear from time to time that there are some interests in property along Monnett for this specific use. That is a residential neighborhood and this kind of tips the corner a little bit into doing some of that on Monnett. I think at all costs we need to remember that Monnett is a residential street. While this particular project impacts that some, it's not directly onto Monnett, but I think anything else – there's a vacant lot, I think, one house up from this which makes it kind of an open property to open that up, and I think we should be very mindful of that – you know, that Monnett needs to remain a residential area. Those are my concerns. I think the positive part of it outweighs that, so I will be supporting it. But I just want everybody to be mindful – above all this is the back yard to a residential area and I think the architects have done a good job working with that and, again, I think the design, being collegiate, is a good buffer between those two.

20. Chairman Sherrer – Just a point of confirmation for staff. The current zoning allows three story buildings, correct?

21. Ms. Connors – Correct. This property is zoned R-3, as well as all the property around Monnett.

22. Chairman Sherrer – So there's no additional height by this change?

23. Ms. Connors – That's correct.

24. Ms. Pailes – It is zoned R-3 three stories, but with R-3 you would have a bigger setback, and it is the setback that I find most upsetting. At three stories it doesn't impact just the house next door – it impacts the neighborhood because they can look down on a good chunk of the houses. Everybody points to OU as having very large buildings. That's true. OU has definitely gotten in the giant direction, but they do offset it with actual open ground, not just balconies

and other things that technically count as open space, but actually open ground. So, yes, they do build very large scale, but they do offset it with actual open space. I would like to split this in terms of voting. I'll be happy to vote for the MUD designation. I don't think I can vote for this particular plan. So can we go ahead and split those?

25. Chairman Sherrer noted that there was already a motion on the floor.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend approval of Resolution No. R-1112-141 and Ordinance No. O-1112-44 to the City Council passed by a vote of 7-2.

\* \* \*