

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

FEBRUARY 8, 2018

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 8th day of February, 2018. 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 Neil Robinson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sandy Bahan
Nouman Jan
Neil Robinson
Erin Williford
Lark Zink (arrived at 6:38 p.m.)
Dave Boeck
Tom Knotts
Andy Sherrer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Chris Lewis

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
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
Drew Norlin, Asst. Development Coordinator
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator
Kathryn Walker, Assistant City Attorney
Elisabeth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney

* * *

Mr. Robinson indicated that the company he works for has an interest in the next item. He asked to be recused on this item.

Dave Boeck moved to allow Neil Robinson to be recused on this item. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to allow Mr. Robinson's recusal on this item, passed by a vote of 7-0.

Mr. Robinson left the room, and Mr. Knotts chaired this portion of the meeting.

* * *

Item No. 9, being:

O-1718-33 – CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE OF NORMAN REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A SCHOOL OFFERING GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES, FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT WITH SPECIAL USE FOR A CHURCH, AND LOCATED AT 1801 N. PORTER AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site – Aerial Photo
4. Site Development Map
5. Special Use Exterior Appearance Variance 1-26-16
6. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports the Special Use which includes the Site Development Map Regulations and recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1718-33.
2. Mr. Boeck – If we approve this and it goes through City Council with the school option, if they decided they wanted to build a couple more classrooms, then they could just get a building permit, assuming they meet all the other regulations for site coverage and things like that to build some more classroom buildings. Is that how that would work?
3. Ms. Greenlee – Well, this site plan regulates that special use, so they would only be allowed at three. If they decided at a point where they would want to come back and do additional buildings, they would have to come in and amend their site plan.
4. Mr. Knotts – You described them as portable metal buildings. On wheels?
5. Ms. Greenlee – No, they would be not on wheels. I believe they would be stationary. I cannot say for sure, but – they'll be anchored to the ground, much like the Norman Public School portable buildings.

6. Mr. Knotts – Do you know the square footage of each building? They look all the same. You're limited by 8' on a – you can go 10', but that's as wide as you can get and these appear to be wider than that.
7. Ms. Greenlee – They did not say how big the portable metal buildings will be, but I imagine that they're going to be ...
8. Mr. Boeck – You keep saying like the ones the public schools have. Tom, they're bigger than 8 to 10' wide. They're classroom buildings.
9. Mr. Knotts – That's my point. I'm not sure that they're – unless they're two pieces.
10. Ms. Bahan – Well, the ones for the school district, the school district builds themselves and they're like 20 by 40 or 30 by 40 – something like that.
11. Mr. Knotts – So they're really not portable buildings.
12. Ms. Bahan – They can be picked up and moved, but not easily.
13. Mr. Boeck – The Norman Public School buildings are still called portable, because they can move them.
14. Ms. Bahan – They can dismantle them and move them to wherever they need to move them to. But this is not a part of the public school system. This school is a separate school.
15. Ms. Greenlee – It's a charter school. Correct.
16. Mr. Boeck – Getting its license from Norman Public Schools.
17. Ms. Bahan – No. It's got its permission from the State. It used to be part of Norman Public Schools.
18. Ms. Greenlee – It did. It was the French immersion program at Reagan.
19. Ms. Bahan – But this charter school is not part of Norman Public Schools.
20. Mr. Boeck – Okay, because you originally said it was.
21. Ms. Greenlee – I did say that it was. But I must have gotten some wrong information. I apologize.
22. Ms. Bahan – They're chartered through the State. They're not chartered by the Norman Public Schools.
23. Mr. Sherrer – I've got a question for clarification. On the 80% variance for the masonry requirements, I understand that applies to these buildings, but anything else to do with the church? Does that also extend to that level if they were to build any other structures, or is it just related to use of a school?
24. Ms. Greenlee – Just to the use of the school. The special use for the church had masonry requirements.
25. Mr. Boeck – That was something we approved earlier.

26. Ms. Greenlee – Yes. That was already approved with the special use for the church. And their masonry requirements match the existing church building.
27. Ms. Bahan – Will these buildings have restrooms in them?
28. Ms. Greenlee – That I do not know.
29. Ms. Bahan – Because the portables in Norman Public Schools don't have bathrooms in them, at least the ones at the high school don't.
30. Ms. Greenlee – The applicant is here to make a presentation and maybe he can give a little bit more detail on some of those specifics.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, 136 Thompson Drive, representing the applicant – I'll be very brief. There's a large crowd for the next item, obviously, so we'll move quickly on this one. Janay covered just about everything. If we get into the details of the school, or its operations, I probably would have to defer back to the client who is here with us tonight. Let me just cover a couple of things. This is already 2025 Institutional, which means for schools, churches, hospitals; so 2025 makes this an appropriate site for a school. I would just say that sites like this function very well. Churches function very well as a co-location for schools and church because, obviously, the church is an intense use on the weekends; the schools use it during the week and they're a wonderful mix of uses when you get into this situation.

As Janay said, the only additional thing we're asking for tonight really is you see labeled 14 – the pink buildings. The rest of this was already approved as a special use previously. We're not asking for any changes. We're not asking for any diminishment of any of that; that is still in place. We think that's important and we're not asking to change it at all. So still the same.

I would just note one other thing. There was a question from a neighbor as to drainage. The drainage goes to the east – completely to the east. And, obviously, the site is very large – tremendous amount of pervious ground here. We're going to be – even if you fully build this out, we're going to be at about 40% impervious. R-1 allows 65% impervious. We will be nowhere near any kind of an issue at that point.

So, again, very good co-location of uses. There have been no protests. Nobody came to the Pre-Development hearing. So staff supports, and we would ask for your support as well. I'm happy to answer any questions you have. Thank you.

2. Mr. Boeck – Except for the bathroom question.
3. Mr. Rieger – I apologize. Yes, bathrooms inside these facilities. Yes.
4. Mr. Knotts – Could you define portable for me?
5. Mr. Rieger – You know, as I sat there and thought about it, portable is a concept of buildings that we see often now, and the one that popped into my head was if you remember the Moore hospital that got blown away, and we had temporary buildings put in place for the Moore hospital. Temporary buildings can be quite large nowadays and they can be structures that are moved in to accommodate really large uses. So I don't have a photo for you tonight, and I apologize that I don't, but these would be basically portable or temporary buildings that would certainly be fully accommodating of the classroom uses and the restrooms and everything they need.
6. Mr. Boeck – You could also use the term modular.
7. Mr. Rieger – Modular is good. Yes.

8. Ms. Bahan – Are these going to be owned by the school or by the church.
9. Mr. Rieger – They would be leased.
10. Ms. Bahan – But the church will construct them and own them?
11. Mr. Rieger – I think the school would be.
12. Unidentified – Ground lease from the church.
13. Ms. Bahan – Oh, you're just leasing the ground, but you're bringing in the buildings. You'll take the buildings with you if you go somewhere else?
14. Mr. Rieger – Correct. The school is responsible for the buildings.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Kay Womack, 1720 Oriole Court – I came hoping to get more information, and I have gotten some information. I live in the neighborhood – Sutton Place. I came to try to clarify some rumors I've heard regarding this. The letter we received from the Planning Commission did not clarify the fact that this was to be for a charter school, so I thought it was the church going to establish a school, so I think it was not very clear as to what is going on. You've clarified, I believe, tonight that the church will own the buildings but lease them to the school. Is that correct? No.
2. Unidentified – No. The school will lease the buildings from an outside vendor, and just lease ground from the church.
3. Ms. Womack – How long does the school expect to be in these buildings? Four years? Ten years?
4. Ms. Connors – If you could just say all your questions, we'll get the applicant back to address them.
5. Ms. Womack – Okay. That's one question. How long will the school be in the buildings? Did the school look at any other locations? I realize being the charter school and the purpose, it will grow in number of students over time, but starting out how many students are we talking about? Eventually what will be the number of students? And let me see if I can remember my thought here. I do have some concerns. Oh, my thought is with the problems with education funding right now, is this the time to start a charter school? And I sympathize with the group who wants to have this charter school. I was a modern language major at OU years ago, so I really believe in learning languages. I was never immersed in a language program, but I can sympathize with that. I don't know if this is the right location and place to do that.
6. Mr. Rieger – Let me answer some of those questions, if I could. How long? Of course, we hope a very long time. We hope this is a very successful operation. I could say this client is very excited about this. The French immersion program, unfortunately, was lost at Reagan. We're very excited that somebody is picking this up and running with it, and it's a neat day, really, in a lot of ways. What other locations did they look at? I don't know. This is the one in front of you and this is the one that we're asking for tonight. As to the number of students, the initial concept would bring it through pre-K through fourth grade, and we anticipate roughly 160 students total. As to the plan is probably for about five year plan of growth, as you add a grade each year – pretty common on schools like this, they add a grade each year as they grow. We anticipate somewhere, probably, over 300 – a little over 300 at max complete build-out when they get

there. But it would be a slow crawl, I think, to get there as they grow with the program. Thank you.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Boeck – Just glad to see bringing back something like this to Norman. I was really disappointed that we lost the program in the Norman Public Schools that we had.

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1718-33 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 | Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Erin Williford, Andy Sherrer |
| NAYES | Sandy Bahan |
| RECUSED | Neil Robinson |
| MEMBERS ABSENT | Chris Lewis |

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1718-33 to City Council, passed by a vote of 6-1, with one member recused.

* * *

Mr. Robinson returned to the meeting.

* * *