

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

NOVEMBER 12, 2015

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 12th day of November, 2015. 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 Sandy Bahan called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. She welcomed Dawn Jourdan to the Planning Commission.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Sherrer
Roberta Pailes
Erin Williford
Tom Knotts
Sandy Bahan
Dawn Jourdan
Dave Boeck
Chris Lewis
Cindy Gordon

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
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator

* * *

Item No. 6a, being:

R-1516-26 – FULTON WORSTER GROUP, ON BEHALF OF NANCY GUERRA AND DON HATCHER, REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN, FROM OFFICE DESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE S.W. AND BROOKS STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

Item No. 6b, being:

O-1516-20 – FULTON WORSTER GROUP, ON BEHALF OF NANCY GUERRA AND DON HATCHER, REQUESTS REZONING FROM RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, TO C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE S.W. AND BROOKS STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report

Item No. 6c, being:

PP-1516-11 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY NANCY GUERRA AND DON HATCHER (PRIORITY LAND SURVEYING, L.L.C.) FOR HATCHER ADDITION FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.62 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE S.W. AND BROOKS STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan
6. Request for Alley Waiver
7. Pre-Development Summary
8. Greenbelt Commission Comments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – This application has three parts to it: the 2025 land use amendment, as well as a plat and rezoning. The existing land use in this area consists of office to the north and east of this subject tract. We have high density residential to the south, commercial and high density residential to the southwest, and additional high density residential and office across the street on 24th Avenue. The land use change would bring this site into the commercial designation if approved. The existing zoning on this site is RM-6. We have RM-6 as well as C-2 to the north of this site. We have RM-2 to the east, RM-6 to the south, with additional C-1 and RM-6 to the west across 24th Avenue. The existing land uses in this area consist of office, some higher density residential to the east of this tract, and higher density residential to the south. There is an institutional use at the southwest corner of 24th and Brooks, with additional apartments to the west. This is an aerial of the site itself. As you can see, the single family home is still in place. There is a larger area to the north of that site. This is the existing home and that's a picture of the area to the north of the home. All of that will be included in the preliminary plat. This is looking north on 24th Avenue. There are some office uses in this area, and that does carry the C-2 zoning as well. This is the office use that is directly north of this subject tract. Looking south on 24th, you can see there is retail commercial. The institutional use is right here at this corner. The apartments to the south across Brooks, and the apartments across 24th on the west side. These are the combination duplex and triplex use to the east of this site; they do access off Brooks. This is the preliminary plat for Hatcher Addition that will consist of two lots. This is the proposed site plan for that area. Again, this is just a proposed site plan; the new owners could come in and take up the entire area, or they could buy one of the lots. As stated, this area has been built out

since the 70s, or possibly early 80s. These uses are definitely more intense than the existing single family use that was there on this site. Staff believes that this is a good in-fill product for this hard corner at Brooks and 24th, and we do support this request and we recommend approval of Preliminary Plat PP-1516-11, the resolution R-1516-26, as well as the ordinance O-1516-20. I am available for any questions you might have. The applicant's representative is here for a presentation.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Brad Worster, representing the applicant, 132 North Santa Fe – Staff's presentation had a lot of the same things I did, so I'm going to go through these pretty quickly and then speak a little bit more toward the actual design of the site toward the end. It is on the northeast corner of Brooks and 24th Street and primarily undeveloped. The house itself probably takes up maybe a third or a fifth of the lot and the rest of it has some ancillary buildings or has never been constructed on. The house itself was built in 1955, which was actually prior to this area of town even being annexed into Norman. Norman was annexed on this, I believe, in 1960. So that's where the zoning sort of started, because they said there's a house on the property, we'll call it R-1 in 1960. I thought it was a little interesting to compare these two side-by-side to see how such a big swath of this has all been zoned RM-6, just like the subject property, but the intended uses was never really to be that intense for multi-family zoning. Then I have some of the same sort of pictures here, walking south on 24th Avenue. That's Westpark Drive – office uses, commercial buildings. There is a nursing home/assisted living facility on the west side of the road. This was an infill medical office use. That's directly to the west of the property, and south. The property has been listed for sale for the last several years and has not been able to be sold as a single parcel zoned multi-family with a land use of office, so we've looked at splitting that into two potential separate lots but connecting them with a cross-access easement so that there would only be one entrance on 24th Avenue and one on Brooks Street. That's the site plan again. I thought it would be a little more helpful if you could see how that site plan lays out on top of the aerial, so you can kind of see the scope. On the east side and the north side, we've designed in a large landscape buffer. There's a utility easement and then the drives themselves also buffer the property from the actual structures and the parking areas. That outlines where the cross access drive would be. Utility vehicles and service vehicles would use that to get to both proposed lots. And that's a quick presentation from the applicant. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

2. Ms. Pailles – The detention pond – is that sloped grassy type of construction?

Mr. Worster – Yes. All of the drainage currently goes from the intersection and then it actually flows to the northeast. We've just let it keep flowing in that direction, then used the detention pond as a buffer again toward the multi-family use there, and it will slowly drain out from the detention pond. It's not a concrete structure. It will just be all grassy berm.

3. Mr. Knotts – Are you dependent on percolation for drainage – I don't see a connection.

Mr. Worster – The preliminary drainage study did allow it to more or less percolate out. It does drain to the north. We based that study on just about as much pervious surface as you can see there. We added a lot more parking than what would be needed for a total of 6,000 feet and it does appear that the engineers have that set up where it will be able to work from that direction.

Mr. Knotts – I don't see any data that says what kind of perc rate it has. This looks like a mess in the back of where these duplexes on the east side are going to have to smell what – for a period of time. Because once you dig this out, I don't think you're going to get to sand. I think you need to think of some kind of structured drainage for this pond.

Mr. Worster – This entire area is a bit of a challenge. I think there is a total of two feet of slope across this whole site, to the street. And it really goes that way in all directions. It doesn't really slope until you get on the other side of 24th Street. So it's a very flat area of town. There is enough room, if the site is built up a little bit, to be able to move water out. We looked at a

worst case scenario as far as from the engineering figures. Again, I'm not the engineer. But I trust that his calculations have all been correct. Will it end up with that much parking area? It's possible; that's why we've showed it. But it could have almost half of that less, which would allow for really plenty of space to have that work. Again, this is a preliminary plat. If we move forward with a final plat and a specific building plan, then we could either bring in an additional detention easement or drainage easement along the north edge of the property and get it to 24th Street. We just require storm sewers.

4. Mr. Boeck – Just for clarification, has a civil engineer been involved in the preliminary?

Mr. Worster – Yes. Absolutely. They've done all of the engineering.

Mr. Danner – Yes, we've had a drainage report submitted and it has been reviewed by the professional engineers – City engineer and development engineer. It is going to be a challenge regarding the detention and how it is released. It may have to be moved further to the south to sheet flow release to the north where it's currently going. So those are typically with final designs.

5. Mr. Knotts – I would just say that this looks like a problem, and the problem could be impacting people off-site. So I think that's something that really needs to be reviewed.

Mr. Danner – And that's one of the things they're looking at, is because they don't want to impact the property owner to the north.

6. Ms. Jourdan – I'd like to address the adequacy of the buffer next to the multi-family housing. I see a greenscape presented there. Is there fencing as well?

Mr. Worster – I believe there's going to be fencing required for any commercial zoning to a residential use, so there would be a site-proof fence that would be installed prior to any other construction.

Ms. Jourdan – Can you tell me a little bit about the road that passes through the site – anticipated flow and so forth?

Mr. Worster – We haven't really designed this to be a giant shopping center. We've looked at this total site, I think, as under 6,000 square feet of total floor space, which is less than 100 vehicles a day, with I think 80-ish on any given peak hour. Anybody turning, even on peak traffic hours -- we specifically set it up so that anybody leaving either parcel 1 or 2 could come back through to Brooks and make a left-hand turn at the light which is a signaled turn lane, and wouldn't have to try to be turning across four lanes of traffic. The way it's designed will hopefully deter anybody from trying to use it as a shortcut to get around the light, because it makes them make six turns instead of one, which would also keep traffic from zipping across the development. Does that answer your question? Okay.

7. Ms. Pailes – The type of business that will be here is unspecified. Is that correct?

Mr. Worster – We don't have a user planned at this time, no.

Ms. Pailes – How can you anticipate traffic demand not knowing what kind of business is there?

Mr. Worster – Well, that's a very good question. It will ultimately come down to when they do a building permit, if their traffic count is higher or if the use is higher, then they'll have to go back and come back through and redo a whole traffic study and see if that's going to work or not. That would be caught at the actual physical development stage.

8. Ms. Williford – Have you considered the traffic that happens at about 8:30 and 3:30 every day with Whittier getting out, because it's kind of a mess right now and I have concerns, even with the cutout, about all the students that are walking and the backup on both of those turn lanes, going right out of Brooks, turning right onto Brooks, left – all of those.

Mr. Worster – I'll let the traffic engineer talk.

Mr. Riesland – The first thing that you look at with any development is how many peak hour trips is it going to generate? This is going to generate less than 100 during the peak hour, so

a traffic study is not required because of that. Commercial developments don't tend to have their peaks at that same time that you're talking about, so we don't view that really as creating any more out there than what there is now.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1516-26, Ordinance No. O-1516-20, and PP-1516-11, the Preliminary Plat for HATCHER ADDITION, with an alley waiver, to the City Council. Roberta Pailes seconded the motion.

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

YEAS

NAYES

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Sherrer, Roberta Pailes, Tom Knotts, Sandy Bahan,
Dawn Jourdan, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon
Erin Williford
None

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1516-26, Ordinance No. O-1516-20, and PP-1516-11 with an alley waiver, to the City Council, passed by a vote of 8-1.

* * *