

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

MARCH 13, 2014

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Complex, 201 West Gray Street, on the 13th day of March 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 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Curtis McCarty
Jim Gasaway
Roberta Pailes
Tom Knotts
Chris Lewis
Cindy Gordon
Dave Boeck
Sandy Bahan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Sherrer

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
Scott Sturtz, City Engineer

* * *

Item No. 12, being:

PRESENTATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (DRAFT) AND PUBLIC MEETING

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (Draft)
2. Appendices

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Riesland, project manager for the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, introduced Eddie Haas with Freese & Nichols.

PRESENTATION BY THE CONSULTANT:

Eddie Haas, Freese & Nichols, the consultant for the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, presented an overview of the plan in a PowerPoint presentation. The Public Hearing is tentatively slated for the Planning Commission meeting in April.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

There were no members of the public in attendance at this time.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Knotts – One of those little corridors that I tried to keep alive all the time that I was at the University, and that is Constitution at Jenkins and Imhoff.
2. Mr. Haas – This still shows that offset, but on the map in the back we have made that connection.
3. Mr. Knotts – Just as an FYI, Constitution is 77T, from Classen to Jenkins. I required that the bridges over on Constitution would support three lanes. So the idea was to have, once that connection is made, you could designate two lanes out entering the Lloyd Noble Center. I think it needs to be constructed right now, because the land is empty.
4. Mr. Sturtz – There are currently conversations ongoing about that and aligning that offset there of those two streets along Jenkins. We've actually had some preliminary meetings. OU is looking at doing a project to rework a portion of Imhoff there in front of the Lloyd Noble Center and they stopped in anticipation of looking at what can be done to align that and make that a more useable area.
5. Mr. McCarty – I had a question for staff. I saw some dates up here. Does this mean that in April we're wanting to adopt this, or is it just going to be something we accept? What is going to be the long-term goal of this?
6. Ms. Connors – The goal is to adopt this as the Transportation Plan. We were trying to find venues, and this was one, for public meetings. We advertised this so that the public could come and give input into this. So at the public hearing, we will be making a recommendation to City Council for adoption.
7. Mr. McCarty – So, if we have questions about things in here, who do we contact?
8. Ms. Connors – You can contact David Riesland. We will get you his email.
9. Mr. Boeck – I don't see any roundabouts anywhere.
10. Mr. Haas – We have not identified specific areas for roundabouts. What we have said is key linkages need to have functional class and/or number of lanes. I presume you're alluding to Lindsey. But Lindsey there has been, in Appendix D or E, is kind of a conceptual idea of the

Lindsey corridor and there are some roundabouts in there. But we did not want to be specific in saying you have to a roundabout here. In that special corridor it is still to be determined.

11. Mr. McCarty – From the City's perspective, what's the highest priority that we need to look at in the top two or three or five items right now that Dave identified that are big problems for us?

12. Mr. Haas – In the action items to be implemented as soon as possible, these would involve the adoption – adopt the thoroughfare plan; adopt the bicycle and pedestrian plan; adopt the Norman engineering design criteria and standard specs – those are kind of wrapped into all of these things. Some of the complete streets policies. These are all tied to this plan. In order to implement this thing, we need adoption. We need to say, yes, we're doing this; we're adopting this thing. Another key action item is adopt the traffic impact assessment preparation review guidelines, so that staff has the ability to be looking at traffic implications as it relates to new developments. Revitalize the City's traffic calming program. Already some good work that's been done by staff as it relates to the traffic calming – traffic circles and things like that. Submit the CTP – this plan – to ACOG, so that the regional NPO can see that this is our statement of transportation.

13. Mr. Boeck – This is like any other plan – like the 2025 – it's subject to revisions and changes.

14. Mr. Haas – That's an excellent point. This is the vision of how we're moving forward based on the work that we've done to date as it relates to your future land use – 2025 – and modeling that's been associated with it. So it's a guide so that things are going to change over time. You're going to have development occurring. You're going to have changing ideas and maybe changing trends. So this needs to be reviewed, at least every ten years, if not sooner, depending on how trends are going or how things are progressing in the community. But then we also have specific project recommendations.

15. Mr. McCarty – I'll look through that. I was just kind of curious. So, in your professional opinion, you typically see transportation plans and updated land use plans being done at the same time?

16. Mr. Haas – Yeah. They really kind of need to be done hand-in-hand. The Norman 2025 Plan – I think that's – how many years old, now, Susan?

17. Ms. Connors – It's almost ten now – 2004.

18. Mr. Haas – And we've talked about this with staff as part of a planning charette – what areas might have some change? We felt that the plan was a good basis of how we could at least model the community. So that served as a basis. We recognize that there could be some changes. I think you've seen some things on potential mixed use areas, or maybe some of the special area planning that could be occurring. What we started from was the 2025 Plan – so the vision that was set there. What are the traffic implications that stem from that? But to add to the flexibility if there are some changing dynamics, that's where we have standards that have flexibility in terms of different roadway configurations.

19. Mr. McCarty – So if we adopt this, does that mean every time that we deviate from this that it's got to go before somebody for approval? Does it become a live document that, if we deviate from the plan, that we come back for approval?

20. Ms. Connors – I've never seen it handled that way in other communities. Unlike the comprehensive plan, which indicates that if you're going to change it, you're going to amend it

– that doesn't usually happen with a transportation plan. It's certainly a policy document and, if it's strayed from, then it's noted in the approval process. But don't usually go through and amend that plan because we don't actually want to amend the plan.

I just want to make one other comment. We felt that we needed to do a transportation plan because we've never really done one, and because of the cost of doing one from scratch that's really what has postponed the land use plan amendment. I know that they'll be looked at and they'll be done hand-in-hand, and, of course, we can amend this document, too. It will be like the comprehensive plan. If we need to amend it, we can.

21. Mr. Boeck – I guess my only comment is one of my issues has always been with the lane widths and the configurations of major intersections – age accessibility, or just accessibility in general – about how pedestrians can use those intersections and navigate them more simply. I know it has to do when you've got six lanes or eight lanes – I haven't heard that being addressed.

22. Mr. Haas – Well, it's indirectly part of the sidewalk plan. You've got gaps in your sidewalk network where you'll have, maybe a portion going up to an intersection, then you don't have on the other side and the pedestrians are maybe crossing this way when they should be crossing. So that's part of the solution. But really it's part of sidewalk crossing and there are standards on appropriate striping and things that need to be accommodated. The idea is that we're identifying certain facilities that are targeted for the larger, principal arterials, for example, within the urban core of your community. So there are certain corridors that are going to be larger roads, just by way of the nature of cross-town movement. Then the smaller the roads – generally the section is attempting to be smaller so that it helps to facilitate pedestrian movements.

23. Mr. Boeck – What I'm thinking of is like the corner of Main and 36th – the mall is there. There's a grocery store there. What I look at are neighborhoods where, if you were elderly, you could live and do all the shopping and stuff that you needed without having to get in a car and drive. But when you've got an intersection like that, it's really hard to navigate in a pedestrian manner because of the size of those intersections. How do you address those?

24. Mr. Haas – Those are major facilities. You've got certain locations where your commercial is. You need to walk certain distances. It's really more of an operation of the intersection – timing of the pedestrian crossing. There's only so much you can do, other than if there are changes in land use where you might have supporting commercial or neighborhood retail to support and get people out of having to make those bigger walks to those high-traffic areas.

25. Mr. Gasaway – On the medium range projects, number 1 is Porter from Acres to Alameda. Where is Porter further north from there? Page 35. Where does the rest of Porter to the north of that fall?

26. Mr. Haas – Oh, that's the special corridor. We've modeled that as a three-lane. Are you suggesting that that is a project that should be considered sooner?

27. Mr. Gasaway – No. I just didn't see it on there. The rest of Porter.

28. Ms. Connors – The Porter Plan went from Robinson to Alameda, and so when we think about Porter it's Robinson to Alameda as the corridor.

29. Mr. Riesland – It's listed here. It stays four lanes north of Acres. It wasn't going down to three.

* * *