NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

JANUARY 11, 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 11th day of January, 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 Erin Williford called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:
ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT	Sandy Bahan Nouman Jan Chris Lewis Neil Robinson Erin Williford Lark Zink Dave Boeck Tom Knotts Andy Sherrer
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 David Riesland, Traffic Engineer Ken Danner, Subdivision Development Manager Todd McLellan, Development Engineer Drew Norlin, Asst. Development Coordinator Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator Kathryn Walker, Assistant City Attorney

* * *

Item No. 8a, being:
R-1718-76 – GOLDEN TRIBE, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION AND FLOODPLAIN AND FLOODWAY DESIGNATION TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION AND FLOODPLAIN AND FLOODWAY DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 410, 414 AND 416 NORTH PARK AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

and
Item No. 8b, being:
O-1718-28 – GOLDEN TRIBE, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 410, 414 AND 416 NORTH PARK AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. SPUD Narrative with Exhibits

and
Item No. 8c, being:
PP-1718-6 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY GOLDEN TRIBE, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR GOLDEN TRIBE ADDITION, A SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 410, 414 AND 416 NORTH PARK AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Plan
6. Pre-Development Summary

Dave Boeck asked to be recused.

Chris Lewis moved to allow Dave Boeck to be recused from these items. Sandy Bahan seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to allow Dave Boeck to recused on these three items, passed by a vote of 9-0. Mr. Boeck left the dais and was seated in the audience.

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:
1. Janay Greenlee reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports this infill development project and recommends approval of Resolution No. R-1718-76. This infill development will provide accessible, multi-generational, aging in place housing stock in close proximity to goods and services. Staff supports and recommends approval of Ordinance

No. O-1718-28. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat for GOLDEN TRIBE ADDITION, a Simple Planned Unit Development.

2. Mr. Knotts – Will there be any kind of specific age requirements for inhabitants or renters?

3. Ms. Greenlee – The SPUD does not speak to that. It does speak to the maximum number of dwelling units and structures; three dwellings will be allowed with two units each.

4. Mr. Lewis – We're taking ten lots that potentially could have ten separate homes on them and we're putting three duplexes, which basically are six homes, plus a detention pond and green space. Is that what I'm seeing?

5. Ms. Greenlee – There are Lots 7 through 16, but they're three parcels, so those lots are combined. Those are not separate lots. Those lots are 25' wide.

6. Mr. Robinson – We have three duplexes, so six units, with how many bedrooms per unit?

7. Ms. Greenlee – What they proposed in the Pre-Development meeting, they're looking at two and three bedrooms for each unit.

8. Mr. Robinson – Single story, correct?

9. Ms. Greenlee – They're single story and two-story. They're both.

10. Mr. Robinson – So we could be looking at 18 bedrooms, ultimately.

11. Ms. Greenlee – And for each unit, 1.8 parking spaces is required per the ordinance, but that's what they're meeting in this as well.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, 136 Thompson Drive, representing the applicant – I'll try to address a couple of those questions as we go. I thank Janay for the description; I think she really described it very well. But let me show you right here – you can see it's a little bit odd. When we were brought this project, it is odd in that you see there are six parcels shown right there – this is the City's GIS – but you can see the three parcels are interior – that's not really a legal parcel. You can't have interior lots like that. There's a lot of oddities here as to what the configuration of existing lots are, and how that came about we don't fully know. As to your question as to specific lots, you can see here, for instance, over on the left, 22 and 23, 24 and 25 – it's pretty common in Norman Old Town to have technically multiple lots per parcel, but very commonly you will have two or three or more actually make up the parcel, if that makes sense, for Norman Old Town.

2. Mr. Lewis – I think my point there, Mr. Rieger, was it looks like we're maximizing space but also leaving green space for the enjoyment of park area.

3. Mr. Rieger – Absolutely. I'll show you that. But the oddity is the configuration of the original lots.

4. Mr. Lewis – Can you clarify one other thing for me? I don't mean to sidetrack us. But this being aging in place, and certainly aimed at accessible first, help me understand these are all one level – or is that a misunderstanding?

5. Mr. Rieger – It is actually proposed as one and two-story. We're still looking at that. But the reason for the two-story is multi-generational and seniors need caregivers often times that would utilize the upstairs rooms. So there are proposals for a second story – or no more than two

stories. The SPUD caps it at two stories. Commissioner Boeck is going to walk you through a floor plan that shows you the details of how it's laid out for aging in place, with the 5' radius and those kinds of things.

6. Mr. Lewis – But we're not talking about any of those tall, three, four and five-story units around campus, because this is primarily aimed at seniors and also millennials that want to live there, not students.

7. Mr. Rieger – Correct. Multi-generational aging in place, and when you see the floor plan you will see that this is really aging in place with the 5' radius circles and 3' wide doors and things of that nature. The second floor is for caregivers or multi-generational people that can certainly climb stairs; the seniors would be on the ground floor.

Commissioner Knotts' question, as to how you deal with that, there are fair housing laws that we can't just absolutely say we're going to just accept seniors. There's a very methodical way you have to do that; it's by covenants and restrictions. It's 55 or older, and you have to maintain 80% occupancy of those 55 or older in return for the ability and right to advertise as a senior housing product, otherwise you can't do it, and that's by law of fair housing laws. So there's a very specific defined way you do that. It's not generally done in the zoning. It's generally done in the covenants on the property.

8. Mr. Knotts – Do you have a plan to do that?

9. Mr. Rieger – Yes, we would do that. We have to. If you're going to advertise as senior housing, you have to do that. It's a law. You can't just say we're going to be senior housing. You have to actually put forth a document that shows that you are that and you're adhering to the 80% occupancy of seniors. Otherwise you lose that right. After that, fair housing of rentals, sales, brokers, anybody – you cannot legally say we're seeking an older couple or a young professional. Any terms of age are discrimination – patently. The only way you can use any term of age in marketing and anything is that one exception for senior housing if you do it per that fair housing standard. So that's how we would have to do it, and that's how we would, otherwise we couldn't advertise it as that. It doesn't matter if you have grab bars anywhere. It doesn't matter. That's the finite legal way.

10. Mr. Lewis – We've seen several of those successful in Norman, I believe, over on Oaktree and I believe on 24th Avenue N.W.

11. Mr. Rieger – There's many of them, and they're successful. I want to take you through several slides that I hope show you why.

12. Mr. Knotts – Is it anticipated that the tribe will maintain ownership?

13. Mr. Rieger – Yes.

14. Mr. Knotts – So the units will not be sold?

15. Mr. Rieger – Correct. This is not a tribe – I just wanted to make sure everybody understands. This is a local owner; Mr. Andy Golden is in the audience.

16. Mr. Knotts – I love it when the Golden Tribe comes.

17. Mr. Rieger – Yes. Local owner; been here for many, many years. I can tell you, just as personal experience, I've worked on a number of his items going way back – 15 to 20 years. Yes. Local owner; local management; local use.

Let me take you through a few more slides to illustrate the project a little bit. Janay showed you, but it's important to note some of these things. Existing zoning. We're asking for a SPUD, which essentially would be duplexes, very medium density. RM-6 is immediately to the north of this, abuts it to the north. R-3 is farther to the south. Then also the floodplain and floodway. A number of structures in this neighborhood – and this is a screen shot from the City of Norman GIS yesterday, but you can see the light blue. It doesn't show up very good tonight but that light blue is all FEMA floodplain, so many properties in this area are covered by floodplain and the purple is floodway, if you're familiar with those terms. Of course, floodway is the much more serious condition of flooding than is the floodplain. Part of this property is covered by a little bit of both and you will see, and Janay mentioned it, we're not touching either one. Our detention is outside of it and the property is proposed to be outside of it.

This is the site. Right now it is a green field. We don't have any idea when the last time it ever had any improvements on it. I think the staff report says decades. That's really all we know. It has been R-1 for a long, long time and vacant for a long, long time. Some of the protests say why don't we just keep this as R-1 and try to encourage somebody to buy it and build a house on it. Well, it's been available for a long time and nobody has done that. We can keep hoping for that, but it simply hasn't happened. The proposal tonight is to go to an aging in place, multi-generational concept that would be very compatible with The Willows to the north. One of the things I want to highlight on this site is we're going to put a sidewalk across the front that connects to the sidewalk right there – you see it across the top where we highlighted in green. That gets you into the trail system of Andrews Park, takes you straight up to the new library, takes you over to Legacy Trail, takes you on down into downtown. A perfect site where we can very quickly – and The Willows, of course, uses that. You'll see them very often use that trail over into the park and we'll connect right into that trail, so it's a perfect location for us. I think, as Janay said, this was really sought out as a site for this purpose. I know Andy has been talking to me about this site for years really, and the first thing we looked at was the oddities of the platting on it. I think we've overcome those and now we've found a way to do it. But he's been looking at this site for a long time as an aging in place product.

This is the proposed site plan. Six units, and really put in a configuration very similar to what the homes would be. Again, it's kind of the three lots that would be homes, and now they would be duplexes. Again, really very close to The Willows – a five foot setback, which is what it is anyway for R-1 – it's 5 foot, so we had the same setback and the same location there. Again, the detention right there. I think Janay showed you that.

This is the green plan, so a significant amount of green space. I think we're upwards of 68% green space on this product, so very large. Again, the floodplain at the bottom is untouched.

Dave Boeck is sitting out here for a reason, because he designed this. This is Dave's design and his project, and so you all are familiar with Dave as an aging in place specialist – that's what he does and that's his focus, and so, with that, I wanted Dave to talk through his floorplan. After he talks through this, I'm going to show you a couple other slides.

18. Mr. Boeck – Is the other floorplan in there also?

19. Mr. Rieger – It is not. We just have this one.

20. Mr. Boeck – Well, this is the one that we're not going to build. I will talk about this one. Dave Boeck, 922 Schulze Drive. Professor of Architecture at OU and a local architect doing predominantly residential, predominantly aging in place. For the last 10 years, all my projects have been for people over 50 that want to live in the neighborhood where they raised their family, because they love their house; they love their neighbors and they want to stay there. So they want to make their house accessible as they age. I have been philosophically opposed to nursing homes, assisted living complexes, anyplace where you concentrate seniors. I'm glad that Sean brought up the idea of multi-generational housing, because when I started working with Andy three years ago on another project and this project, the idea was to make housing

that met the needs of seniors, millennials, families – because the concept really is a universal design. All houses should be designed so that anyone, whether it's a little child this tall, or someone this tall, or someone this tall, or someone this big can live independently because the house supports them. We originally designed one and two-story. The one-story are two bedrooms, two bathrooms that are accessible. This particular floorplan is two-story, two bedrooms and a bathroom upstairs, master suite downstairs, but you can see that 5' radius circle is kind of the emblem that's used in all accessibility codes and standards, but the idea is to provide space so that people can get around, whether they're using a walker, whether they're walking independently, whether they are in a wheelchair. Builders today do not build houses that way. Part of my research is in looking at how to design housing, how to redesign, how to modify housing, how to build housing, where does housing need to be, so that people can stay integrated into their culture, into their community, as they age.

This lot sat for a long time. I knew the guy that owned it. He was going to put a house on it then decided not to. It's in the middle of everything. The library is going in there, Andrews Park is there, these buildings are here, there's shopping within walking distance, and basically if you read anything, the World Health Organization has eight indications of an age-friendly community, and one of them is integration – social integration where seniors can live and work and play and integrate with their neighbors in a neighborhood that is supportive. So that's the whole idea. I've got a couple friends that live over in the Miller District. They're my age – older – and they hate their houses because their laundry is in the basement, they've got bedrooms on the second floor, they've got this huge yard that they have to cut and they're starting to have lots of health issues. They go we'd sure like to live someplace where we didn't have to cut grass and we didn't have to walk up and down stairs. So Andy and I have been working on that. That's one of the nice things about being a college professor – I don't have to work for any client – I can pick my clients and I've decided to pick clients that want to do the kind of stuff that I want to see in a community. He's one of those.

I've tried to talk him out of garages before, but his compassionate desire to help seniors is the fact that we have bad weather in Oklahoma and a lot of senior apartments the parking is across the parking lot because they're two or three-story apartments. So you have to walk a distance to get to your apartment. Having a garage – having a place to park your car, or if a caregiver comes, a place for them to park – is important. We have a storm shelter in there; you can see safe room underneath the stairs. The laundry is accessible. The bedroom, bathroom and closet are accessible, as the kitchen and living room are. Of course, facing the park was important, so there's a front porch, trying to maximize the size of that, and a back porch so they have a place to sit outside and enjoy nature and enjoy the center of Norman.

The idea of designing houses that are accessible – universal design is designing a house that has the right kind of lighting, that has the right kind of spaces, right kind of building materials, no steps – there's no steps – this is all on one level. Andy and I had a discussion – we really have decided that we're only going to build the two bedroom, one-story units. The other units are going to be a little bit more costly and that's the other thing, is trying to find a price range for the stuff that he's building that's affordable. He has the option, he could sell them. He likes to keep them right now. It's obvious in Norman 60% or 70% of the houses in Norman are rental properties, especially around Campus. I personally know people that own 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 rental units. This neighborhood is no exception. Our son lived around here. Most people know that I'm opposed to what has been going on on Campus Corner with those mini-dorms. One, they're not building anything that's accessible. I've been working with one builder in Campus area and he's actually doing an accessible apartment building – the first one in the Campus Corner area. So it's important to us – Andy and myself and Sean – that there's housing in central Norman that's accessible. That's what this is all about. Any questions?

21. Mr. Rieger – A couple more slides to cover, too, if you don't mind. Let me cover a couple more points here. I wanted to just highlight, too, immediately north of us is The Willows senior housing RM-6 project. How more compatible can you be than to be an aging in place senior

housing product next to what is already a more intense RM-6 senior housing product? This was just a website I pulled off and it said it was built using HUD funds for the elderly program.

One other, this was another article that we found. This was the Office of Policy Development and Research of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, an article in Fall of 2013. I think this is a little bit instructive to our project tonight. It says, "Most seniors would prefer to age in place". You've heard Commissioner Boeck tell you that for years. But "home modifications are critical to this process, but the costs can be prohibitive." So when you're reaching that moment in life where you need to start looking at aging in place options and the facilities within your home, it gets expensive. You maybe can't afford that kind of a capital outlay, so you need to look to a rental option, possibly, and you may only be looking at something for five to ten years, so it's hard to justify any extensive capital costs to do that. So this report goes on and says that, "In addition, much of the rental housing" – and Dave just mentioned this – but "stock lacks the accessibility features that make residences more aging friendly; only 36.3 percent of renter-occupied units have wheelchair-accessible bathrooms, only 15.5 percent have handrails or grab bars in the bathrooms, and only 6.3 percent have extra-wide doors or hallways." You certainly see that. Bathrooms are usually a two-foot door. For aging in place they need to be three-foot wide. To make that kind of a modification in an existing facility is very hard to do, because you get into electrical and structural and oftentimes the cabinets and everything – it just doesn't work. You really have to start from ground up to get to that point to be able to do that, and that's very hard for a senior to do. So rental properties, as Dave mentioned, become very important.

This one is supported by staff. It's directly adjacent to The Willows – the same concept again as we're proposing here. It is a perfect location with the library, and the trail of Andrews Park and everything you can get to from this location. It just fits ideally.

There is a significant protest; Janay mentioned it. When you read those letters, those protests are very largely all about rental housing. If you read those protest letters, they say we shouldn't have any more rental housing, that this should just be kept as R-1 for a single family to buy. Again, I would say it's been R-1 for a single family to buy for a long time. This is a product we need. This is a product that is immediately compatible with what's immediately next to it and, therefore, it should be justified. With that, I'll answer any questions you have. I thank you very much for your consideration.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. George Ahmadi, 502 N. Park – I did have a couple of questions -- if there is a way to legally go about making this into aging in place residences through the Fair Housing Act – the covenants – why can't we do that in the SPUD doc? Second, why aren't The Willows under this same parking requirements as I guess this – the 1.8? Also, if there is some issues about one or two stories, why can't we define stories as being one level in the PUD doc as well, just, again, to give a little bit more protection to the zoning and also in case Mr. Golden decides to sell, it would also pull the next developer under the same constraints.

I just wanted to be very clear that, as far as my protest goes, I am very much in support of this property being developed. I just wish that it was not leased – so what I feel so contradictory to the rest of the neighborhood – I feel like garage door frontage is not happening in that neighborhood. I appreciate the fact that there's some green space being utilized. Again, I understand that design criteria is not part of the zoning decision, but if we are asking for a customized zoning then I think it is part of the decision. Thank you for your time.

2. Terrance Wood, 428 N. University Boulevard – Thank you very much. Much as was said before, my concerns are not necessarily for the design. There are some of the plan aspects, with the garage frontage, and also with zoning regulations as far as parking and having multiple vehicles in front of that. When you're talking about having potentially a 3-bedroom or 4-bedroom unit, you're talking about having honestly more than one or two vehicles. Secondarily, I don't know that anyone in the neighborhood is opposed to the aging in place, but I think the large concern is there is nothing that would hold the next owner or owners in the future to

maintaining that aspect. So this very easily could become – you know, considering the size of it and with the amount of rental property, especially this close to the University going into this area, we may have the greatest of convictions at this point in time as we go into it, but what we have to make sure is that we're planning for the future and a future owner of this property. So, while there are aspects of the SPUD that I think could address that, I am opposed to this without more information about the dwellings that will be there and any future prohibitions that will be placed upon using this for alternate purposes in the future. Thank you very much.

3. Phyllis Murray, 801 College – We have eight parcels of property on Tonhawa, including one on University. I really welcome senior housing. There's not a problem in the world with that. I think I would really like to see a drawing of the plans of what they plan to use, rather than – I thought this was what this was, and we don't have the final plans, and I'd really like to see that before I can say too much more. I was concerned about the two stories. I do understand that the caregiver and other family members might be upstairs. I get that. I don't see a porch, other than just a little stoop maybe on one end of each one of those housing units. I'm not really objecting to the design. I just have some questions about not seeing the final plan, which I think all in this room probably would like to see. I don't see any ramps, and perhaps I'm missing those in those plans. If it's a wheelchair bound person, they're going to have to have a ramp. If I'm missing that, I'm sorry. It would just be nice to see that.

I will agree that it is in a neighborhood that is very, very walkable to everything. You've got everything that anybody could ever want in that neighborhood as far as walking ability and accessibility. It is a wonderful spot. It has been vacant for a long time, and I understand that it needs to be built on. I don't have a problem with that. I think aging area – the families would be appropriate for that area. But I do have questions about the height of the building, and I realize they can go up much higher. But it would be nice to be able to see the final plans of what they are intending to build.

We do have a bed and breakfast in that neighborhood. We did have to have two houses taken down because they were just non-repairable for what we wanted them for, and one of them had been condemned. But we did try to build in those spots housing that would be compatible with our neighborhood. So it does fit in with the neighborhood that we're in. I'm hopeful that I will see this more compatible with that neighborhood with their new plans. Thank you very much.

4. William Murray, 309 W. Tonhawa – Owner of a bed and breakfast and, yes, we do have eight parcels in this area. The SPUD does not address design, but there are other places in town that I feel that this particular design has shown to be a negative aesthetic. With the garages in the front, it tends to be not very aesthetically pleasing and not compatible with the neighborhood, in my opinion. In doing our design of our properties, we were held to a standard and had to be compatible to that standard. To me, to get to a duplex, it's going to look like a duplex no matter what, and I understand that's part of the plan. One thing that we also had to always keep in mind was who's going to buy it next and what can they do legally, and I think that's where there's an address here that is a concern of most people in the protest, because, obviously, aging in place and the design and the use for the current plan sounds fantastic. But, at the same time, what happens next? If you don't put in the restrictions now – kind of what Mr. Ahmadi said – then we don't know what's happening next, and that's probably my biggest fear. Thanks.

5. Carol Jacob, 324 W. Daws – I guess I'm here talking about the people who do not want to see it rezoned at all, and left at R-1. We had a lot of people who signed the protest, and that was their biggest concern – setting precedent for other properties in the neighborhood to be rezoned. We certainly do have a lot of rentals in Norman. I agree with what Mr. Murray said. We don't know what's going to happen next. We have had houses built in the neighborhood – there's one on Daws Street under construction, one on Tonhawa Street that was just built that have owners living in them. I talked to several millennials – younger people – who have bought

quite a few homes in the neighborhood that were rentals because they want to live in that neighborhood because of the neighborhood it is, and we are a neighborhood of small homes. We are hoping that more of those homes will be bought by people who want to live in a walkability neighborhood. We don't know what's going to happen next. We don't know how long this property is going to stay this way and we were told at the meeting we went to initially that there was no guarantees who was going live in those apartments – they couldn't really regulate who was going to be there. Given what we've seen in other parts of Norman, it makes us very nervous. We're a small, quiet neighborhood. We would like to stay that way. I've talked to Brenda at The Willows. They are not all seniors. People have lived there for 20 years. They move in there when they're younger. They are not thrilled with what's going on. The buildings butt right up against it, and I realize that that's the code – they're allowed to do that, but The Willows are feeling very confined by that and they're not real thrilled to have who knows who living in those six residences. We want to see homes built there. I actually have lived there long enough to remember when there were homes there. We would like to see them continue to be there and we really hope that you will keep that into consideration that we have so many rentals in Norman. We really don't want to see our neighborhood become full of more rentals. We are hopeful that, because young people are buying there now, that that trend will continue. Thank you.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Sherrer – Maybe a question or just understanding from the applicant. Heard a lot of comments about garage frontage, and I assume that's design. Just talk to us a little bit about why the garage was placed in the front. No way to get around the back. I know garages are important. I'd just love to hear a little bit more about that. That seemed to be a common theme in those comments.

2. Mr. Rieger – First of all, obviously, the architect is right here, so I'd let Dave speak, but I would just make one comment about it. It is an older neighborhood, so I understand the comments that they don't like the garages in front. But realize Original Old Town had garages as a separate building, often times in the back. So this is different now, and that was discussed – do you have an elderly person park in a separate building, and it didn't really work. And just also cost. This is a cost issue with seniors. So go ahead.

3. Mr. Boeck – Yeah, he explained cost. To me, the safety of having a garage. Everybody you think lives in a house with a garage that's attached to the house – if you can park in your garage when it's snowing outside or if it's icy. Most apartment buildings have outside parking. The Willows has outside parking on the street. But Andy's concern, and I think it's a good concern, was that this gives them a place to pull into that's in the house that's a conditioned space that makes it more safe, especially if they're using a walker or a wheelchair.

I will bring up one thing, because it seems like the concerns are we don't know who will live there next. Because of the slides that Sean showed in terms of the number of units – the lack of accessible units around. I'm on the ADA Transition Steering Committee right now, and one of the next things we're going to study, after streets and parks and stuff like that, is housing because there is a deplorable shortage of accessible housing. Once people move into accessible housing, like The Willows, they stay. That one person said that people have lived there for 20 years. So that speaks to itself.

4. Mr. Rieger – Let me make one other comment, too. A lot of comments about they don't have garages in the front in this area of town. Another comment about that is because there are a lot of alleys in this area of town and so access to garages often times happens at alleys. We don't have that here. We don't have an alley here to use or to work with and so the garage has to go out front. If you were to put it out back, you'd have an enormous cost of concrete and you basically are building a road around this property, which doesn't work – it would kill the project. So that's largely why that happened.

5. Mr. Lewis – I appreciate that Commissioner Boeck has designed such a very accessible building for aging in place. Had there been an alleyway in the back, I might say that the garage might be turned around, but there's not an alley there. For a piece of green space that has been vacant for numerous years to make something that is very aesthetically pleasing, also for aging in place to make something that close to a library, close to an arts area which is our amphitheater over here, something close to a walking trail – I can't imagine, as we're all not growing any younger, finding a better place in Norman to live, and as long as I've sat on this Commission – which has been numerous years now – I always hear the same argument: this is not the place for it, there's a better place. With this design and this location, I cannot imagine that there's a better place for these aging in place duplexes than exactly where you've designed them. So thank you.

6. Ms. Bahan – Dave, if I understood you correctly, that the picture you showed us of the layout – that's not the one you're going to use?

7. Mr. Boeck – That's the two-story, three bedroom.

8. Ms. Bahan – And you're going to do a one story?

9. Mr. Boeck – Yeah. We looked at the cost of building a two-story unit, because that's one of the things that seniors can't afford – they have limited budgets. So the two bedroom, single story unit is what is going to be built there, just in terms of the cost going up two stories.

10. Ms. Bahan – So it is going to be just one story?

11. Mr. Boeck – Yes.

12. Mr. Sherrer – So can you change the SPUD to that?

13. Mr. Boeck – Well, the SPUD has flexibility.

14. Mr. Rieger – I would be reluctant on that. This is already allowable for two stories as R-1.

15. Mr. Sherrer – I understand. I just wanted to make sure that was not something you wanted to redefine.

16. Mr. Rieger – I would prefer to have the flexibility, if we do go to multi-generational. I think it's a cost issue and a budget issue for Andy to figure out if he wants to do that.

17. Mr. Boeck – We may figure out how to make it more manageable in terms of size to get another bedroom, because quite frankly, when you look at millennials and seniors, you're looking at two and three bedrooms are the kind of spaces that they're looking for. I understand the concern is they don't want students living here because of what happened on Campus Corner, and I understand that. But this is designed to be accessible and so we're pretty confident that once people move in here they're not going to leave and, no matter who owns it, it's going to be accessible housing and there's a waiting list.

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1718-76, Ordinance No. O-1718-28 and PP-1718-6, the Preliminary Plat for GOLDEN TRIBE ADDITION, A Simple Planned Unit Development, to City Council. Chris Lewis seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1718-76, Ordinance No. O-1718-28, and PP-1718-6 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-1.

Commissioner Boeck returned to his seat.

* * *