

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 13, 2014**

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Conference Room D of Building A of the Norman Municipal Complex, 201 West Gray Street, on the 13<sup>th</sup> day of February 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 6:35 p.m.

\* \* \*

Item No. 1, being:

**ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Curtis McCarty  
Jim Gasaway  
Andy Sherrer  
Cindy Gordon  
Sandy Bahan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dave Boeck  
Tom Knotts  
Chris Lewis  
Roberta Pailes

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

\* \* \*

Item No. 8, being:  
**750 IMHOFF, L.L.C.**

**8A. R-1314-99 – 750 IMHOFF, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION TO HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 750 IMHOFF ROAD.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report
3. Pre-Development Summary

**8B. O-1314-36 – 750 IMHOFF, L.L.C. REQUESTS REZONING FROM C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, TO RM-6, MEDIUM DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 750 IMHOFF ROAD.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Site Plan

**PRESENTATION BY STAFF:**

1. Jane Hudson – There are two applications for this site. The 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan amendment: currently the site is designated as commercial. There is a car wash on that site that has been out of business for several years. To the south and north there is high density residential. To the west there is low density residential. To the east there is the University property. As proposed, this would pull this into the high density residential designation as well.

The rezoning application is for C-1 to RM-6. There is R-3 that goes around the west side and the south side of this proposal, commercial to the east, and then there's R-3 which, again, is the University housing to the north across Imhoff. There is additional RM-6 continuing south down Chautauqua. This is the existing land use in the area. Again, University housing to the north and the high density surrounding this tract of land.

This is the car wash itself. The commercial on the corner – the 7-Eleven. There's a Sonic to the south of the 7-Eleven there at that corner. This area where the concrete blocks are – in the staff report it was noted that there is a cross-access agreement that this will be the portion of the area that the multi-family development will access on the west side of the 7-Eleven and to the Sonic as well. That curb area there is essentially close to where they would be entering the apartment complex. This is the multi-family development to the west, which has been in place since the mid-1970s. I believe that there are 112 units in that complex. This is going down the west side of this lot. That existing multi-family will be a buffer between this development and the single family that is to the west of that existing apartment complex. Again, that existing apartment complex is on the south side of this proposal. This is the University housing that's across Imhoff, and that development consists of 192 units.

This application is consisting of five 4-story buildings and they're all under one roof. They're connected with one roof that would be open on the sides – a breezeway, essentially. There's 23 residential units – 78 beds. The current zoning ordinance requires 41 parking spaces – and I apologize, in the staff report I said 40, but it should be 41 – and the development is designed with 78 parking spaces located throughout the complex.

I also need to update for the Norman Board of Park Commissioners. They met on February 6 and a fee in lieu of land decision was proposed and received a unanimous approval for that.

With the close proximity to the University and the other multi-family developments that are out there that I showed you on the map, and the easy access to State Highway 9, it makes an appropriate infill project. Staff does recommend approval of Resolution No. R-1314-99 and

Ordinance No. O-1314-36. The applicant is here and he does have a presentation for you as well.

**PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:**

1. Tom McCaleb, engineer for the applicant – Rick McKinney is the architect; he will talk to you in a few minutes. This piece of property is an infill project. It's already final platted. Its legal description is Lot 2, Block 1 of the Sherwood South 2nd Addition, a Replat of the same. It's significant that this is already platted. Infrastructure is already in place – water, sewer, drainage all that's done. Curb cuts done. No additional requests; no changes for that. It's done. I did that plat, and when I did it it had the 7-Eleven at the corner and we divvied it up around the 7-Eleven. We put in the Sonic and put in the car wash. The car wash has been there for a while; it is now not washing cars. The applicant has looked at this property carefully. It's constrained. It's small. But it's big enough. So with the infrastructure and the proximity of the size, he has asked the architect to do a lot of work, and he has. We're going to take the detention pond – if you've been to the site, you've seen a hole in the ground. I'm going to cover that hole up – put a parking lot on top of it. The volume of the pond will be the same. We've got detention already done. We've got the water and the sewer and access. No additional traffic report was required. We also retained a traffic engineer and he came to the conclusion that this did not justify a warrant and staff has agreed. So, with that, I'm going to let Rick McKinney tell you some of the architectural stuff that I have no idea what he's talking about.

2. Rick McKinney, McKinney Partnership Architects, 3600 West Main Street – We're pleased to present this to you today. We're excited about the potential for this. If I can tell you a couple more features about the project. There are five buildings. It's four-story. RM-6 zoning typically allows 3 story, and if you set back an additional 5' you can go to 4 stories, which we have on that west property line, so our setbacks are adequate. We have sixteen 4-bedroom units and seven 2-bedroom units. Some of the other features in the project: we have a fitness center. We have study lounges. We have five buildings and, like she said, they're connected with open breezeways. One of the features the applicant requested was a very secure facility, so pedestrian access into the project will be card or fob access. Also, in the back of the project, the back portion of the parking will have a gate access, as well as covered parking, and there will be detention underneath that parking lot. All of the coverage ratios on the site – the coverage, open space, impervious area, floor area ratio, and recreation space are met or exceeded. Actually, the impervious area increased from where it was before – we have more green space than the car wash offered. The landscape will meet all of the City regulations, or exceed that. On the site plan you can see one feature we're having. This area will be an active lawn for the project; this will be more of a quiet lawn for the project and we're actually going to introduce a rock water feature inside this west courtyard. We're going to surround the entire project with at least a 6' fence, possibly an 8' fence. It will wrap the entire project here, all the way down, all the way across, and also buffer here from the Sonic development and along the back behind the 7-Eleven. We are also proposing a roof deck on top that will have all the appropriate code features and the guard rails. It will be about 1,500 square feet. The roof on this project is flat; it will drain to remove the water. There's an egress stair here that is enclosed; there's an egress stair here – I mean, they're about  $\frac{3}{4}$  enclosed – open air on one side. There's also an elevator in the middle of the project that goes up 5 floors – it goes all the way to the roof deck to provide access for all occupants to all parts of the project. One last feature here, in between these two units – this is one building, this is another building, and then these are glassed in study lounges, because with 4 bedrooms this will be a quiet area where each floor will have an independent lounge that they'll be able to have access to. This is the front entry off the parking area. It will be card access here as well. We are hoping to be able to preserve some of the concrete in front and not have to tear it up and then repour it, so we would like to reuse that if we can. If we can't – if it doesn't have the right slope or drainage, obviously we would fix that. The materials on the project are masonry. There's some accent panels, some full-height glass. Some of it is tinted. There's some stucco. Different ratios and then masonry on all the buildings.

There may be some high graphics. All of our signage – we're hoping to identify each building for easy accessibility and identification. There will be some project signage maybe up high on one of the areas.

A couple of other things. Tom mentioned the underground detention. All the ratios. I think what is really important is the buffer – we're at four stories. Immediately to the right it's two stories – a fairly broad swath of apartments. Across the street is three stories and then beyond that there's townhouses, and then beyond that is single family. So I think the tiered density coming up to this, and then on the other side there's commercial and they look out into the University campus. I think it's appropriate for that location. And also the way we positioned all these units – none of these units look in each other's windows; they all have privacy looking out. We're excited about it, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

One other thing. We will provide the required number of adaptable and accessible units on the ground floor for these type units.

3. Ms. Gordon – It looks from this plan that most of the parking spaces are in this back lot – in the south lot. Is that correct? So is the only access to that back lot by driving between the 7-Eleven and the Sonic?

4. Mr. McKinney – Or behind. Yes. Again, out of trying to be green and save materials, this driveway would be maintained. This driveway is maintained. There is cross easements through here and through here that all of these three users will be able to use. The dumpster is located right here in the middle where there's common collection between all three projects.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

None

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

*Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-99 and Ordinance No. O-1314-36 to City Council. Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.*

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

YEAS	Curtis McCarty, Jim Gasaway, Andy Sherrer, Sandy Bahan
NAYES	Cindy Gordon
MEMBERS ABSENT	Roberta Pailes, Tom Knotts, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1314-99 and Ordinance No. O-1314-36 to City Council, passed by a vote of 4-1.

\* \* \*