

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

APRIL 11, 2019

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 April, 2019. 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 Chris Lewis called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Nouman Jan
Neil Robinson
Chris Lewis
Tom Knotts
Dave Boeck
Erin Williford
Steven McDaniel

MEMBERS ABSENT

Lark Zink
Sandy Bahan

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Interim Director, Planning &
Community Development
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer
Beth Muckala, Asst. City Attorney
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist

* * *

Item No. 6, being:

O-1819-37 – 310 INVESTMENTS, L.L.C. REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, ESTABLISHED BY ORDINANCE NO. O-0203-2, AS AMENDED BY O-0506-9, AND REPLACED IN THEIR ENTIRETY BY O-0607-13, TO ALLOW FOR A SENIOR LIVING CENTER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO MEMORY CARE AND ASSISTED LIVING, WITH AMENITIES FOR THE RESIDENTS AND THEIR GUESTS (E.G., RESTAURANT, BAR) AND WITH A REDUCED PARKING RATIO, FOR APPROXIMATELY 11.35 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE N.W. AND RADIUS WAY.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Amended and Restated PUD with Exhibits
4. 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 request for a PUD amendment to permit a senior living center with a restaurant, a bar, and a reduced parking ratio of 1 parking space per living unit; staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1819-37.

2. Mr. Knotts – I was wondering if this is a public restaurant and bar.

Ms. Greenlee – The public will be allowed to access that through the senior center. From my understanding, it will be as part of that development.

Mr. Knotts – So it will be internal.

Ms. Greenlee – Visitors would be allowed to access the restaurant and bar.

Mr. Boeck – So you could go in there and buy dinner.

Ms. Greenlee – You could. And have dinner with any of your friends that live there.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

1. Sean Rieger, 136 Thompson Drive, representing the applicant – I'll take you quickly through just to show you a little bit more. This is the actual aerial of the site. You can see Terra project is right here; that's the large multi-family project that is in place on the ground along 24th Avenue, so our site is just north of that, basically a bare piece of land – no trees, no development on it. Obviously, 2025 is mixed use per the UNP area and the PUD. This is the general conceptual site plan. I'll tell you a little more about the site plan in just a moment. The PUD request, again, as Janay said, is for clarification that this can be a senior living center. Just to give you a little more on that, the PUD already allows for residential uses over as much as 30% of the entire UNP area. Your zoning code, under RM-6, you have to have a special use, basically, for anything that would be like this; it doesn't allow it as a matter of right. Also, under commercial, also would be a special use. So we don't really fall into an as a matter of right category, even though the PUD contemplates 30% of the whole area would be residential. We still want to make sure that we're clarified that the legal zoning is there. So it would be independent living (about 100 units), assisted living (about 64 units), memory care (about 24 units).

The second request for the PUD amendment is the restaurant and bar, and to give you a little more clarity on that, I'm going to show you in the site plan where it is. We're not talking about a large-scale restaurant and bar element; it's really fully internal. But the idea being that the public and, most importantly, guests of these residents could come, pay their own tab, be their own customer, but be there with the residents. What they have found is that when they provide that opportunity, they have a lot more people come and spend time with these residents. Whether that's a statement on our society or not, I'll leave that alone, but that's what they have found in practice. So they have found a way to basically make it a public, so to speak, bar and restaurant and encourage people to come spend that time with the residents, and that's been very successful. From a zoning standpoint, then, what we get into is that if there is going to be a point of sale of alcohol directly to a person that's not a resident, then we have a zoning issue we need to make sure is covered. Because then the ABLE Commission can step in

and say, hey, you're selling alcohol to the public; you've got to have a special license. Just in case we get anything like that, we want to make sure the zoning allows for it and we don't have to come back and do that. Because the ABLE Commission, if that comes up, will not issue a license unless they verify that the zoning allows for it. So that's the reason for the request for the restaurant and bar.

Then the parking requirement. The PUD also only talks about parking – the current PUD – in the sense that it is per the requirements of the City of Norman ordinances. When you look at the parking requirements, we have a parking count for apartments generally that says 1.8 spaces per dwelling unit. We have parking allotted for nursing homes and convalescent homes, which gets into 1 per 4 residents plus some for employees. So, again, per the existing code, which the PUD references to, we don't really have a clarity of what the parking is required to be. So we've requested 1:1 per residence, which should be ample. Probably still may be a little bit more than we need, because oftentimes, obviously, these residents do not have cars.

So that's the reason for those three PUD requests tonight and why we've come before you. Let me show you a little bit more. This is the site plan for Phase 1; there is a Phase 2 I'll show you in just a moment. The blue is the independent living; the red is the assisted living; and the orange, far lower right, is memory care. The memory care is planned as one story; the assisted living would be three stories; and the independent living would be four stories. That center element that you see is the common areas, so this is where the pub and the bar and that kind of element would be. Let me talk to you about the proposed amenities. When I was talking to the client, it's incredible – I've never seen one like this. This is really a remarkable development as to what they have planned. This is the first floor, what you see on the left, is the first floor diagram. You see that center element being the common areas has really an incredible array of amenities. The restaurant and pub is right in the middle there; it would only seat 32 people, so, again, we're not talking about a large experience here, but enough to hopefully bring people in to spend time with these residents. So the pub is right there. But you start seeing all of these list of amenities: art studios, pool, fitness center, game room, coffee bar, outdoor courtyards, multi-purpose theater, dog park – what we often find is that when you get into senior housing a lot of them have pets and so we have a dog park for them, and really a significant amount of green space around this facility. So lots of amenities that are planned for this facility.

This is Phase 2. Phase 2 we're for tonight to approve would be just off to the northeast or north of the facility. It would basically add another element – would basically courtyard in the independent living element into another element off the end.

That's basically it. That's the request tonight. Those three additions to the PUD. I want to clarify again they only change this site – this location in the PUD. It does not amend the PUD beyond this site. The University North Park PUD would only be amended for that legal description and nothing else.

Staff supports. Nobody came to the Pre-Development meeting at all; it was just us. There's no protests that we're aware of. With that, we would appreciate your consideration. I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

2. Mr. Boeck – That bar thing really got me interested. I guess the question I have, if you've got family members and friends coming in to eat, is it not open to the public, so that someone driving by and seeing Sean's Steakhouse, and go this looks pretty good, let's stop in and grab a steak.

Mr. Rieger – I think the intent is more that they would be people coming to visit the guests. But, again, if we get into a point of sale to a customer, we want to make sure we have the allowance for that. But the intent is really ancillary to the guests. But we want to make sure they can pay for it. This gets very detailed and technical, but if they pay for that bill directly and it's not put on the guest tab to be paid by their room bill, which maybe some of these folks don't want to do that, or you would rather pay for their meal, we don't want you to have to go to the desk and figure all that out. We want you to be able to just pay the bill.

Mr. Boeck – So does this also double as the dining room for the residents?

Mr. Rieger – No. There are separate dining facilities. If you look on here you see – I don't think we have them labeled really clearly, but there are multiple dining rooms. These elements, if you can follow my pointer – there's one there, one there, and there's one down here. So they're kind of across the middle are multiple dining rooms, which are much larger spaces.

Mr. Boeck – Those are what I'd call the service dining areas for the facilities themselves.

Mr. Rieger – Correct.

3. Mr. Knotts – I was out there today. I know we're not supposed to talk about design, but it seems like the facility misses an opportunity with Terra right next door, and it doesn't really walk to anything, but it could walk to this place.

Mr. Rieger – It is separated by Radius Way. There is a public street between the two, but I understand your point.

Mr. Robinson – Why would people from Terra walk over here?

Mr. Knotts – Because they can't walk anywhere else. They'd have to get into their car to go someplace else.

Mr. Boeck – Well, that was the intent of University North Park, to get in your car and go.

Mr. Rieger – I will carry those comments back to the applicant. I appreciate that.

Mr. Knotts – Senior care facilities sometimes have financial difficulties, so it would be a good way to subsidize.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Dave Boeck moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-37 to City Council. Neil Robinson seconded the motion.

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

YEAS

Nouman Jan, Neil Robinson, Chris Lewis, Tom Knotts, Dave Boeck, Erin Williford, Steven McDaniel

NAYES

None

MEMBERS ABSENT

Lark Zink, Sandy Bahan

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-37 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *