

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

AUGUST 9, 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 9th day of August, 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.

Vice Chairman Tom Knotts called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sandy Bahan
Nouman Jan (left after Item 3)
Chris Lewis
Tom Knotts
Lark Zink (arrived at 6:30 p.m.)
Dave Boeck
Erin Williford
Andy Sherrer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Neil Robinson

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
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
Elisabeth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator

* * *

Mr. Jan announced that he would need to leave at 7:15 p.m. this evening.

CONSENT DOCKET, BEING:

Item No. 2, being:

TMP-131 -- APPROVAL OF THE JULY 12, 2018 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

* * *

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chris Lewis moved to approve the Consent Docket: approving the July 12, 2018 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. Dave Boeck 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, Dave Boeck, Erin Williford, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Neil Robinson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the Consent Docket, passed by a vote of 8-0.

* * *

Item No. 3a, being:

R-1819-19 – FULTON WORSTER GROUP, ON BEHALF OF BLUE JAY CONSTRUCTION, L.L.C., REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.2 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5451 HUETTNER DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

and

Item No. 3b, being:

O-1819-5 – FULTON WORSTER GROUP, ON BEHALF OF BLUE JAY CONSTRUCTION, L.L.C., REQUESTS REZONING FROM I-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR APPROXIMATELY 6.2 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5451 HUETTNER DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative with Exhibits A-D

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. We did receive protests on this application which amounted to 6.6% of the notification area. Staff does not support the request to amend the land use from Industrial Designation to Commercial Designation and recommends denial of Resolution No. R-1819-19. The uses proposed for this site are not in conflict with the adjacent uses. This general area, located in close proximity to I-35, is well suited for transient use such as an RV park. Staff supports this request and recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1819-5.

2. Mr. Knotts – The reason you object to R-1819-19 is just to keep the same type of situation as the hotel got?

Ms. Hudson – Right. Again, because in their PUD document they're keeping the industrial designation for the zoning (I-1, Light Industrial District) and they're just asking for that one additional use of the RV park. So it's not really a commercial use and we don't want the commercial land use to start into this area.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Brad Worster, 132 N. Santa Fe, representing the applicant – A lot of these slides are the same, so I'm going to fly through them, especially since we have to try to wrap up a little early. Nobody wants to hear me talk all night. Some of these are sort of the same. This is kind of the overall location. You see at the north there again Indian Hills Road, then Franklin Road at the south. Both sides of that can be access to the site, not just Indian Hills, although Franklin Road doesn't have an entrance to be able to continue southbound, so any southbound travelers would have to get back on at Indian Hills. I believe we've already seen this slide; that's the current zonings. A couple aerial images and they just zoom in a little bit to give you an idea. But I do want to start to point out the size of this site compared to the rest of them there. All of these that front along I-35 and actually back up to Huettner Drive are one-acre parcels, one and a half acre parcels. All of these on the back side – most of them are one and a half to two and a half acres. This one here, I believe, was about three and a quarter or three and a half. This is a two-acre parcel. Subject parcel is 6.2 acres, so it's significant in area and the proposed use is going to be much less dense than they could build on it with any other use. I've got another one and you get a little closer. You've already seen all the pictures so I will click right through those. Lot size – to give you an idea of some of the dimensions there. Total depth is about 610'; total width at its widest point 480'. Again, to follow up on Ms. Hudson's comments on the land

use plan. We chose to go ahead and submit an application for a land use plan should you all feel it's necessary. We don't really think it was necessary, but we can't go back and create the application after the fact has started. So if you feel keeping it industrial is the right way to go, then feel free; that's fine with the applicant. We'll hope that you would support the PUD, however. So I hope you can vote on those separately.

This is an RV park, initially named Iron Horse RV. Why? The recreational vehicle market has changed a lot in the last five years. 2017 they built over half a million RVs in the United States. That was 17% over what was built in 2016. Halfway through this year they're almost 6% above that rate for 2018. Late model RVs are larger, longer. They have slide-outs on them. And they're stronger; they end up being able to tow up to 30' trailers. They're allowed to be 70' long for an RV and a trailer in Oklahoma. The vast majority of the parks that exist anywhere in Oklahoma – first, almost all of them are on I-40 and then there's a couple that go up I-44 for people traveling across the country. There's none going north and south. So this location lets us capture people leaving Houston and driving to Yellowstone, and they will stop at their 7-hour break in Norman, Oklahoma. The older lots where RVs used to be 20' long, they used to be van conversions or pick-up truck conversions or 30' long, most of them across the country can't accept a 70' long half million dollar RV and trailer. So the supply available is limited and the demand for the spaces is going up dramatically.

Specifically on this lot, again 6.2 acres. It's already platted. It's already zoned. I've listed some of the other sizes of the lots in the area. Originally, we thought that I-1 zoning was going to work without any amendments, but there's not a word in the I-1 base zoning that says anything about staying the night. I-2 you're allowed to have a night watchman. But I-1 mentions nothing about anyone staying the night. There is a zoning for mobile home parks; it's RM-4. But that would not allow daily rental for RVs, which is what this park is. So the only remaining option was to have a PUD done and come back in front of you and ask for rezoning of the parcel. To kind of reiterate, I-1 allows the sales of RVs specifically. They can fill the whole lot with a parking lot and park a whole bunch of RVs on it. They're allowed to service them. They're allowed to build a warehouse and store them. And they're allowed to have offices all in I-1. The only thing that we need is the sleeping on-site. That's why we've got a PUD. Further limitations on the park, City of Norman has an ordinance that says you have to have a license to operate an RV park. It's very dated. I think they're going to have to come back and maybe ask to change some of that. For instance, it requires one washing machine for every 30 RVs and a clothes line, not a dryer. So we may be back to update some of those a little bit. The licensing requires no more than 15 RVs per acre; this site has 12.25 per acre. Park has to be at least five acres, so it has to be a large parcel; this park is 6.2. RVs have to be 25' from the public right-of-way; this one is 40' minimum. So we've got big setbacks and less density than the RV park ordinance would allow. All guests are going to have to leave their registered name, permanent address, tag number, driver's license and all of that before they can even come on the park. There won't be unknown people on the premises and they'll have to be able to leave their permanent address as well, and they have to keep that list – it's a register that the City can come inspect at any time and they'll have to be able to go back in time for a year to know who was there at any point in time. Furthermore, all of the RVs have to be able to have all of their own facilities. The site will be plug-in electric and water, and then they'll be able to remove their waste when they leave the park, but they'll be required to have those as well.

I'm going to fly through some picture for you, to give you an idea of some of the types of RVs and trailers. This is a 5th wheel pulled by a heavy duty or a medium duty pick-up truck. That's another one with the sides that slide out. That's where the width changes. A lot of the older parks have maybe a 10' wide pad site, but then you have pop-outs that come out 18" to 24" on each side and people are walking in the grass around them; it's just not convenient. You'll notice later that these pad sites are 18' wide. This was new to me. This is a toy hauler. It can be pulled by a pick-up truck. The front half is residential; the back is basically a garage for your motorcycles or ATVs or what-have-you. Those can also be pulled by a 30' or a 40' RV as well. This is called a Class C Motorhome; it is built on a van or a truck chassis, also has the slide-outs on it. Moving up to a 35' Class-A Motorhome with the 2' slide-outs. Conversion from a bus.

A motorhome with the toy hauler, which is 65'. There's 70'. There's another 70'. So there's nowhere really in the area that you can park something like that. So they just drive right through Oklahoma. And that's probably seven figures for that get-up right there.

The modern RV owners generally families with significant disposable income. Instead of staying in a resort somewhere, they pack up the kids, jump in the RV and take their own accommodations with them.

The allowed uses – this was gone over by staff. Short-term rental for RV pad sites. We did add the possibility of an apartment. Say it was an apartment community or even a mobile home park – you would have an on-site manager in a unit there. But offering an RV for an on-site manager to stay in didn't really seem appropriate, so we wanted the ability to maybe add a small apartment above the office where somebody could stay there 24 hours. But it specifically states that it's for on-site personnel, so it's not going to be renting it out for a non-employee. It would be only for on-site personnel. And we gave them 2 because someone doesn't want to be there 24/7 and there may be a manager and a maintenance person. But that isn't the primary use at all; it's more of a management/operational issue. Then we clarified that all the existing I-1 uses could stay.

Some of the differences. This has 35% greenspace – 2.2 acres. That's pretty much any two lots along the frontage on I-35 there in green and open space. A PUD, by the way, only requires 10%, so they're going – they didn't use a PUD to try to reduce that space. 76 maximum RV spaces. A building footprint of 10%, which is significantly less than could be built otherwise. Reduce the building height to 2 stories; I-1 is 3 stories or 45'. So it will be a less intense development than what could go there.

We did have a couple neighbors show up at the Pre-Development meeting and we visited with them there and have come back and modified the PUD I think five or six times to try to tweak it to make it work for them. The site plan, I believe, we're on version seven to try to optimize it for everyone. Gated fence all the way around it. Six acres of fence is a significant cost, but they want to not only keep it safe for any guests, but also trash and anything from blowing around. They're only asking to be able to do signage that would already be allowed in the I-1 district; they're not trying to do anything over the top different with a commercial signage. They want to keep the exterior of the buildings basically looking the same, so it won't be some glitzy glam looking thing that wouldn't look normal in the neighborhood.

Here's the site a little larger. You'll notice, again, that these sites are for the large RVs. That's 80' deep and we generally allow for a parking space behind it even. They share the little green spaces in between. These sites are designed to be able to handle an 80' or two 40's and then having the parking space beside it. Over here is a restrooms/washrooms area, kind of an open community building. They may have a continental breakfast available when people leave. Patio – probably have a couple barbeque grills there. A little maintenance shed shown there. This is the office. People would be able to pull in. Gated off the entry here. It's a one-way in, one-way out; both gated. All the interior drives are at least 25' to be able to allow the proper turning radius; it's been engineered to work. We have two options here; this is what they plan to build. We don't want to be deceptive. This is the one they intend to build. In the future, if the building opportunity of adding a maintenance shop or something is a better use, we just wanted to be able to do that as well.

That's a closer look. A normal parking space maybe in your local grocery store might be 8.5' wide, maybe 19' or 20' deep. These are over 9' wide and showed as 20' deep. So there's really ample parking and it gives a driver more room to maneuver. They may not be professional truck drivers, so they can cut that corner a little tighter and still be able to get into that.

The greenspace plan – minimum of 20' on all sides. Fifteen feet up front. It will be further than that, but the dumpster had to go in there and some other things, so 15' was all that we could really clearly say. I believe 30 trees are shown.

This is the second option that shows those other buildings. Just plopped three buildings down there in that general footprint area. We don't have those designed or planned. Just so that in the future they'd be able to add those regular industrial use buildings. Zooming in, those

were 120' by 60' to scale. Also shows the restroom building there, little patio/maintenance building. On the front side the third optional building and the office, the gates, dumpster.

That might be the kind of building that would go there. I don't know that that meets the exact codes, but that's the picture that I found today that I put in the slideshow. Something like that might go up front where they could service them, have a little office for the service center.

The property is already platted. I did some quick calculations. It's a very large site. You could put a 165,000 square foot warehouse on it, 45' tall, with 60 parking spaces. You could build a 3-story office building, 120,000 square feet, with 400 parking spaces. That's just going across the hall and getting a building permit. The applicants' proposed use is much less intense than that. They've got 76 people, maybe a few staff people. Maximum building area comes up to less than 30,000, so five times less than what could be put in there. It's the largest lot in the area. That was one thing I did want to throw in there – the Woodspring Suites – and neither myself nor the owner knew that might be a problem property until we heard from the neighbors at Pre-Development and in their letters. The owner is here and I promise you he does not want any of those problems. I expect that we'll be able to work with the neighbors and help resolve those issues by adding more lighting, security cameras, and things on this site. That hotel has 102 rooms on 2 acres, 51/acre ratio; this is at 12.5/acre ratio so it's nowhere near the density. All the guests here pull in in their vehicles and stay all night and then leave. They won't be wandering around the neighborhoods.

That was to show the scale. The density up here is significantly higher. As a matter of fact, this lot I sold two years ago and they have since filled that in. I don't know that they have their final permits on it yet, but it's probably 90% concrete and buildings right now. So this cul-de-sac area will be completely built out. This area down here is still one lot to go, and I guess this is a lot as well.

Owners are going to be good neighbors. They're going to help the existing neighbors with any code violations existing at the hotel next door. They want a safe location for their own guests. They'll have additional lighting, security cameras. I want to clarify, again, this isn't a residential trailer park. I'm going to take the blame for planting that seed in the opening overview of the PUD. I was starting to draft language showing that there's nowhere for these things to park because there have been mobile home parks closed in Norman and none made for 50 years. I think that gave the impression that we were looking to do a residential mobile home park. That is not what we're doing. It's an RV park, not multi-family.

Just to give you an idea of what it costs to own an RV nowadays – these are prices for used ones. Pulled these today. Those are all the 35', 36'. Here's some new ones. That's not including trailers or other vehicles. So this isn't a low-rent district by any means. They want to be able to have customers come and stay, pay a pretty significant amount nightly for water and sewer and the other buildings. I did include the source, so if anybody wants to look it up, I'm not just making this up.

Typical notice area 350'. You are familiar with that. I did the quick math on that. That's usually around 11 acres in the notice area. This notice area had to be increased to 850' to collect the minimum 15 neighbors. That makes the entire notice area over 100 acres. I think that's significant when you think about that. The notice actually goes across I-35 at one of I-35's widest point and named two neighbors over there. The scale of this project is hard to see on the pictures. There was no comments from Greenbelt Commission officially; I did speak to some of the people afterward and they talked about having some of those wider setbacks so kids could get out and run and walk their dogs a longer distance. So we added the landscape plan and increased those distances. Pre-Development we had two neighbors attend; I believe one of them is here today and then a new one has since put in a protest letter. We did modify the PUD to try to accommodate them.

With that, that's my presentation. We respectfully ask for your approval of PUD O-1819-5, and I would be happy to answer any questions, along with the owners if I can't answer them for you.

2. Mr. Sherrer – You described the fencing. I think I read it was security fencing. Do you have a design on that? What kind of fencing would it be that would be surrounding the property.

Mr. Worster – The PUD does state kind of the wrought iron look, 6' steel fence along the front, because that's going to match not only to have a better front façade, but also the security gates will be made of that as well – those will be sliding back and forth. The rest of it is going to be chain link, which is pretty much the same stuff that York has on their property. It's a 6-acre parcel and you can't do a \$40/foot fence around it. They want it enclosed. They don't want people being able to sneak in and pull something off one of these RVs and run off with it. The whole idea is to keep it a secure facility.

3. Mr. Knotts – Will there be a limitation as to the number of nights that each individual can stay?

Mr. Worster – That was one of the things we addressed. I had originally wrote up to a year on leases in the PUD. The owners didn't request that; I was just trying to give them flexibility. After the Pre-Development meeting, we pulled the year out. It currently reads as nightly, daily, weekly, or monthly. Realistically, you can't leave your RV there parked in one of these spaces for a month. You would want to take it somewhere else, because the cost would be prohibitive. So they'll be limited to – the PUD will allow it a month, but we really don't see that happening at \$40, \$50, \$60 a night for a parking space.

4. Mr. Knotts – You know there are football fans from Houston.

Mr. Worster – Yes, and they may stay for a weekend or ...

Mr. Knotts – I'm familiar with people that come, bring their RVs, and park them for a season.

Mr. Worster – I don't think that will be viable at our cost point. I don't want to stand here and say that no one is going to come up and spend \$1,500 a month to be able to park their RV there. If they want to do that, then they may do that.

Mr. Knotts – But there is nothing that – other than cost prohibitive – nothing that prevents them from coming on September 6 and staying until play-offs – I mean, December?

Mr. Worster – From a practical standpoint, I guess, it would be hard to limit that and just have to rotate them out. But they're not going to be able to have a permanent address. There's no mailboxes.

Mr. Boeck – But there is no limit? There's no – like no more than a month? No more than two months. Specific.

Mr. Knotts – Or basketball season only.

Mr. Worster – We did not see it as a problem. If that's something that – I don't think the owners would be against making people drive off for a night and come back, or whatever needed to be done. They're going to be there, by the way. I didn't mention that. They're going to be owner managing this. They're going to be on-site. They're not the hotel owner in Kansas. They're going to be there. They're not going to let any shenanigans go on, because this is a big investment. This isn't a small project. This is 7 figures, starting with a 2. Short answer, they could stay longer.

5. Mr. Lewis – I have a question for staff. I have three questions and one partially relates to what some of the Commissioners have already addressed. With this being an RV park, is there any stipulation in the ordinance if we change this from Light Industrial to PUD that specifically spells out how long a mobile RV can be parked in a lot of this nature?

Ms. Hudson – So within the PUD you're asking ...

Mr. Lewis – Right. Is there anything in the Norman City ordinances that would stipulate how long a mobile RV could be parked in this kind of a development?

Ms. Hudson – I think you're probably referring to Chapter 13, which would be the section that they have to – one of our Code Officers goes out and does annual inspections for the

mobile home parks and everything. I don't believe in Chapter 13 that there's anything in there that says how long someone could ...

Mr. Boeck – You just said mobile home park. This is not a mobile home park.

Ms. Hudson – This is not a mobile home park, but Chapter 13 covers licensing for mobile home parks/RV parks, so they would have to meet any standards in Chapter 13.

Mr. Lewis – I'll go on to the other two questions and maybe we can come back to that one and get a specific answer, because I know, like for food trucks that park in parking lots, they have a specific time limit that they can be there before they have to move and do something, and I think this would give comfort in knowing we have a finite timeframe if someone came and stayed, would they be limited to staying a week, a day, a month, a football season, a basketball season, or permanently? That's a concern for me. The next concern is, knowing that the RVs will have bathrooms and showers, and that this property will be connected to the Norman sanitary system, do you know will there be required impact fees into our sanitation system when this park would be developed?

Ms. Hudson – There will be. We already actually talked to Utilities about that. I don't know exactly what the calculations would be, but we do know that they will be charged the excise tax for the development.

Mr. Lewis – And third and last, knowing that there would be more dumping than there would be consumption of water, and that the rates in the City of Norman sewage is based on consumption of water between November, December and January – I believe that's the dates – would there be a calculation made to compensate the City for excess dumping, as opposed to the consumption of water into our sanitation system? Or have we addressed that?

Ms. Hudson – I'm sorry, but I don't think that's been addressed. That wasn't discussed.

Mr. Lewis – Do you see what I'm saying? I mean, if many RVs are coming in on I-35 and are using the site as a dumping station, then that would be a huge impact on our sanitary system in the City of Norman. However, if the PUD is only being charged for consumption of 1,000 gallons a month or some arbitrary amount that doesn't even correlate to the amount of dumping that is occurring, then there's a huge offset there that City is having to foot the bill for.

Ms. Hudson – I'm sorry. We didn't discuss the offset of that. Like I said, I do know that we talked to Utilities already and there will be an excise tax on it. But as far as, like you say, the impacts for the additional dumping ...

Mr. Lewis – Is that something we can address before City Council gets this?

Ms. Hudson – I can get with Utilities and find out if there would be ...

Mr. Lewis – And then back to item number 1 that I had, that limited amount of time. Could we have an answer for that?

Ms. Connors – I don't believe that we have any time limits in Chapter 13 that says an RV can only be in a location for any set amount of time.

Mr. Boeck – But that could be written into the PUD.

Ms. Connors – Yes, and it would need to be in the zoning document. The zoning document will be what governs how this use operates.

Mr. Lewis – The reason I bring up these questions because of the three protests that were vocalized. Many of them are concerned this is going to become a permanent parking lot for RVs or recreational vehicles or housing.

6. Brad Worster – Mr. Chairman, if I could maybe add a little bit to those questions there at the end. I just spoke with the owners. In the PUD itself we had originally said daily, nightly, weekly, monthly, annually. They're willing to strike monthly off of that right here today and moving forward to Council remove the ability.

Mr. Boeck – What about striking annually?

Mr. Worster – That's already been done. So we'll take another term off of it and do that right now. Their intent isn't that. I don't know that, from a practical standpoint, someone could really live there for a long period of time. Not only financially – they wouldn't have their own address. They couldn't register to vote. They couldn't get mail. Couldn't go to schools. So they wouldn't be able to really do that.

Mr. Boeck – Yeah, but if it's an old couple that doesn't want to get mail, and they've got lots of money.

Mr. Worster – I don't know that that's detrimental. It keeps them from driving in and off every day. It would maybe reduce the traffic. But if the concern is that they stay too long, we'll drop the month off and when it moves forward to Council we'll get rid of that. As far as the water and sewer part, each of these – you've got to think of them as a sealed container. Whatever they take in – they fill up with water – they'll put 40, 50, 60, 100 gallons of water in their RV when they leave. When they're there, they're using water just like a normal faucet, and then they purge the system when they leave. So they will use quite a bit of water and it may not be exactly the same ratio, but we will definitely work it out. They're not trying to steal water or overburden the sewer system by any means. If the Commissioners feel that eliminating monthly is appropriate, they could maybe amend that on the motion and we'll strike it moving forward to Council.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Andy Golden, 1401 Wandering Oaks Lane – I own the property right across from that and I've probably got \$3 million invested in that. I've got a lot of inventory. So it may only be an acre and a half, but I consider my acre and a half worth more than theirs, personally, because of the layout. I understand his rights; I'm really against going against anything. But I've had a terrible problem over there. My signs have been run over five or six times. My parking lot is being – people park there even though there are signs there. They use it as a turn-around. I'm right directly across from them. I've had invasions from the hotel over there, with drug use, to people – kids vandalizing. I've had the police out there. The police are always out at the hotel – they have been out at the hotel. There's no way they're going to be able to control what's going on in my parking lot. Right now I'm going to have to have some concrete fixed because of these big trucks that are always on there. They talk about the rich people, well not all people drive a million dollar RV – some of them just pull up in a \$25,000 RV. I know \$1,500 seems like a lot, but there are people in that hotel that live there all month. Most of them have been pretty nice. But the problem is I have a big invasion on my property of people using it when they shouldn't. My property is about 25,000 square feet. It looks like a metal building, but inside looks like a bank. I spent, I think, \$700,000 remodeling it inside. I've got a theater room in there that's 70' x 50'. It's a personal thing for me also. It's a weekly deal where I have people using my property. Either their cars, or people coming in there walking around. I don't know how they would control it. I don't know how they're going to control people coming over there, wanting to walk their dogs, wanting to walk up and down that alley. I have a big green space, too. I've got an acre and a half and half of mine is green space. I've got the same problems and I'm really worried about a bigger invasion. I'm already dealing with the hotel. Now I'm going to be dealing with a bunch of people that come in for a day and they have absolutely no investment in what they're doing over there, other than they're there for a day. They come in like people that are going to stay there a day and they're going to wander around. Maybe they'll stay in their area. Maybe they're going to want to walk up you know. My brother-in-law does stone work out there. He's a national stone guy from all over – does castles in Europe. He builds stuff out there. We've had several people out there messing with his stuff. Even though I have posted – even though I have cameras and I have all that. I've just had a big problem with people coming out on my property. I may have to end up putting a fence around it and putting a gate on it if I'm just inundated with all these people that are going to go out there all the time. That's my main problem. Like I said, I don't know these people here. I'm sure they're great people. I don't like to tell people how they can use their land or not use their land. I just have a problem with what it's going to leave my problem with, and that is protecting my property and not having to deal – because I have a major problem with that from trucks turning around in there, and now you've got these big – you know, if they go the wrong way, the only place they're going to be able to turn around is my place, because I have two big entrances and I can handle these big 70' vehicles. That's basically my issue.

2. Sama Astani, Taeed Properties, 5500 Huettner Drive – I'm speaking on behalf of the company my father and my uncle own, who own the property Metro Turf Outdoor Power Equipment. I'd also like to make this known, this is not a personal attack. I am all for implementing businesses on Huettner. It's good for us; it's good for the Huettner community. However, I do believe and we are very personally against rezoning this district as outlined in our letter that I can hopefully clarify some other reasons. So just to build up what Andy said, I can give you kind of a personal experience of what it's like on Huettner. We've been there since 2001. We were one of the first buildings on Huettner Drive, second, I think, to his building. Huettner Drive is small. The service road is small. Indian Hills Road bridge is small and crumbling. The street is constantly being repaved. There are a lot of businesses on Huettner on top of a hotel which, by the way, we were very much against. However, Mr. Huettner claimed a lot of stuff that convinced us, and it did not come to pass and it's not the hotel that we thought it would be. Implementing an RV park would destroy the street. The street is already full of trucks. It is full of semi-trucks. When Victory Gymnastics has meets, the street is packed; you cannot move through there. We have trailers moving in and out all day. There is no room on Huettner Drive for RVs to come in and out every single day. There is no room with the Johnson Controls Air Conditioning plant, especially when they go off shift. The service road is backed all the way from Indian Hills to our building, especially on shifts. We cannot get out. Indian Hills Road bridge is packed when their shift is up. You will be sitting in traffic for about 20 minutes in Norman; that's kind of atrocious. We are very concerned with security. Our business since 2001 has been broken into several times. We have been implementing security systems. We have recently beefed up our security system – Metro Turf has. I have a document from the Norman Police Department from 2016 documenting the instances at the hotel, and at the hotel there have already been 6 calls for burglary, 20 calls for domestic violence, 7 calls for assault, and 23 calls for motor vehicle accident. Having an RV park would increase these numbers. We're very worried about the security for our business. Our business at its peak carries about \$3 million in inventory. That inventory, however, is not just ours. Servicing the City of Norman, servicing our neighbors in Moore, we carry a lot of equipment for the citizens of Norman and Moore. These people's equipment will be put into danger if we allow residential zoning – or PUD, I apologize, I don't know the terminology – if people are allowed to stay on Huettner Drive. To have on-site personnel is not security enough. To have that many RV vehicles parked there with the amount of people is not enough to have one or two people sitting there for security. Having a fence to protect their property is all well and good, but who's to protect our property? The traffic – again, I have to reiterate – you guys have to come there during peak hours. It is not – not – I repeat, not capable of holding the traffic of an RV park. It is not capable of holding the traffic currently for today. Another issue that I'm glad we spoke about is how there is no guidance for somebody how long they can stay at the RV park. I know they understand – I guess they're willing to get rid of their monthly stipulation. But what's to say somebody drives off their RV park and then comes back in the next night? To us, that is a residential zoning and we do not agree with it. We are vehemently against this. Again, it's not a personal attack; it is just to protect our businesses and all the businesses around us who, again, have millions and millions of dollars of inventory, who have been there since the beginning of Huettner. That's our argument.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend rejection of Resolution No. R-1819-19 to City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

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

YEAS

NAYES

MEMBERS ABSENT

Sandy Bahan, Nouman Jan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Erin Williford, Andy Sherrer

Chris Lewis

Neil Robinson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend rejection of Resolution No. R-1819-19 to City Council, passed by a vote of 7-1.

Dave Boeck moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-5 to City Council. Erin Williford seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Erin Williford
NAYES	Sandy Bahan, Nouman Jan, Chris Lewis, Dave Boeck, Andy Sherrer
MEMBERS ABSENT	Neil Robinson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-5 to City Council, failed by a vote of 3-5.

* * *

Mr. Jan requested to be excused from the remainder of the meeting.

Item No. 4, being:

O-1819-6 – NORTHSIDE CHURCH OF GOD REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR A CHURCH, TEMPLE OR OTHER PLACE OF WORSHIP FOR PROPERTY CURRENTLY ZONED R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, AND LOCATED AT 222 E. HAYES STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Aerial Photo/Site Plan
4. Letter of Explanation
5. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Janay Greenlee reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports this Special Use request with the variance for the metal building with an evergreen landscape buffer to be continually maintained in the front of the building. Staff recommends approval of Ordinance No. O-1819-6.

2. Mr. Boeck – Coverage?

Ms. Greenlee – They have to maintain all the R-3 setbacks, so the 5' from the side property and the 65%.

Mr. Boeck – The metal building doesn't put them over any kind of maximum coverage?

Ms. Greenlee – No.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

None

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Chris Lewis moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-6 to City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Sandy Bahan, Chris Lewis, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Erin Williford
NAYES	Andy Sherrer
MEMBERS ABSENT	Nouman Jan, Neil Robinson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-6 to the City Council, passed by a vote of 6-1.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

O-1819-7 – MUIRFIELD, INC., REQUESTS CLOSURE AND VACATION OF THE PLATTED BUILDING LINE ON LOT 8, BLOCK 1, WILLOW BROOK ADDITION, LOCATED AT 914 W. TIMBERDELL ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Request to Close and Vacate a Build Line

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff supports the request for the removal of a platted 55' front building line and establishing a 49' front building line for Lot 8, Block 1, Willow Brook Addition.

2. Mr. Boeck – Are there any other houses that encroach also along Timberdell?
Ms. Hudson – I'm sorry; I can't answer that. I just know that their understanding was – and being out there on-site – they thought that the house on the west actually did encroach.

3. Mr. Lewis – Is that footing the actual house that's being built? The footing and the foundation is already poured, so now they're coming back after the fact asking for the 6'?

Ms. Hudson – No. They knew moving forward that they were going to be going over that platted build line. They submitted a letter of understanding that should, for some reason, they not get the vacation that they would have to remove that and comply with the platted build line.

Mr. Lewis – Kind of presumptuous.

Ms. Connors – We allow applicants to do that if we have a letter in hand. They understand that they're taking the risk, not the City.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

None

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-7 to City Council. Erin Williford seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Sandy Bahan, Tom Knotts, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Erin Williford, Andy Sherrer
NAYES	Chris Lewis
MEMBERS ABSENT	Nouman Jan, Neil Robinson

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1819-7 to City Council, passed by a vote of 6-1.

* * *

Item No. 7, being:

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSION & STAFF

Ms. Connors announced that this would be her last Planning Commission meeting. Jane Hudson will be the Interim Planning Director.

Item No. 8, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "K. Connors", is written over a horizontal line.

Norman Planning Commission