

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

MARCH 9, 2017

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 March, 2017. 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 Neil Robinson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Sandy Bahan
Nouman Jan
Neil Robinson
Lark Zink
Dave Boeck
Tom Knotts
Andy Sherrer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Erin Williford
Chris Lewis

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Leah Messner, Asst. City Attorney
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator
Jud Foster, Director, Parks & Recreation

* * *

CONSENT DOCKET

Item No. 2, being:

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2017 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

and

Item No. 3, being:

COS-1617-4 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY VICTORY CHRISTIAN CHURCH, INC. (MICHAEL R. JOHNSON, P.L.S.) FOR VICTORY MEADOW ADDITION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 5101 84TH AVENUE S.E., APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE SOUTH OF POST OAK ROAD ON THE EAST SIDE OF 84TH AVENUE S.E.

and

Item No. 4, being:

COS-1617-5 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY JOHN OFFENBURGER (SURVEY SOLUTIONS, INC.) FOR OFFENBURGER ACRES FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF ROBINSON STREET APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE WEST OF 60TH AVENUE N.E.

* * *

Vice Chair Robinson asked if any Commissioner would like to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, he asked if any member of the audience wished to remove any item. There being none, he turned to the Commission for discussion.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Dave Boeck moved to approve the Consent Docket as presented. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to approve the Consent Docket as presented, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 2, being:

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2017 REGULAR SESSION MINUTES

The minutes of the February 9, 2017 Regular Session of the Planning Commission were approved as presented on the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 3, being:

COS-1617-4 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY VICTORY CHRISTIAN CHURCH, INC. (MICHAEL R. JOHNSON, P.L.S.) FOR VICTORY MEADOW ADDITION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT 5101 84TH AVENUE S.E., APPROXIMATELY 1/4 MILE SOUTH OF POST OAK ROAD ON THE EAST SIDE OF 84TH AVENUE S.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Norman Rural Certificate of Survey
3. Staff Report

COS-1617-4, the Norman Rural Certificate of Survey for VICTORY MEADOW ADDITION, was recommended for adoption by City Council on the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 4, being:

COS-1617-5 – CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY JOHN OFFENBURGER (SURVEY SOLUTIONS, INC.) FOR OFFENBURGER ACRES FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF ROBINSON STREET APPROXIMATELY ¼ MILE WEST OF 60TH AVENUE N.E.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Norman Rural Certificate of Survey
3. Staff Report
4. Request for Variance

COS-1617-5, the Norman Rural Certificate of Survey for OFFENBURGER ACRES, was recommended for adoption by City Council on the Consent Docket, with a variance to the width at the building setback line for Tract 1, by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

NON-CONSENT DOCKET:

Vice Chair Robinson announced that there are a number of items that have requested postponement until the April 13 Planning Commission agenda.

Item No. 6a, being:

R-1617-73 – MATTHEW AND LAURA FLIES REQUEST AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR 0.923 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4751 24TH AVENUE N.W.

and

Item No. 6b, being:

O-1617-28 – MATTHEW AND LAURA FLIES REQUEST REZONING FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, TO C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, FOR 0.923 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4751 24TH AVENUE N.W.

and

Item No. 6c, being:

PP-1617-7 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY MATTHEW AND LAURA FLIES (D5 ARCHITECTURE) FOR WHITETAIL MERCANTILE FOR 0.923 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 4751 24TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Postponement Memo
3. Request for Postponement
4. Excerpt of February 9, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes

Item No. 7, being:

O-1617-29 – UNIVERSITY NORTH PARK PROFESSIONAL CENTER LOT 1, BLOCK 1 REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE EXISTING PUD ESTABLISHED BY ORDINANCE NO. O-0203-2, AS AMENDED BY O-0506-9, O-0607-13 AND O-1415-45, TO GENERALLY ALLOW FOR C-1 COMMERCIAL USES AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF 24TH AVENUE N.W. AND TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Postponement Memo
3. Request for Postponement
4. Excerpt of February 9, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes

Item No. 9a, being:

R-1617-60 – WALLY G. KERR REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR 0.73 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 801 36TH AVENUE N.W.

and

Item No. 9b, being:

O-1617-32 – WALLY G. KERR REQUESTS REZONING FROM RM-2, LOW DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR 0.73 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 801 36TH AVENUE N.W.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Postponement Memo
3. Request for Postponement

Item No. 11, being:

O-1617-31 – AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING CHAPTER 22 OF THE CITY CODE TO ADD “MUNICIPAL USE, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC UTILITY” AS A SPECIAL USE IN THE RE, O-1, CO, C-1, C-2, CR, C-3, I-1, M-1 AND MUD ZONING DISTRICTS; TO REMOVE “MUNICIPAL USE, PUBLIC SERVICE OR UTILITY USE” FROM THE PERMITTED USES IN THE A-1 AND A-2 ZONING DISTRICTS AND ADD “MUNICIPAL USE, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC UTILITY” AS A SPECIAL USE IN THE A-1 AND A-2 ZONING DISTRICTS; TO REMOVE “MUNICIPAL USE” FROM THE PERMITTED USES IN THE TC ZONING DISTRICT AND ADD “MUNICIPAL USE, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC UTILITY” AS A SPECIAL USE IN THE TC ZONING DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Postponement Memo
2. Excerpt of February 9, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to postpone Resolution No. R-1617-73, Ordinance No. O-1617-28, and PP-1617-7, Ordinance No. O-1617-29, Resolution No. R-1617-60 and Ordinance No. O-1617-32, and Ordinance No. O-1617-31 to the April 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. 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, Neil Robinson, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Tom Knotts, Andy Sherrer

NAYES

None

MEMBERS ABSENT

Erin Williford, Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to postpone Resolution No. R-1617-73, Ordinance No. O-1617-28, and PP-1617-7, Ordinance No. O-1617-29, Resolution No. R-1617-60 and Ordinance No. O-1617-32, and Ordinance No. O-1617-31 to the April 13, 2017 Planning Commission meeting, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 5, being:

O-1617-26 – HINES FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST REQUESTS VACATION AND CLOSURE OF A PORTION OF THE UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATED ON THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE SOUTH SIDE OF LOT 14, BLOCK 2, LAS COLINAS ADDITION SECTION 2.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Memo
4. Petition to Close Easement
5. Attachment A

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Ken Danner reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. Staff does not see an issue with this and recommends approval.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Bob Dill, representing the applicant – I don't actually have a presentation for you. I think your staff report covers it all. It's a very simple request to close a 7.5' wide strip in a 15' wide utility easement. I would add that the OEC electric line has already been moved by OEC, so there's no impediment to going forward with it. Planning Commission and the City previously granted a Consent to Encroach, so this is a step up from the Consent to Encroach so that the permanent improvements can be made without risk of them ever having to remove them. That's why we're here. If you have any questions, we'll be happy to answer them.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1617-26 to the City Council. Nouman Jan 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, Neil Robinson, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Tom Knotts, Andy Sherrer

None

Erin Williford, Chris Lewis

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1617-26 to the City Council, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 8a, being:

O-1617-23 – ARIA DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. REQUESTS VACATION AND CLOSURE OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY OF OKLAHOMA AVENUE BETWEEN ENID STREET AND CLASSEN BOULEVARD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location
2. Staff Report
3. Letters of Non-Objection from Utilities

Item No. 8b, being:

R-1617-69 – THE CITY OF NORMAN AND ARIA DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. REQUEST AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM OPEN SPACE DESIGNATION TO COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION FOR BLOCK 14 OF SOUTHRIDGE ADDITION, LOCATED SOUTH OF ENID STREET BETWEEN CLASSEN BOULEVARD AND OKLAHOMA AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

Item No. 8c, being:

O-1617-24 – THE CITY OF NORMAN AND ARIA DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. REQUEST REZONING FROM R-1, SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, FOR BLOCK 14 OF SOUTHRIDGE ADDITION, LOCATED SOUTH OF ENID STREET BETWEEN CLASSEN BOULEVARD AND OKLAHOMA AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report

and

Item No. 8d, being:

PP-1617-4 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY ARIA DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR CLASSEN LANDING FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF CLASSEN BOULEVARD AND LINDSEY STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Development Plan
6. Greenbelt Commission Comments
7. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. We did receive protests from adjacent property owners coming to 8.1% within the notification area. Staff does support this request. We recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1617-23, Resolution No. R-1617-69, Ordinance No. O-1617-24, and PP-1617-4.

2. Mr. Boeck – Why did you approve this?

Ms. Hudson – Why did we approve this? Well, they're requesting to utilize the piece of property there that's designated as open space. The Parks Board recommended approval of that area because technically it's considered more of a traffic island – that's how Parks recognized it. As far as the closure, I can't speak to the closure – that's Traffic.

3. Mr. Sherrer – This may be a question for David, but from a transportation perspective, we have one less curb cut as it's proposed, I think, if I'm keeping track of that. What impact does that have on traffic? Is that safer? I admit I'm not as big of an expert as you are, Sir.

Mr. Riesland – Any time you can get rid of curb cuts on a road like Classen that's a good thing.

Mr. Sherrer – Hopefully it would help the safety.

Mr. Riesland – Absolutely.

4. Mr. Robinson – Enid Avenue remains open; is that correct?

Mr. Riesland – That is correct.

Mr. Robinson – And there will be a connection from the commercial area onto Enid to go out. In other words, you could come from the commercial area that's proposed onto Enid and go.

Mr. Riesland – Yes.

Mr. Robinson – You could also go north on Oklahoma?

Mr. Riesland – Yes.

5. Mr. Knotts – Do you know if – I don't know if you've got this plan, but the area of Enid and Oklahoma into the property on the east side of Oklahoma is shaded. Does that mean it's going to be rebuilt?

Mr. Riesland – It's probably a question for the applicant.

Tom McCaleb, engineer for the applicant – You're correct. The shaded means it's going to be rebuilt and the applicant will pay for it. That is what that means.

Mr. Knotts – Is that the only entrance into that parking around that building?

Mr. McCaleb – One connection coming from – there's one to the south, there, Tom.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, representing the applicant – I think I'll be able to answer all those questions during the presentation in just a moment. First I want to clarify again, you've kind of heard it, but I want to be very clear about what's in front of you tonight. There are four items, but the first three – a, b and c – I want you to realize are, in essence, a joint application of the City of Norman and the applicant. The closure of Oklahoma Avenue, which you see on "a" over on the right, and then "a", "b" and "c" is the rezoning of that traffic island – it's not a park; it's a traffic island and I'm going to show you verbiage from the Parks Department in just a moment. Then the last item is what you would traditionally see from a developer like us – a preliminary plat. But the large piece of the development as you see on the bottom is the only thing before you is a preliminary plat. It is already zoned commercial and there's no change there. So the essence of what happened here is this applicant came with this case and the City, through those discussions – and you're going to see this verbiage in just a minute – basically said we have a problem on Oklahoma Avenue. We have cut-through traffic that has been a problem for a long time. What if we clean this whole situation up, close Oklahoma Avenue, and piece this together so we correct that problem? Applicant was fine with that; we did that. We said okay, let's do that. So we've come forward with this application and I'm going to show you what that involves. The applicant is bearing all the cost of this, frankly – will bear the cost of reconstructing the street, of demolishing it, and will take the open space in perpetuity in maintenance on their dime. All of that is laid out in your staff report and put upon the applicant.

You've seen the location right there outlined in red. Again, this is a zoning. It is already zoned commercial, so the bulk of this project – the vast bulk of it – the building area, the parking lot area – is already zoned. There's no land use change here. There's no change in use, intensity, density – anything. That's already there. It's already platted. We're not replatting anything beyond what needs to be done to make it one site, and I'm going to show you that in just a minute. 2025 already shows this as commercial; there is no change there. So, again, the only change is out on this point, and that's as a joint application with your City through us so that we can clean up the traffic problem.

There you see it. That is OU on two sides of us. To the north is OU and a parking lot – they built basically a bridge across to this large facility right here. They have OU across the railroad tracks, as Ms. Hudson mentioned. The Millennium project down here on the right, U-Haul over here on the lower left, Classen Boulevard shooting up here. I think you can start to see the problem they're having. You see Classen Boulevard, which is a pretty high-traffic situation, and you can see it's just a quick little turn right up Oklahoma Avenue. You hardly even have to slow down. You just veer to the right and you're zooming up Oklahoma Avenue. I'm going to show you in just a moment from the staff report how they have actually calculated the percent of cut-through traffic, as they call it, regarding the complaints they've received on Oklahoma Avenue. As Ms. Hudson showed you, the site was frankly kind of a mess. It was a salvage yard and there's a floodplain behind there – a sensitive body behind it. That's a salvage yard that's been cleaned up and will be cleaned up with this. It's gone now; they've demolished all of that. It's now just parking pads. But all the curb cuts are still there, and you see them right there – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 curb cuts, two street intersections – 6 actually, then two street intersections right here. So many curb cuts. As Commissioner Sherrer said, we face this all the time. I was in a meeting just today where we were going to ask for another curb cut and, in essence, we weren't going to get it and we backed away. But that happens daily in this building, asking for curb cuts and being denied them. And no way whatsoever will you ever be given that many curb cuts. So we're cleaning up that situation on Classen Boulevard. Again, you see the curb cuts – one right there, two right there, three, four, see five right there, two intersections very close together. We never get to put intersections like that anywhere near each other. I was on the phone today with the City Attorney – they're wanting to condemn a curb cut down on 12th Avenue and we're not wanting to lose that and we're negotiating how close we can get this curb cut up to Highway 9 and we're talking hundreds of feet to try to figure out how to do this within standards. In no way whatsoever would you ever do anything like that nowadays with two curb cuts that close together. So it's a dangerous and a disruptive street edge condition that we're going to be cleaning up with this development.

That is the preliminary site plan in front of you. You see it right there. That's the building right across it – about 19,000 square feet right there. It faces Classen Boulevard across the front and you can start to see the cleaning up that we're doing on the street edge right here. You can see the new sidewalk all the way up the edge and only two curb cuts – one at the top and one down here at the bottom. This curb cut then feeds into an area right here that then feeds to the back, where employees can park – primarily that will be employees. As Commissioner Knotts asked, does it go back out to the top? It does. But primarily this is employee parking back here, and so you can see with the two curb cuts out front, and the building really shielding that back area, by and large almost all this traffic is going to come in and out of these two curb cuts. Down here we have another building, likely a restaurant. We're working to fill that with a restaurant right now. East Norman has been wanting restaurants and things of that nature for a long time. We're excited to possibly bring one right there and there's discussions in the works right now as to what restaurant that would be. So that's the site plan. You see the floodplain line right there – the blue line. That is the floodplain; to the right of it is floodplain. We're not touching it. We're not even getting close to it. You can see quite a bit of separation all across there. That is not the case right now. There is pavement back close to that floodplain right now that we're going to be taking out and restoring back to green. As Mr. McCaleb showed you, you see the dark gray up here. The developer, at their expense, will demo the street, reconstruct this street, and add in all the curbs and the sidewalks and all of that along Classen Avenue, all at their cost and expense to improve and clean up this situation.

That's the preliminary plat, again. The changes you see are the curb cuts – significant changes in curb cuts. That's a significant value hit to the property, frankly. We try very hard to not lose curb cuts, but here we're glad to do it – taking it down to two and a new sidewalk edge all along there. There previously was one curb cut up on Oklahoma; we're not changing that. There was one before; there would still be one now. The other big change is we're relocating a sewer line. The sewer line comes down through here; we're going to relocate that to accommodate the building that would be built around it.

Green space is a significant improvement as well. On the right, you see that is from your website and that's the link for the stormwater utility plan that went through. We ran this number and it was 38% green or, on the alternative, 62% impervious. This site will increase the green; we're going to 48% green now, reducing the impervious, taking it down to 52%. That's something everybody wants significantly is a proposal right now in R-3 areas to go to a maximum impervious of 55%. I don't know that that will pass, but even if that passed here, we would still meet that as a renewed provision. So we have significant improvements on green space on this site, and not touching the floodplain at all.

As to the Oklahoma Avenue closure, it is a joint application. It really wasn't even our idea, is my understanding. That is actually confirmed when you read the staff report. I'm going to read it verbatim. That's it. These are not our words; these are the staff's words. It says the City of Norman has an opportunity to improve the transportation network and traffic circulation in the area by eliminating an unnecessary intersection that will reduce the cut-through traffic that has plagued the residents of Oklahoma Avenue. Over the years, the City has considered an improved layout of the Classen Boulevard, Oklahoma Avenue, and Enid Street intersection area and sees in the current proposal an opportunity to make that a reality. I note the words over the years. That's been around longer than we've been around. We just came to this site. But over years they have looked for a solution on this site as to this problem. It goes on – the segment of Oklahoma Avenue between Classen Boulevard and Brooks Street has been the subject of considerable scrutiny over the past several years. We haven't been here for several years. So for several years you've had a problem on that intersection. In bold I would show you – staff has received numerous complaints regarding cut-through traffic and speeding on this segment of roadway. Again, it's because, as you can see on the right, it is a quick little loop right up into Oklahoma Avenue from Classen at high speed, and so they go on, and this was pretty remarkable to me – I didn't know they did this – but they actually calculated the amount of cut-through traffic. They came to a number. Staff said 35% of the traffic currently using Oklahoma Avenue are cut-through trips. 35%. They went out there and calculated it, took numbers, and came to that conclusion. The closure of Oklahoma Avenue at Classen Boulevard will eliminate one of two closely-spaced intersections along Classen Boulevard and discourage cut-through traffic. Ladies and gentlemen, several years they've had this problem of complaints – numerous complaints – looking for a solution. We didn't create that, but we're here happy to help to do it per our joint application to close that street, all at our expense, and putting an island into the perpetuity maintenance column of this developer and off the City's.

Let's talk about that island. It's a .13 acre traffic island. You see it up on the right. If you look closely up at the right, the red is the current green space. The green outline is the result of this project. Same scale; same drawing. At Parks Board we committed this, and we're happy to put it however you want to put it – but that green area will stay green. So you see the transformation is from the red to the green – open space to open space. There is no change. It will be open space, just as it has been open space. We also committed at the Parks Board that if we take out a tree, we replace a tree. We will keep it as it is with that minor change, and we will clean up a traffic condition that has been a problem plaguing – your words, not mine – this neighborhood for several years. I want to read again from this staff report. This was the Parks Board, and we were there for quite a while that night. I was at that hearing. We debated it for quite a while. Parks Board initially was, you know, gosh, what are we going to do here? We're moving a so-called open space or traffic island into a development, rezoning it to commercial because it's one lot now, so it has to be the same zoning. How do we do that? So we talked through the tree preservation. We talked through the open space preservation. In the end, after I think maybe 30 or 45 minutes, they went to a unanimous vote to support this project in this fashion. This was their report. It said the small triangle of island is currently classified as a beautification island. We do not classify the area as a park, due to its small size and busy location. It is basically a traffic island. Staff agrees with this proposal, which would transfer ownership and maintenance of this small traffic island from the City to the developer – in perpetuity, I would add – and not make any noticeable impact on the amount of usable parkland in the Norman park system. Developer will keep it in a manner that keeps as much

green space as there is currently in a safer condition at developer's maintenance expense in perpetuity. All at the developer's cost; all at their dime. Staff supports this. The City, in joint application, has brought it to you, and we're happy to accommodate it.

We're cleaning up a terrible street edge. You see it right there. Again, you can kind of see the problem. These cars coming up and they just can make a quick, swift move right up Oklahoma Avenue at high speed – 35% of the traffic on Oklahoma Avenue is doing that right now. You see the street edge right here – all of these curb cuts, which is a particularly dangerous condition. We try to eliminate those as much as possible, and here we're going to do that.

I want to share one last slide with you. This was the Greenbelt Commission. We went in front of them as well, of course, and we talked with them at length. The picture on the left is – it's a little fuzzy, but that's the best imagery you have of the Greenway Master Plan. But if you look at it, and it's hard to see again, but this is Lindsey Avenue – the red-dashed line is Lindsey. Boyd is up here. The yellow-dashed line is, in essence, a proposed trail that came down through this area. But what was discussed at length at Greenbelt Commission that night, and I was at that hearing as well, was they didn't want to put it along that creek – there's nothing there. There's nothing to the north and they don't want the trail behind the commercial building and they had nothing to connect it to. So this is their comment – the project should honor the intended trail, but not in the alignment suggested in the Greenways Master Plan. They did not want it there. So they said a trail should be designed for continuity and safety, particularly regarding crossings of driveways and intersections. So we discussed that night how do we do it? We discussed this bridge back here with OU and how pedestrians are already coming from this building over to here into this parking lot, and so what was concluded is that we will bring the trail along the street along the new sidewalk in a much safer condition than was ever there before. So that was the result of those discussions and that, too, went to a unanimous support of Greenbelt Commission for this project in that manner.

So with that, we have support from Parks. We have support from Traffic. We have joint application with the City. We have support from Greenbelt Commission at their suggestion to do what we did. We hope to have your support. Staff supports this. They wrote the subject tract was platted in the 1920s, discussing the little island. Public improvements are existing and no additional improvements are required. The developer will be reconstructing Enid Street at their cost. There will be rerouting of water and sanitary sewer, as well as replacement of sidewalks and overall development. Staff supports this request and recommends approval. Significant and broad support from the entities that you have trusted for a long time – the Greenbelt Commission, the Parks Board, staff, Traffic, everyone is onboard with this and asking you to support it tonight. With that, I ask you to support it as well. I'm happy to answer any questions you have. Tom McCaleb is here, obviously, and he's happy to answer a lot more questions if you have them.

2. Mr. Jan – I have just some general comments to make. I travel through this road at least four or five times a day. This is one of the busiest roads. Just an observation, besides project and whatever, but something similar was constructed on Classen south – the new businesses south of Walmart. The only problem since we go there from my office for lunch and stuff like that, it's the coming in and going out of that particular commercial building has become more and more hazardous, because you have that new red light close to Walmart, and the amount of traffic and the volume of traffic. This particular junction has almost twice the traffic. So my only concern right now is the traffic. Are we expecting more accidents? People slowing down, cutting to get in. That is just my concern right now. I have no problems with the project.

Mr. Rieger – No, I don't think we are. In fact, as I think your Traffic Engineer told you, we're expecting a safer condition. I would remind you this property is already platted. It is already commercial, and it already has five curb cuts. They could go build right now the commercial building. It would be slightly different than what they're showing, but not a lot different. It's already got more impervious. They could go rebuild it right now without coming back through this process and keep the five curb cuts and keep the cut-through traffic and

keep it all the same. They don't have to do that. They have the right right now to go do a commercial project on that site and leave it as a much worse traffic condition than what it could be. So we definitely believe it's a much better improvement. Your Traffic Engineers believe that. Everyone believes that and that's why it's in front of you tonight.

3. Mr. Robinson – I have a question. On the north side where you're connecting from the back side of the commercial development into the Oklahoma and Enid intersection, I see there's your dumpster location to pick up the dumpster and then you're bringing your parking lot back out onto the roadway there. Is there a method to prevent cut-through traffic there – to prevent anyone other than the employees, for instance, from using it?

Mr. Rieger – Well, I don't think we've considered it in any particular specific instance. I think it would be highly unlikely that somebody who's shopping and using this area right here would think to even go back around over here when they could simply drive to right there. I think it's highly unlikely you're going to see people do that, or when they could simply drive to right here. I don't see any benefit or reason they would travel all the way around the building to come back to what is essentially a similar location. So it's not something we considered. We believe this is a really good layout. We think that, actually, the employees will be the only ones that even notice this parking in the back. In fact, if you think of commercial centers around town, I would encourage you to consider how often do you drive behind them? Or how often do you see traffic driving behind them? Not very often. So I don't think that would be a problem here.

4. Mr. Robinson – I think the access onto Oklahoma to go north is probably the issue – what you have now, obviously, is not a good situation. Another thing about onsite detention – I take it there's detention on this site.

Mr. Rieger – No detention. We are improving the impervious – so we're actually benefitting the property by increasing green space and decreasing the impervious ground. When that happens, you have made the improvement that you have to do.

5. Mr. Knotts – So that south entrance/exit is very close to the Classen/Lindsey light. Will that be a right turn only?

Mr. Rieger – It is a full turn in and out at that point. Both of those traffic locations are full turn in and out. Staff blessed it. Staff looked at it. I forget the exact wording in the traffic report, but they have accommodated that. Again, we're going from five to ...

Mr. Knotts – I understand that, but that is the proximity, and given that it's the only one at that point, it could stack and people trying to come across Classen are going to have to be real fast.

6. Mr. Sherrer – Is there a curb cut in that proximity now – that curb cut on the south end of the project. I see there's a curb cut that you have five or six already. There's probably one there already, so in essence it's no worse than probably where we stand.

Mr. Rieger – Correct.

Mr. Knotts – Well, it is worse when you stack more people and cars and, I'm assuming that there's going to be – this isn't an office building, is it?

Mr. Rieger – It is commercial. C-2 allows for office, restaurant, retail – any of it. It could be office.

Mr. Knotts – So anything that you can put in there, and so you're hoping for some turn of the parking lot and that is going to be – it's going to put more people in that particular area, I think.

Mr. Rieger – It does put them in one spot. But, again, traffic wants that. They don't want them in four spots.

Mr. Knotts – I understand that. I'm just ...

Mr. Rieger – They prefer it that way, I think.

7. Mr. Knotts – So tell me the location of this existing southern on this – the one you had up. So this existing southern curb cut is basically the same location as this one.

Mr. Rieger – That's what I was just going to show you, if I could change the slide. It's right here.

Mr. Robinson – A little further north.

Mr. Rieger – And then there's one right here. So we in a similar – actually a better location than what's there existing. I trust the Traffic Engineers who say that's a better condition than what the existing condition is.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Rosemary Preston, 517 Enid Street – My protest is that, when you close that access road, you're going to cause more traffic to be diverted onto Enid Street and the way he has this plan, he's basically making Enid Street a driveway for his property – that's what his plan is. You see it's directly in there. It goes directly from Enid Street onto his back part of his property. That's going to put more traffic on Enid Street. My driveway is directly in front of that onto Enid Street, so now he's talking about taking my driveway away where I park in front of my house. There's going to be more traffic – like I'm going to have to look – really be careful when I back out of my driveway so that I don't get injured. Now they're talking about widening Enid Street – which there's no reason to widen Enid Street if you're not going to use it as a driveway onto your property. I mean Enid Street is fine the way it is. Then they're talking about closing Oklahoma Street, and I live on the corner of Oklahoma and Enid Street so I am well aware of how much traffic whips off of Classen onto Oklahoma Street and how fast they drive. Those people do go fast – I agree with that. They do go very fast down there. But you're not going to stop them from going fast; you're going to change that so they're going fast down my street and then they're going to whip around that corner to go down Oklahoma Street. It's not going to decrease the amount of traffic; it's going to change where the traffic is, which is going to cause potential hazards – there are children that play on Oklahoma Street. There are people that walk their dogs. There are people that live next door to me that are an elderly couple; they walk down that street. My niece comes out of her driveway. I've lived there for over 40 years. So those are my concerns being on the corner of Enid Street. That plus that park, which the Parks Department asked me to adopt that as a park about five years ago. So, as far as I know, it was considered a park by them. It's a greenbelt area in front of my house which detracts from the traffic that I have to look at. I don't have to look at the traffic on Classen Street because those trees are there. Those are my concerns: the increased traffic and that that's going to cause potential danger for me living on Enid Street. Plus I don't really particularly know how they're going to widen the road when I won't have access to my house.

2. Terry Shelby, 513 Enid and 1505 Oklahoma – I live on Oklahoma Avenue and we own a house right next door to Rosemary on Enid Street. I've got basically the same concerns that Rosemary was sharing with you guys. I'm not opposed to the development, and I like the idea of closing the avenue, as far as slowing the traffic down and all that. My concern is if we give access to the property on the north side like it's proposed here, then it is going to create the increase in traffic on Enid Street, like Rosemary was talking about, and it's also going to potentially increase the traffic on Oklahoma Avenue. We don't know what types of businesses are going in there. We don't know what kind of traffic is going to be coming down there, but through the years it could be significant we think. So we would rather just see the access coming in from Classen, not from the north side. Thank you.

3. Karla Shelby, 1505 Oklahoma – I also own a house at 513 Enid. So I'm actually being affected on two streets. I'm being affected on Oklahoma and Enid. My parents are 93 and 86; they live on that street. So here's the problem. I'm not against commercial. It's already commercial. I'm not against saying that it stay commercial; that's fine. But I like the neighborhood; I'm for the neighborhood. I live in an historical area and I want that neighborhood to stay a neighborhood. So my proposal is Oklahoma Avenue – they keep saying

that we've been plagued by all this traffic. Okay, you're saying the word closure. You're closing, yes, at Classen, but what you're doing is saying that Oklahoma is actually closed. No, it isn't. It's another entrance and exit to a commercial property. So the people that want to come to those spots – whatever that restaurant or whatever it is – they would have three options. They have Oklahoma entrance, Enid entrance, Classen entrance. Okay, that's going to cause a lot more traffic down a neighborhood that's historical. We walk dogs. We jog. My suggestion is I would like to see Oklahoma Avenue at the south end curve – make a complete curve with a curb into Enid, so that the addition right now is pie-shaped – Oklahoma is straight and the street is pie-shaped and at the bottom is Enid. If we make Oklahoma come straight south and curve at the pie at Enid, then every street that runs east and west into Oklahoma is a neighborhood. Oklahoma is an avenue for a neighborhood – for Enid, Shawnee, Tulsa – and then nobody messes with the commercial business – they have a north entrance – they have room to make a north entrance and a south entrance on Classen, just like every other business has two entrances. They still have two major entrances, north and south, on Classen. Leave Enid alone. Leave Oklahoma alone as a neighborhood – quiet neighborhood. Oklahoma Avenue – go all the way down, curve it and right there Enid – don't even mess with it. Foliage – guess what, that park – leave us a few feet. There's a red fire hydrant and a drainage ditch. Leave us about three feet right there to put some trees up so we don't see the commercial building and give the rest of that pie – or whatever they want to call it – park to them. But leave us some foliage and give us a curve so that every ...

4. Darla Miller, 513 Enid Street – I'm also a co-owner of a house, 513 Enid, at the corner of Classen and Enid. I do not want to see Enid Street become a traffic street. I have a 93 year old and 86 year old parent that lives at the corner. There are no sidewalks, so for them to walk to my sister's house at 1505 Oklahoma, they walk on Enid Street, make a turn going north onto Oklahoma and walk in the neighborhood that they live in. We want to see that area stay safe. Right now, the only traffic on Enid are the people that live there. There's only two houses on Enid and they've been there for many, many years. Now the proposal is that Enid Street is now the new entrance to the north end of a commercial area. What I would like to see is, again, they can keep a north entrance. They have that green area owned by the City that they want to zone commercial. That's fine. So a little south of Enid you could put in the north entrance to that area, curve it around so they can go by their trash cans and the back end of their parking lot. None of the plans have to change. What you see on the plan – we're not asking for anything to change. It's all there. We're just asking that that north entrance not be Enid Street, because it's going to become traffic right there and you have only two owners, and one has lived there for 40 years, and I have elderly parents that live there and don't have a sidewalk that they can walk on. To me, they deserve to have a quiet neighborhood, even though we're going to have commercialism, and we've had commercial properties there before, so that's nothing new. There's been businesses there before – a wrecker service and all that. So that hasn't changed. We're just asking that this humongous building that might have potential of lots of business and people in it not come down Enid Street. As far as traffic goes, I think this would help, you know, keep Oklahoma and Enid. I propose, also, that it curves into Enid. I would like to see that stay a neighborhood street. I believe that the fire hydrant that is there could stay there with some foliage around it. Enid Street would not have to be widened. It would not have to go toward our properties and take away some of our front yards the way that that ...

5. Mallory Daniel, 517 Enid Street – This house has been in my family – well, I was born in the house. So it means a lot to me. There's been two generations go through this house. It will be handed down to my daughter after we're gone. I hate to see it go commercial. I'm with them about putting the bushes and stuff in front of the business – give us a leeway so we don't have to see the back of the trash bins and all that stuff. It's come a long way. Like earlier this year there were derelicts – bums that were living in there in the trees. I don't want to see the trees gone. It gives us a little buffer. It's just so sad because you're going to take my driveway. You're going take trees that my grandmother planted. It breaks my heart. I don't know what else to say, but I

just want to save my street and it doesn't need to be widened. If you're going to widen it, build it on the park side, not on our side. There's so much pipes and stuff – sewage and all that on our side that goes out to Enid. I really don't have anything more to say. But I just want to leave it the way it is. It doesn't need to be changed with the entrances and all that. I agree with all the people that were up here before. I love that house. I love that neighborhood. We used to ride horses up and down that road when we were kids. That parking lot that OU has – I had a barrel horse that I used to ride in that pasture. One of my foals was born in that pasture. There's just a lot of history with that area with me and my family. I guess that's all I have to say.

6. Barbara Fite, 535 Shawnee – That's heartbreaking and I would kind of like to make everybody happy, and I think there's a way to do that. I don't understand exactly. I like the stuff that Aria builds. I like the idea of closing Oklahoma. I like the little park. We were told in a neighborhood meeting that it was a park and maybe we could do something with it with Southridge. I think it should be a big park – bigger. I don't know why they need – are you planning to take that park up with parking?

Mr. Rieger – No. Green space.

Ms. Fite – It'll stay a park? So that same place stays. I mean, if the street could be closed and turned into green space and let Oklahoma just dead end into a park it would, to me, seem to be helpful, maybe, to everybody. I do think it might be a good addition to the neighborhood to have something nice there instead of what was there. I do think it will bring in more traffic than the tattoo parlor did that used to be there and the palm reader that I always meant to go to and never did. So it will bring more traffic. I definitely agree with all the people there that Oklahoma should not be an entrance into that commercial spot. But anyway, good luck to everybody. I wish we could keep the green space. Thank you.

7. John Ryden, 620 Tulsa Street – We live in an historic neighborhood just to the north of this location and, of course, commercial property is – I have no problem with that. That's how it's zoned. I think that's great. I think what's the issue to me is there's some safety issues that, perhaps, need to be tweaked. Classen is a very busy intersection – or busy street and the north entrance of that property that is proposed onto Enid Street is going to be, to me, seems like just like was said, an entrance into that street. I think that needs to be tweaked a little bit. Also, I think no one has mentioned about the traffic just to the north of that in that parking lot where OU parks. There's going to be a lot of traffic now going through Enid, going through Brooks, going through Chickasha, going through Shawnee – through the various neighborhoods to get to that parking lot, or coming from the other direction. So I think there's some issues that need to be looked at as well and I do like the idea – if you could go back a couple of slides, do you mind, to see where that green space – is that possible? Okay. That's what I wanted to see to make sure the green space was there. Okay. The question I have, though, is about the north entrance in the back of the building, and how that's going to filter onto Oklahoma and to Enid Street. I'm not crazy about that idea. But there's some issues that need to be looked at. Safety is definitely one of them. The inflow of traffic into the neighborhood that – and there's no doubt going north on Classen and making that sharp right onto Oklahoma is an issue for some people, and especially for those that are living on Oklahoma and Enid Street. So I hope that you take that into consideration, and maybe the developers can do some tweaking with that. But we look forward to the commercial property, just maybe a little tweaking needs to be done and some more thinking about the way in which traffic flows through there. Thank you.

8. Sandy Ryden, 620 Tulsa Street, which is part of an historic neighborhood just north of the area that we're talking about. I have concerns about closing a street. Period. I think it sets a bad precedent. Yes, I understand the safety issues, but I think to begin to do that for commercial property, or any property for that matter, is something that really ought to be looked at and for you all to be quite hesitant on. As far as closing the street is concerned, you are going to have more traffic on Enid Street. It does seem that human beings will do just about anything to avoid a traffic light, including going down Enid Street to rumble on down Oklahoma

to Brooks and beyond, because they're trying to avoid the traffic light at Brooks and Classen. You are going to have a lot more traffic with this commercial property, which I'm glad it's going to be there. I'm glad they're just going to have two entrances, hopefully, not three. But I just wanted to caution everybody on closing a major street. I walk this area all the time. I walk that little green space. I always feel secure being on Enid Street now. I will not feel secure nor safe if that gets closed off. So I hope you'll just give that some consideration, because I'm pretty concerned. There's a lot of walkers in the area and there were also people who couldn't be here at this meeting this evening who have grave concerns about closing it off who are in the historic district. Thank you all.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Sean Rieger – We were just talking quite a bit about this and I just want to give you a few thoughts what we've heard from traffic engineers and if Mr. Riesland wants to comment. My understanding is that that was actually discussed at one time to close this, but they were worried that traffic would come down Oklahoma and want to get into this site, and so when they do, they would then wait here, turn left, hit their brakes, and turn left again. So that was my understanding what was talked about, and Mr. Riesland is nodding his head, that that would be actually more dangerous, and so we were told that they wanted this connection to keep that from happening is my understanding. So this was actually deemed the safer way to do that.

One other thing I would say in comment, again, I'm hearing all this about nobody wants a commercial connection ...

2. Mr. Sherrer -- ... making up stuff here, but if you push the building back, or did some sort of a redesign – I don't know if they would be open to that, but to me that's the key is really that back deal, David. To me you have some questions about whether or not – it does become, when you have the flow-through, a potential flow, where instead of having the safety that you want to have for pedestrians walking that commercial development – I know usually you're looking at things from a road perspective, and not at an actual development, but to me you do present an opportunity for someone to expose. I understand the left turn deal, but was there thought put into the other side of that, which would be the traffic in the neighborhood?

Mr. Riesland – I don't know if they really have room to ...

Mr. Sherrer – I don't know if they do, either.

Mr. Riesland -- ... take the Enid to Oklahoma movement – the through movement and have the driveway T into it, for example.

Mr. Sherrer – No, I really meant more behind – the back, as Sean just talked about. I understand the having to turn left and then turn left back into the commercial property but if you could have the back entrance and still have the Enid, which I think creates the nice neighborhood that many people have commented on tonight that produces a really nice residential area, but you still have that commercial development that produces sales taxes, all the things we want it to, that makes that really nice corner, but do you have to have that back connection to the neighborhood? Do you really feel like that's essential from a traffic perspective?

Mr. Riesland – We don't absolutely have to have it, no.

3. Mr. Knotts – It looks like there's adequate with the current design – adequate space to bring a drive from the north entrance off of Classen around the north side of that building and connect right into the proposed drive ...

Mr. Boeck – Not really.

Mr. Knotts – Yes, there is.

4. Mr. Sherrer – Maybe I'll just make a comment, then. I'll just say this. I support this plan overall and I will vote for it as is, but I think there's some concerns that I have about is this the perfect plan? I think it's a much better plan than what's been in existence before. I think we're improving our traffic flow. We've had an area that's zoned commercial that, frankly, I think they

could put something in place right now that's very similar on the space. But I'm always looking for the best solution. So, as this progresses to City Council, I think finding and determining if really that is a better traffic situation, because that's what we're trying to accomplish is the optimum traffic situation here – is that really the best? I think working with neighborhoods to understand whether that's best or not, keeping the green space as it is – I think they've done an amazing job of keeping green space as a big part of this, but I think that's where I would think the challenges before it comes before the ultimate body that will make the decision – City Council. I would encourage maybe further discussions.

Mr. Riesland – Trade-offs either one way or the other. Yeah.

5. Mr. Knotts – Well, it's a matter of what was discussed as traffic problems and holding the community – the development – the historical area together and not creating a jeopardous situation for the residents. I think that really has precedent over some idiot that wants to come out on Classen and stop and then turn in. They'll learn quickly enough how to navigate to this building. If the drive to the back, which is adequate, could just come right around the north side, it could say employees only and kind of completely take care of all the problems that we've heard about tonight.

6. Mr. Sherrer – I have a question for Susan, a real fast one. If we vote in favor of this tonight as presented ...

Mr. Boeck – Well, I'm not.

Mr. Sherrer – We make our recommendation – I'm just, as a body if we voted in favor of this, then we would still be able to have the comments and promote that to City Council as seeking the optimum solution. But if we vote no, then that just goes a no and, I guess, the comments go along, too, really either way with the vote. Is that correct?

Ms. Connors – Yes. Your minutes will go forward with this to City Council verbatim, so you could do it either way.

7. Mr. Rieger – Mr. Chairman, we've been sitting over there sketching on this while you've been talking on Mr. Knotts' idea – Commissioner Knotts ...

Mr. Boeck – This is not the appropriate place for this kind of stuff.

Mr. Rieger – For what? I'm sorry.

Mr. Boeck – For ad libbing.

Mr. Rieger – We're trying to work it out, Commissioner. We're trying to work through this.

Mr. Sherrer – I'd like to hear it, frankly.

Mr. Rieger – So we've been sketching over there. I just showed Mr. Riesland. I think you lose a little bit of green space, and we're not sure if your Sanitation works, but we're certainly willing to look at this before we get to Council to see if that works. If it's safer – again, we were told it was safer to do it this way, but if that's okay with Traffic, we're okay to explore that idea.

Mr. Knotts – Okay. Well, I think that preserves the neighborhood much better than this solution that you had.

Mr. Rieger – We're not married to going into Enid Street. We were told that's what everybody wanted. If we can work it out with Sanitation and Utilities and that space – you can't see it, but I'm showing Mr. Riesland – we're happy to look at it.

Mr. Knotts – Okay. Well, I have a French curve that I can make this work. I know you don't use pencils anymore.

8. Mr. Sherrer – I'll just repeat, then, my last comment would be I'm very supportive of that sort of a change, if Traffic can get comfortable with it. I think that would be an ideal solution, to make sure that everyone is – it seems like everyone then ends up with an optimum solution.

9. Mr. Boeck – Well, I'm still skeptical. Enid Street is a horrible solution. If the City came up with that then I'm dubious as to other solutions, because one thing, I live in this neighborhood and I drive this neighborhood every day, three or four times a day. You have the parking lot for

OU, which OU was able to slide their parking lot in there and all the traffic that goes along it. Fortunately, Oklahoma Street, on that end, is very practical for what it does, bringing the traffic in and out off of Classen for everybody that parks in that parking lot. I don't know how many hundred cars and trucks go in there every day, but that's how they come in there. So when you cut it off to Enid, what you're doing is making all that traffic go down Enid Street and then turn a corner. That's a very narrow corner there, so that's stupid. It's stupid to do this. I know the developer wants to get his square footage in there, and I'm sorry that the City approved this as far as the greenbelt and everything else, 'cause it's a stupid solution. I say let the developer deal with things the way he's got it in reality. That street works. You talk about all the traffic that goes up the street fast, but there are no street fronts until you get to Brooks. All the houses face Enid and the other streets. You've got a couple houses there on the east side of Oklahoma and that big parking lot and all that traffic – it's got two solutions: you either go down Brooks to the parking lot or you go up Oklahoma, and the way Oklahoma is sited right now really makes getting off the street onto Oklahoma very easy, so you don't have a hindrance of traffic at Classen. It's really easy to get on and get off right there, and it doesn't affect those houses, 'cause that's a neighborhood with houses. It's a very small street and I'm all for development happening, but I want to see it done sensibly and I want the streets to be done sensibly and not just come up with solution like this, because it's not sensible. That's my feeling.

10. Mr. Jan – Being an engineer myself, obviously this plan is designed in case Oklahoma Avenue is closed. A question to our developer, why can't you push your building towards the south and not close the Oklahoma Avenue, make the readjusts the citizens want? I think, personally, I know you guys were drawing stuff over there. I can always draw something over here and come up with a solution, so I think it has to be rethought. This is not looking – like Dave said, not sensible to me.

Mr. Rieger – Let's be very clear. Your choice is that – five curb cuts and no approval through this process. We go build whatever we want through the current zoning and the current planning. It's been very clear – I think we've shown you through the staff reports and the impetus of the City itself to close those curb cuts. We don't have to close anything if we go forward with the plans as we wish under the current zoning and platting. All this we're talking about was to improve the conditions. We're happy to do it, but we don't have to.

11. Mr. Boeck – Just wait a minute. You were talking when you were up there about the places that the City makes people cut off – take out curb cuts. This is a development project. You can – and I've seen you do it – take out curb cuts on a new development.

Mr. Rieger – Correct. When it's replatted. We don't have to replat. It's already platted. We're replatting because we're moving in that side piece. But we don't have to replat. It's zoned commercial, 2025 Plan commercial, platted right now. We could increase the impervious – C-2 allows for a much bigger impervious than what's there. We could do a vastly different project, but it's not better.

Mr. Jan – Obviously, there will be Plan A, B and C and what we are shown is perhaps E, D or F.

Mr. Rieger – I disagree with you, Commissioner. What you're proposing us to just leave it alone is not better; it's worse.

Mr. Boeck – Well, for the developer. For the neighbors ...

Mr. Jan – We have not seen that. That's what I'm saying.

12. Mr. Danner – I do need to make one correction. This property is not platted.

Mr. Robinson – It's not platted?

Mr. Danner – No.

13. Mr. Rieger – Alright. My understanding is that – you're saying it was not platted, but we could go ahead and get a building permit on it now, because it's already zoned and there's already improvements on it.

Mr. Robinson – Would the City staff require platting to accept this plan? You'd have to plat it.

Ms. Connors – Yes. To issue a new building permit on this property, the property has to be platted.

Mr. Rieger – That was not our understanding before.

14. Mr. Robinson – I think there's a good many things about this that I like. I concur with Sean Rieger's conclusion about the curb cuts along Classen; it's not a good situation. The opportunity to rectify it is good; I'm glad we have the opportunity. But I also see there's a problem with that connection into the neighborhood on the north. I think there's also a problem with the fact that that 120-car parking lot was put there and brings a lot of cars through the neighborhood and that's going to continue whether this project goes forward as it is shown or as it's redrawn, however you do it. That's still going to happen. That's a separate problem, really, from the problem that this project is trying to solve. There's a good deal about this that I like. I do see some opportunity up on that north side. With some creativity and some reconfiguration I think you could probably redraw that to achieve the goal. There's one issue that hasn't been brought up yet that probably is going to fall into the mix before everything goes on is the Fire Department is going to want circulation around the building so there's going to have to be some way to get a fire truck back there without backing it up. Fire trucks are going to go where they need to go, and that's the bottom line. The issue, I think, is that the north side connection into Oklahoma and Enid Street – it's difficult. It leads to traffic on both streets, but the condition is existing now. It's going to continue to exist because of the parking lot on Oklahoma. Then the question becomes is there a way to reconfigure this to make that better and satisfy as least some of the concerns of the neighborhood? There's also, I think, an opportunity to slide the southern driveway north into the next bay of parking to get a little more separation from Classen Boulevard. But there are things like that that can be undertaken. But in the meanwhile, I think the north side concerns me and the connection to the neighborhood. I think this needs to be reconsidered and reconfigured in a way that would be a little less of a problem on that north side.

15. Mr. Boeck – I was going to say one more thing. I'm for development along there, too, because of all the stuff that we've had there and the palm reader was the last straw. So I want to see commercial along there but, quite frankly, and this is just my own humble personal opinion, driving that four or five times a day, the way Classen and Enid and – what's the next street north of Enid? -- Chickasha work right now, they work. You have your residential separation. You have a park – whether you call it a traffic – it's a park that has trees on it that provides green separation for Enid Street so they have some privacy. Those things, I think, need to be taken into consideration. How you enter and exit that development, I'm not sure how you do it, but I also watch how cars get to that OU parking lot, and because Classen is the way it is right now, they come off of Classen – or off of Porter right there and go into the parking lot and don't bother anybody in the neighborhood and leave the same way. Anything that you do that disrupts that is going to bring more traffic onto Oklahoma one way or the other, unless we can refigure out where that parking lot goes. That's just my thoughts.

Andy Sherrer moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1617-23, Resolution No. R-1617-69, Ordinance No. O-1617-24, and PP-1617-4, the Preliminary Plat for CLASSEN LANDING, to the City Council. Dave Boeck seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1617-23, Resolution No. R-1617-69, Ordinance No. O-1617-24, and PP-1617-4 to the City Council, failed by a vote of 2-5.

* * *

Item No. 10a, being:

R-1617-88 – THE CITY OF NORMAN REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION AND HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO INSTITUTIONAL DESIGNATION FOR 7.33 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF WEST ACRES STREET AND JAMES GARNER AVENUE FOR A NEW NORMAN PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTRAL FACILITY.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

Item No. 10b, being:

O-1617-33 – THE CITY OF NORMAN REQUESTS REZONING FROM I-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, AND R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO C-3, INTENSIVE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, FOR 7.33 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF WEST ACRES STREET AND JAMES GARNER AVENUE FOR A NEW NORMAN PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTRAL FACILITY.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report

and

Item No. 10c, being:

PP-1617-8 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY THE CITY OF NORMAN (CEDAR CREEK, INC.) FOR NORMAN PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTRAL ADDITION FOR 7.33 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF WEST ACRES STREET AND JAMES GARNER AVENUE FOR A NEW NORMAN PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTRAL FACILITY.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Preliminary Site Plan (3 sheets)
5. Greenbelt Commission Comments
6. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF/APPLICANT:

1. Terry Floyd – I'm the Development Coordinator and also the Project Manager for the Central Library. Tonight we are kind of breaking new territory; you don't see us plat and zone our own properties very often. For this we have a NORMAN 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan change; you see that and, of course, Commissioner Robinson read that, that we'll be changing that from what is designated as commercial in the 2025 to institutional use so it will remain that for City purposes. The cell tower stays the same. Also, you'll be looking at a rezoning tonight, from I-1 and R-3. The current zoning has I-1 in a big slug of the tract that was the old Adbar plat, and then the little homes up front were R-3 some years ago, I believe in the 50s, so prior to the zoning ordinance, I believe. Then, of course, we would be changing that to a commercial zoning. There's a little aerial of the triangular-ish shaped piece that is the Central Library property today. This is our plat; it's rearranged differently to set somewhat square with the world so it's north and south. You see the roadway on the right-hand side there is where James Garner Avenue will eventually run at some point, and that's part of the Norman Forward program, just like the library is, so that's been taken into account as we've looked into building and platting this property. There's a copy of the site plan as well that you see on the preliminary plat. The library will set close to the frontage of Acres, which is on the very bottom there. All the parking will be dedicated back to the west and then the north of the property. There's about 318 spots there for parking. There's another sheet there just kind of showing some of the site details, and I'll walk you through those in another presentation here in just a second. There's another portion,

the northern site with some more of the parking connection to Highland, and then actually back here a connection to Hughbert Street.

Now I've done the staff presentation; now I'll do the developer presentation. Tonight I wanted to start here with something that you'll see – I wanted to show this to you because we're doing something tonight that's 50 years in the making. This picture was a picture of the groundbreaking December 21, 1965 of the Central Library that is here today. I think the Mayor is up there – Mayor Morgan and the State Librarian, William Lowry. Just an interesting kind of perspective of where we're at today. I've mentioned some of this to you, but it is a 7.39 acre site. The library itself will be 79,000 square feet – the building will be, and I'll walk you through a few details of that here in just a moment as well. The site actually has – I had put 295, but there's been a slight modification – about 300 and change parking spaces on it. It has a number of LID features – low impact development features. There's bioswales that are included as part of the islands in the parking lot. Geological gardens all have native landscape and plantings, with very minimal irrigation. That's really just to help it keep alive and established. After that it won't be irrigated at all. There's also an element of a green roof on the children's wing that will be incorporated into the building itself. The library does access, as I pointed out, off of Acres, Highland and Hughbert Street. There is no access from James Garner Avenue when it's built. It's not there today because there's no James Garner. The library will also have an entrance directly connected to Legacy Trail on the east side. There will also be sidewalk constructed on Acres Street on our property frontage – there's no sidewalk there today. The other public improvements are being conducted really as part of the James Garner Avenue project, such as a water line relocation, road improvements, and so forth.

Just to give you a little bit of background, the design development of the 65% design of this project and the site plan was actually approved by City Council as an update to them on September 20th. Greenbelt Commission recommended approval of this as we went through the process on February 20th, and our citizens' ad hoc group, the Library Ad Hoc Group as part of Norman Forward approved the construction documents and site plan at their February 23rd meeting, so we could go forward with the bid. So it's been through a number of other bodies and boards and tonight you guys are looking at it from a platting and zoning perspective. The project is currently out to bid and we anticipate the start sometime in the second quarter of 2017 – so very soon we'll be starting the project.

Give you a few pictures of the site. You're probably familiar with it. This is standing on the north side of the property looking south back to Andrews Park. Another slide here, this is just reversed from Andrews Park looking north on the site. As you can tell back on this picture of the homes that were there – the City acquired those; those have been demolished and all of the different clean-up that you've seen of the trees and things there – the engineer actually marked those – that's all that's coming out, so there won't be any additional removed off the property. There's a picture, of course, on the west side of the property – I'm standing about where James Garner is going to be – somewhere in there looking back to the west at the apartment complex. Then, of course, this is the site looking back to the north. There's a picture of the plat, again. I think I pointed out a couple of features. Currently right now this interchange and this section of James Garner is under design and is planned to be improved at the same time as the library is under construction. It's about a two-year construction project for the construction of this Central Library on the site.

A couple of features I also wanted to point out to you -- this is the landscaping site plan – and talk about some of the low impact development features. These are some of the bioswales and different things we were talking about. The detention on this project ...

2. Mr. Boeck – Can I ask you about that? Those bioswales, does that mean – usually landscaping in the parking areas like that curb up so you've got those that you have to water them and cut the grass and stuff like that. So the bioswales – parking lots actually drain to those areas.

Mr. Floyd – Right. It's an important feature, because the detention on this project is underground. There's two detention features – one here and one here. As Mr. McCaleb might

say if he was here all the good easy land is gone. This land has got a lot of drainage and different things, but from a locational standpoint for a Central Library, I don't know how you get much more central in town. So yeah, as Commissioner Boeck pointed out, there's bioswale features here. Additionally, there's a regional geological garden here.

Mr. Boeck – What's that? What's a geological garden?

Mr. Floyd – That will have different plantings and different native planting features that – we'll have a lot of educational signage across this project to educate people on what this rain garden is, what this does, what that does, and that's part of our – this is also tracking for LEED silver certification on this building – so a building this size, it's quite a feat. So that will be taking place there. There will also be a lot of native plantings out front here and in different features. A couple of things that our civil engineer pointed out to me and I wanted to make you all aware of – the detention on this will actually release water at a slower rate than what it did historically. Normally, we make it release at the same rate. This will actually reduce a little less. Also, these bioswale features and different features within the actual underground detention will help the water even be cleaner than what it would have been when it was previously developed. So these different features help to actually clean the water as it goes into the detention basin underground, and I'll leave it here, but there's another clean-out mechanism if any kind of other debris gets in that underground detention to clean it again further before it discharges later to the creek. And, again, the drainage on James Garner Avenue – the interchange portion – is also being designed. Very important that those two work together. The same civil engineer is doing both projects.

Just a few things about the building itself. Gosh, I could talk all day about it, and if you ever see the plan set you would definitely have to. But it is about a 78,000 square foot building. It has multiple entries. A couple of key features I wanted to point out to you. There's a public meeting room in the very top of the library, and I'll point it out, that has a seating for 300. It also has a walk-out terraced area and, of course, the green roof on top of the children's section, which is a very large feature on the first story. Lots of different seating and mobile service approach, and it has books, too, but we didn't get to the books. Also a lot of collaborative study rooms and conference rooms and things, and as our operator, Pioneer Library System, works through things, I'm sure those rooms will be available for rent and various things down the line.

Of course, I mentioned that the project is tracking for LEED certification of silver – potentially gold. We're just going to have to see as we work through that. We're looking at a total building that will reduce its energy by 30% -- all LED lighting within, and actually the building is oriented in such a way to make maximum use of sunlight. There will be portions of the day in which the library will have very minimal lights on because of the amount of light that gets into the building because of its design. Of course, we'll be using low VOC paints and adhesives and sealers. Landscape bioswales we mentioned. And drought-tolerant native plants.

A couple of things about the architectural features about this, and I am definitely not an architect, but I can tell you what the architects told me. This building will have a whole variety of different types of features – stainless steel panel in portions, shaded baffling in areas, iron spot brick, a lot of clear glass to really add to an environment that people want to be in. Here's a rendering of this building. I'm standing, if you were looking north from Andrews Park, the meeting space I mentioned is right up here. This area here where you see these fine people is going to be a little walk-out kind of terraced area so you can walk out and look over the green roof on top of this section here which is the children's wing. There will be an entrance right here into this and this plaza space that we think could seat maybe a couple hundred people. So you can imagine a really nice night you could go out to the plaza and have a little outdoor concert or something to that effect – but a really nice wonderful area for people. A look at the building looking back from if we were standing on Legacy Trail looking south. You can see the connection – as part of James Garner, Legacy Trail will have to be relocated in portions, but we will have a connection as part of the Library project that will connect it to Legacy Trail so people can pull their bikes and so forth over here and there is an entrance that has a little café area and different things in the building. This little piece here – I'll show you the interior. This is the third

story and it's going to have a little glass box walk-out area so you actually can sit out there and look out over the horizon. This is on the north side of the project. If we were coming from the parking lot that I pointed out on the north walking in – it's about 140 feet of covered walk space so it'll be a 24-hour library here, if you're familiar with the one at Irving – that's what that will be like. And then, of course, back in here is the actual turn-around point for the drop-off space, staff and so forth back in here.

I won't walk you through all the details of the layouts of the floor. I will point out a couple of things. This is the children's area. It has one entrance in and any of the egress or the doors you see on the outside are only for emergency exit, so it's a very controlled space. On the first floor, you're looking at some books and, of course, what they call the back of house where they bring in books and handle things. There's also the store for the Friends of the Library and different entrance components. Second story -- a lot of staff space on the second story and then, of course, the teen area and the adult fiction. I'll just leave this at a sidebar – you can't believe how segregated teens want to be and how they try to work – library designers do – in getting them into the building, but they have their own space – all news to me. The third story is, of course, the multi-purpose meeting room I pointed out. You can see that it has the ability to really open up, and some other back of area multi-purpose rooms, what they call the local history room where the genealogy section will be is right in here. We'll see a rendering of it here in a minute. There are two elevators in the building – one that's kind of a public elevator, and then one that's a staff elevator as well – and a three-story open staircase, and we'll kind of take a little bit of a look at that as well.

This is an interior rendering of the Level One Marketplace. This is kind of looking as you would be coming in from where the covered walkway is, and you see the staircase I mentioned earlier – this open staircase right here. It's a very wide staircase – very popular in a lot of libraries today – where you would have an area where people could actually sit beside where people would walk up. It's a very open floorplan, so you'll be able to see down in different floors from the staircase itself. Children's area you can see very colorful and bright; it will have different little nook areas where kids can sit and read. There's a separate section here that actually has a wall that can close off so if they want to do story time in this area and let kids read books over here that can happen, or it can be opened up and leave to a really wide access and, of course, this is where it sits on the first story of the building. This is the third story. I wanted to show you all a couple of features here. This is the meeting room. This is that little walk-out terrace area. You can see it's a building that really relies on technology as much as it does books. There will be a lot of books in it. But there will be areas to charge your iPads. You can imagine someone having a conference here and then coming over and charging their iPad or doing their business outside of the building. This is the local history room – very traditional looking library will be the idea here. It's very different than some parts of the library, but again kind of lends itself to what it's doing and being a section. I wanted to point this out because I know very little about this, but the buffalo tables that are currently in the Central Library today are going to be relocated up there and I will take pictures when they get them up there that day, because those things are huge and heavy, but they will be actually putting those in there.

With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions. I know we've had a pretty long meeting, but I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

3. Mr. Boeck – We're excited.

4. Mr. Jan – When is the groundbreaking, by the way?

Mr. Floyd – We anticipate opening bids on March 23rd, and depending on how we work our way through the contracts and award by Council, but let's just say hypothetically Council could award by April, I would venture to say, because this is a two-year build, it's probably going to take them 45-60 days to mobilize a contractor, so to get to the answer, probably somewhere in late May, early June we could see a groundbreaking, maybe a little later. We'll be scheduling that ahead of time and it will be quite a cool event.

5. Mr. Boeck – And, of course, the senior association is hoping that the bids come in under so that there's some money left over for the senior center.
Mr. Floyd – I definitely want good bids.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Dave Boeck moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1617-88, Ordinance No. O-1617-33, and PP-1617-8, the Preliminary Plat for NORMAN PUBLIC LIBRARY CENTRAL ADDITION, to the City Council. Lark Zink seconded the motion.

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

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

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1617-88, Ordinance No. O-1617-33, and PP-1617-8 to the City Council, passed by a vote of 7-0.

* * *

Item No. 12, being:

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

1. Susan Connors – You have a special meeting on April 6 on the Center City Form-Based Code. I wanted to mention to you that I'm doing a presentation/Pre-Development meeting on March 23 here in the Council Chambers if you wanted to attend that to hear it before the meeting – what the Form-Based Code is about. It's at 6:00 p.m. I'd be happy to talk to any of you individually before the public hearing.

2. Mr. Knotts – I was looking around on the City website and I couldn't find any reference for the form-based code. I thought it was up.


Ms. Connors – It absolutely is. On the front page on the right side it says "Center City Vision Project" and you click on that, and at the very top of that page now. She'll send you the link tomorrow.

* * *

Item No. 13, being:

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments from Commissioners or staff, and no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:16 p.m.



Norman Planning Commission