

EDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, June 5, 2007

5:30 P.M.

The Edmond Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Chairperson Suzy Thrash at 5:30 p.m., Tuesday, June 5, 2007, in the City Council Chambers at 20 South Littler. Other members present were Leroy Cartwright and Barry K. Moore. Ingrid Young and Bill Moyer were absent. Present for the City were Robert L. Schiermeyer, City Planner; Kristi McCone, City Planner; Jan Ramseyer-Fees, City Planner; Steve Manek, City Engineer; and Steve Murdock, City Attorney. The first item on the agenda was the approval of the May 22, 2007, Planning Commission minutes.

Barry K. Moore requested that the May 22nd minutes be corrected to add the following: "In accordance with Title 2 of the Municipal Code calling for the election of a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission in April each year, elections were held and Suzy Thrash was elected Chairperson and Bill Moyer was elected Vice Chairperson serving from June 2007 until April 2008 when elections will be considered again."

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moore, to approve the minutes as corrected. **Motion carried** by a vote of 3-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Moore, and Chairperson Thrash

NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Case #SP070017 Public Hearing and Consideration of site plan approval for two commercial buildings on property located on the south side of 15th Street, east and north of Arrowhead Valley Addition, west of I-35. (Hilltop Plaza Joe Javadzadeh)**

This site plan was received prior to the effective date of Title 22 Zoning Ordinance (March 1, 2007).

Planning Department:

1. Existing zoning – "D-1" Restricted Commercial PUD and some in the "E-2" Open Display Commercial on the east side. The PUD Design Statement is attached plus Planning Commission and City Council minutes of the rezoning.
2. Setbacks – The front setback for building #2 on the west side of the property from 15th Street is 165 feet. The setback on the west next to Arrowhead Valley is 45 feet. The setback on the south next to Arrowhead Valley is 55 feet and the setback on the east from the east lot line is 104 feet. The south and the west elevations are sensitive borders. For building #1 the front setback is 108 feet from the property line on 15th Street. The west setback is 38 feet which is next to building #2. The south elevation is 50 feet and this is a sensitive border edge of the property. The setback from the east property line is 74 feet. The sensitive borders require a 50% increase in building setback. The property is zoned "D-1" Restricted Commercial PUD and the required setback is 30 feet. A 50% increase would add 15 feet so the rear yard to the west is 45 feet and the rear yard to the south is 45 feet. Both locations comply with or exceed the 45 feet requirement on the west (which could be interpreted to be

the side yard which is only 20 feet or 30 feet considering the sensitive border). The setback on the south for building #1 is 50 feet. The engineering plans were used in this determination, not the architectural plans. Construction will have to comply with the engineering plans.

3. Height of buildings – 33 feet to the highest point of the mansard.
4. Parking – There are two lots and two buildings. Building #2 which is on the west side of the property contains 16,100 square feet. 80 parking spaces would be required and 75 74 are shown on the engineering plans. This represents 5 less than the requirement which is not a substantial variance as compared to other sites which were encouraged not to over park. Building #1 on the east side of the property contains 28,200 square feet. 141 spaces would be required, 137 spaces are shown on the engineering plans. The buildings together contain 44,300 square feet. Since the lots are to be platted separately, they could be sold separately. Based on all of the parking provided, 212 spaces are shown on the site, and 222 spaces would be required. One of the standards listed in landscaping provides that 75% of the parking lot shall be screened from view from all surrounding properties and residential areas. Besides the grade cut, retaining walls and other masonry walls constructed on the west and the south, the parking would be screened from the Arrowhead Valley Addition. Is there sufficient screening along the front of the property to meet this standard? The landscaping plan is continuing to be modified at the preparation of the Planning Commission Agenda. Verification of the 75% screening could not be determined.
5. Lighting Plan – this property is located in the I-35 Corridor and the light poles cannot exceed 25 feet in height including the base regardless of the surrounding topography. 9 light poles are shown in the front, wall packs would be provided on the back of the building. A photometric lighting plan has been submitted. The light at the property line is very limited. The height of the poles are 19.5 feet. The building wall packs will be constructed at approximately 8 feet high on the wall just above the door height. The owner may be installing some 12 foot tall lights in the landscaped area in front of the building. This standard appears to be met. The lights are decorative in character and are generally pointed downward. There will be ambient light from the site where there is little under current conditions since the existing house on the property is vacant. The light levels at the property line comply with the new ordinance even though it is not in effect for this project as to the level of foot candles. The site will be heavily graded. There will be a 6 foot masonry wall along the west and south sides of the property and there are substantial retaining walls along the south as well as other parts of the project indirectly affecting the spread of light from this site.
6. Signage – The Sign Code provides for the following: Size of Sign: A) For lot frontages of 249 feet or less, 60 square feet per side of the sign; B) For lot frontages of 250 feet to 499 feet, 75 square feet per side of the sign; C) For lot frontages of 500 feet or more, 100 square feet per side of the sign. Height of the Sign: A) For lot frontages of 249 feet or less, the maximum height of the sign shall be 25 feet; B) For lot frontages of 250 feet to 499 feet, the maximum height of the sign shall be 35 feet; C) For lot frontages of 500 feet or more, the maximum height of the sign shall be 50 feet. Mr. Javadzadeh wants to construct a 50 foot tall sign consisting of approximately 200 square foot per side of sign area and he indicates there would

only be one ground sign. Under the I-35 Sign Code, a master signage plan can be considered for PUDs and this is the track Mr. Javadzadeh appears to want to follow using the entire frontage of the site which is 515 feet. The sign is recommended for denial for violating the square footage allowed. In addition, the pole cover does not include materials that are compatible with the building or other existing sign structures.

7. General architectural appearance – The PUD Design Statement identified a Mediterranean style structure as Exhibit B. The proposal is for a store front look similar to the Wal-Mart or other projects using the territorial style. The building exterior includes brick, cast stone, limestone and split face block. The roof is flat. The back of the building does indicate antique brick although panels were shown on some of the plans. The staff does not recommend that tilt up panels be used in the I-35 Corridor particularly next to single family homes. All four sides of the building are recommended to be brick veneer.
8. Sensitive borders – the sensitive border standard in the I-35 Corridor reads as follows: “When a site directly abuts residentially developed or zoned land on any side, to minimize the impact of commercial development on the residential area, the building setbacks and landscaping requirements must be increased by fifty (50) per cent of the minimum required by the City code. A landscaped buffer area against the residentially developed or zoned land shall be required. Efforts should be made to minimize the increase in the noise level from the traffic lanes and the frontage roads of I-35 during the site development process. The use of masonry walls, berms, fencing, landscaping and the preservation of existing trees is required to prevent any increases in the noise level.” The landscaping requirement for the project is 15% (this project was submitted under the previous Zoning Code) plus 7½% increase due to the sensitive border location adjacent to the Arrowhead Valley location. The additional 7½% landscaping is required along the sensitive border area on the west and south sides of the property. The applicants understand this requirement. That standard has been met on one of the lots but not the other since the entire landscaping plan is being corrected.
9. Mechanical equipment – The roof is flat. The standard for mechanical screening in the I-35 Corridor is as follows: “The mechanical equipment cannot be visible from the surrounding property or adjacent residential areas.” This may require something beyond the normal parapet because there is no distinction for as observed at ground level at the property line as there is in non-I-35 locations. The mechanical equipment will be placed on the roof. The front elevation of the building will clearly block the mechanical equipment as viewed from 15th Street and from the east elevation. While there is a shorter parapet wall on the south and west sides of the building, the mechanical may be screened but the plans reflect structures to be installed around the mechanical equipment to screen them further if not screened by the parapet wall. The retaining wall adjacent to the south property line will have a 6’ stamped concrete fence on top of it, but depending on how large the grade change is, additional screening may be necessary to screen the view to the south. The houses on the west where the retaining wall is taller than the surrounding yards, the adjacent properties cannot see the mechanical equipment on the roof due to grade changes.

10. Fencing/screening – A stamped masonry retaining wall and/or fence wall is shown along the south and west property lines as provided for in the PUD. The developer has provided 2 examples he wants to use as options. The stone look wall is more characteristic to the area than the irregular masonry pattern. The sight proof fence exhibit is also shown indicating a block. The masonry fence wall is placed on top of the retaining wall.

Engineering Department:

12. Driveways/Parking – The developer is requesting 2 drives on the west lot which do meet the separation requirements and 1 drive on the east lot which is aligned with the traffic light into Wal-Mart. The developer is required to pay for 100% of the cost of having the traffic light modified to work in all 4 directions along 15th Street. A right turn lane is not proposed with this project. The driveway at the traffic light will be shared with uses to the east and there is an interconnecting driveway to all of the lots. Typically, a traffic study would indicate for the full development that a right-turn lane would be warranted for this site however, no traffic study has been developed for this site. Of course, if the turn lane is to be added later, there will be a disruption of traffic at the entrance for 44,300 square feet shopping areas being considered with this site plan. Depending on the sale of the property to the east, a cohesive traffic study may be difficult to obtain but necessary for traffic management. If a different use is proposed with the western building, the Engineering Department wants to consider that matter as a part of the drive cuts to be approved. As proposed, the Engineering Department recommends approval. The driveways would be considered separately if other uses are planned. The best practice would be to install the right turn lane on 15th Street with this project.
13. Title 21 Water and Sanitary Sewer Plans – City water and sewer are adjacent for service and are being extended on the site for service.
14. Drainage Report and related Grading Report Plans – Red Plains Engineering has submitted drainage plans meeting Title 23 requirements. In this case, the design is for 2 underground detention areas. No cleaning or filtration system as with Wal-Mart, is proposed with this project. A public storm sewer will be extended from the existing drainage structure west of the property.
15. Street paving and access management – 15th Street is four-laned in front of this property. Access management standards have been met. The right turn lane will preserve the traffic carrying capacity of 15th Street east bound.
16. Fire Prevention and Building Department – The Edmond Fire Prevention Office has reviewed the above plans using the 2006 edition of the International Fire Code. This office grants a tentative approval of these plans pending the following:
 - Both buildings are shown as fire sprinklered. This will allow the plan to be accepted as drawn.
 - On 3-12-07 this office spoke by phone to Terry Moore with Hilltop Plaza LLC, he stated all buildings will be fire sprinklered. This review was conducted with this agreement.
 - Provide property water line, fire hydrant layouts & under ground fire sprinkler line plans.Note: A fire control room will be required for each building. This control room shall have one fire sprinkler riser system for the entire building. The fire department connection for the fire sprinkler system shall be within 100 ft of a fire hydrant.

- The hard surface fire lanes & fire hydrants shall be installed and approved before the first use of combustibles on the building.
 - Combustibles defined: As sheetrock, roofing materials, wallboard, plastic sheeting on insulation, etc.
 - Hard surface fire lanes defined: Asphalt or concrete engineered to support 75,000 lbs.
 - Fire hydrants shall have all City of Edmond Engineering acceptance testing & approval complete.
17. Community Image: The landscape architect for the developer was not available at the time of packet preparation (May 28-June 1). He has been working on corrections to the plans, after discussion with the staff for several weeks. A new landscape plan is to be submitted on Monday, June 4. The plan submitted does not meet current required standards and could not be recommended for approval. Forester Kim Miller is aware of these issues and has been working with the landscaper to correct these plans.
To be provided by Monday, June 4, 2007.
- | | |
|--|--|
| 17. <u>Landscaping - Lot area = sf</u> | <u>Landscape provided on plans submitted</u> |
| Ten per cent of lot = sf | sf landscaping/lawn area |
| Required in front yard = sf | sf in front yard |
| Plant units required = plant units | plant units |
| Evergreen required = plant units | plant units |
| Front yard plant units = plant units | plant units |

Sanitation Department:

18. Refuse facilities – the dumpster locations are on the south side of the property nearest the homes. Fire lanes are required around the buildings and these locations become usual locations for dumpster enclosures. The enclosures could be moved more to the front of the property to keep them away from residential but they would be more observable from 15th Street even with the enclosures. The City Council has often required dumpsters to be moved to the front such as the Bank of the West on Santa Fe and the Danforth Plaza location adjacent to the Park Lane Addition. The issue with the dumpster locations, while more effectively screened with the plans submitted, is the noise associated with the pick-up. With the growing number of commercial collection locations, it is not possible to time the pick-up where any noise disturbance might occur during a busier time of day when other activities are taking place. There also may be an odor issue nearest the homes. The owner is aware of this concern. Alternate locations have not been presented and parking spaces or landscaping may have to be eliminated for relocated enclosure sites.

Electric Department

19. Electric – The property is being platted. Electrical easements will need to be provided.

Commissioner Moore indicated there were approximately 6 items in the staff report that were lacking. He noted he had only received the landscaping plan at the meeting. Attorney Randel Shadid representing Mr. Javadzadeh indicated they would withdraw the ground sign at this time and re-submit that at a later date for consideration. He indicated that the landscaping plan, while received just prior to the meeting, did meet all the

recommendations recommended by Kim Miller. Mr. Shadid indicated he would like to move on to the City Council and receive a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Mike Rusnack, property owner in Arrowhead Valley Addition, gave a Power Point presentation of the issues he felt important to this project. He illustrated that the retaining walls had not been decided and would not look like other projects such as Wal-Mart to the north. The owner had discussed the stamped concrete fence/wall and the retaining walls but had not decided what the design was going to be. This was an important feature adjacent to the homeowners' back property line and needed to be known. He asked that the dumpster be moved away from the back property line due to the smells, rodents, noise and other adverse conditions that would occur with them placed nearest to homes. He indicated that the owner needed to make some definite decisions on the project before proceeding. Bill Haag from Fox Lake asked about where the drainage was from the project. City Engineer Steve Manek indicated the detention was underground but the outlet drained into Fox Lake. John Luton indicated that Wal-Mart and Fox Lake had a filter system for the drainage and suggested that this project include that if possible.

Commissioner Cartwright asked about the transformer location and staff indicated they were in the back with the dumpsters. Chairperson Thrash asked if the cleaners was a commercial cleaners rather than a pick-up and drop-off business. Mr. Shadid indicated it was not a commercial cleaners. Chairperson Thrash indicated the dumpsters were too close to the homes. Mr. Shadid indicated he was meeting all the codes and understood that the corrected landscaping plan was submitted late but that their landscaper had followed Ms. Miller's recommendations. Other staff comments were opinions or suggestions but were not violations of the codes. Commissioner Moore indicated that the material needed to be submitted in advance so that all the members could study the response to the codes by the plans provided by the owner. He indicated he was not ready to vote for approval or denial or list a series of recommendations for the Council.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moore, to continue this request 2 weeks. **Motion carried** by a vote 3-0 of as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Moore and Chairperson Thrash
NAYS: None

The next two items on the agenda were **Case #Z060085 Public Hearing and Consideration of Edmond Plan Amendment from Urban Estate Dwelling District to General Commercial Planned Unit Development on the northeast corner of Covell and Douglas (23.9 acres). (Caliber Development)**

and

Case #Z060086 Public Hearing and Consideration of rezoning from "R-2" Urban Estate Dwelling District to "E-1" General Commercial Planned Unit Development on the northeast corner of Covell and Douglas (23.9 acres). (Caliber Development)

These two items were withdrawn by the applicant.

The next item on the agenda was **Case #Z060089 Public Hearing and Consideration of Edmond Plan Amendment from Urban Estate Dwelling Usage to Restricted Commercial Planned Unit Development Usage on property located south of Coffee Creek Road between Douglas and Post (62.7 acres). (Caliber Development)**

This Plan Amendment was received prior to the effective date of Title 22 Zoning Ordinance (March 1, 2007). This request has now been amended to 62.7 acres of "D-1" Restricted Commercial PUD. The request now complies with Edmond Plan IV in principle, since Edmond Plan IV suggests more acreage within suburban mixed use. The application was submitted under Edmond Plan III. Staff has elected to continue with this Plan Amendment review based on conditions of the Edmond Plan when the application was originally submitted. Edmond Plan III did not suggest any commercial in this area. The following general planning considerations represent some of the factors evaluated in reviewing justifications for Plan Map Amendments.

1. Infrastructure: There are no water lines or sewer lines currently available to serve this project. The lines need to be extended off site. The water line would have to extend to the water towers at I-35 near Second Street and the water line sizes would be larger than the minimum main standard. The sewer line is also to be extended off site. The owner is responsible for obtaining the utility easements and paying the costs for the water line and sewer line at 100% of his responsibility. All easements must be obtained by the developer at his cost and initiation.
2. Traffic: There are no current traffic counts in this area. The owner would be obligated to provide the right-of-way for the Covell Parkway and the other arterial streets adjacent to the site. Half street widening with curb and gutter is required for the density proposed. Based on the Edmond Transportation Plan, Douglas is a primary arterial and Post is a primary arterial south of Covell. Covell is a primary arterial and Sorghum Mill, Post north of Covell and Coffee Creek are secondary arterials. The right-of-ways need to be provided in accordance with the Transportation Plan when the area is platted.
3. Existing zoning pattern:
North – "G-A" and "R-1"
South – "G-A"
East – "G-A" and "R-2"
West – "R-3" and "R-2" and "G-A"
4. Land Use:
North – undeveloped and partially developed Woodleaf Aero Estates
South – partially developed with larger acreage lots
East – Stonegate Addition, partial undeveloped area and large lot unplatted
West – Coffee Creek Estates and undeveloped parcels
5. Density: The developer has indicated that the 62.7 acres might be developed as homes if it doesn't develop as commercial. That would allow for 250 - 251 additional homes in addition to the 1894 to be located in the remainder of the project for a total of 2144 homes. The developer is retaining the "R-2" zoning which allows for 60,000 square foot lots on water wells and septic tanks east of the Coffee Creek Basin.
6. Land ownership pattern:
North – large tract ownership
South – 5 and 10 acre or larger ownership

East – 5 acre and larger ownerships

West – 2 acre ownerships or larger

7. Physical features: this tract involves rolling terrain and there is remnant forest in some of the area.
8. Special conditions: None.
9. Location of Schools and School Land: not a factor, the nearest school would be the new school development at Coffee Creek and Coltrane.
10. Compatibility to Edmond Plan II: the Edmond Plan III has shown the area for single family, the area is not adjacent to utilities, is zoned for 60,000 square foot lots, somewhere between 765 and 831 units could be built on this property as currently zoned, the private extension of utilities was not anticipated with Edmond Plan III.
11. Site Plan Review: a site plan is required due to the commercial use of the property. Residential character would be important for this location. Additional height beyond the 35 feet allowed in residential should be discouraged. Access management standards would apply for driveways. A Traffic Impact Assessment will be needed.

Dennis Box represented the applicant and spoke requesting approval. He indicated it worked on the project approximately one year and he has been waiting for the Edmond Plan to be complete. The project was now in accordance with the Plan to lessen the commercial to “D-1” and to reduce the acreage to less than 100 acres along Coffee Creek not adjacent to Post or Douglas. The overall density does not exceed 4 units per acre including all portions of the development. The developer will extend all the utilities at his cost as the Subdivision Code requires. The developer indicated the multi-family had been moved and the project was designed to leave substantial open space, recognize features such as ponds. Some of the areas left for the current zoning of “R-2” Urban Estate which will no longer require a lift station east of the ridge line.

Attorney Randel Shadid representing J. W. Armstrong and Aubrey McClendon opposed the project due to the density. He indicated the area was developing as one, two and five acre lots and urban density was too intense particularly the “D-1” Restricted Commercial. The PUD is used to increase the density in certain areas by counting open space areas and this was contrary to the character of the area. He indicated this project does allow 6,000 square foot lots and this would set a precedent for more high density development in the area. Jim Watts, Redbud Canyon, spoke in opposition. He requested 150 foot setback along the perimeter. He felt a transportation plan was needed due to the impact of the higher density. He was concerned about clear cutting large areas prior to actual development. Terry Sparks owns land to the northeast and she was opposed to the higher density and the change to the rural character there. Joe Lake from Redbud Canyon spoke in opposition. He was opposed to the change in the habitat or the wildlife in the area indicating that the way Redbud Canyon has been developed allows for space for wildlife. Tim West on Westminster spoke in opposition indicating this was a money issue for the developer to develop at a higher density. Dennis Box indicated that the developer had performed his study for the project using the Edmond Plan and making sure his project complied with the Transportation Plan and the Land Use Plan. He indicated that the project would take more than 20 years to develop. He indicated that a majority of the existing area surrounding the plat was buffered with open space, large lots or arrangement of lots backing into the arterial streets. Engineer Bryan Coon indicated

that the water study had been completed partially paid for by the developer with the appropriate size water lines and planned to serve all of the units proposed. The developer has started acquiring easements. Sharon Newman indicated she owned 20 acres and was opposed to the project and all the changes that would be generated from this development. Janie Sparks spoke in opposition.

Commissioner Moore indicated he had not had anyone ask him to vote for this project that lived in the area. Chairperson Thrash was concerned about the impact of extending utilities and the results of starting those new improvements far from existing services.

Motion by Moore, seconded by Cartwright, to approve this request. **Motion denied** by a vote of 0-3 as follows:

AYES: None

NAYS: Members: Moore, Cartwright and Chairperson Thrash

The next item on the agenda was **Case #Z060092 Public Hearing and Consideration of rezoning from "R-2" Urban Estate Dwelling District to "D-1" Restricted Commercial Planned Unit Development on property located south of Coffee Creek Road between Douglas and Post (62.7 acres). (Caliber Development)**

This rezoning was received prior to the effective date of Title 22 Zoning Ordinance (March 1, 2007).

The overall Canyonwood project has been reduced in size to include a total of 761.31 acres including residential and commercial uses. This includes the land estimated to be within the Coffee Creek Basin that could gravity flow into the wastewater plant on Coffee Creek. This land is already zoned "R-2" and could be developed with 60,000 square foot lots with septic tanks aerobic systems and individual water wells. The developer is indicating that the residentially zoned portions of the project, would not exceed 1,894 dwelling units. He is also requesting single family usage of the "D-1" PUD 62.7 acre parcel if commercial doesn't develop. This might add another 250 units.

On page 4 of the Design Statement under #11 a statement of utility lines and services the developer explains that "some areas containing large lots may provide sanitary sewer services through the use of lift stations or aerobic systems." This statement is unclear in that for large lots (60,000 square foot or greater) lift stations are not needed. Utilities will be addressed on each lot rather than on an addition wide basis. Lift stations are discouraged by Title 21 since they represent permanent maintenance facilities. The above sentence may be a misstatement because it appears the project is now a combination of 60,000 square foot lots, continuing with the "R-2" Urban Estate standards with wells and septic tanks and urban density requiring city water and city sewer, in this case extended at 100% of the developer's cost and this includes providing all easements. The last paragraph under #11 on page 4 of the PUD Design Statement states these conditions.

These utility issues are important to be correctly stated in the PUD Design Statement, otherwise urban uses such as single family density and commercial uses are not appropriate particularly of the size parcels proposed. There are commercial projects on water wells and septic tanks in Edmond but none of the parcels exceed 10 acres in size.

The 62.70 acre commercial parcel is in conformance with Edmond Plan IV even though this project was submitted under Edmond Plan III. Due to the lack of utilities in the area, commercial corners or commercial parcels are not recommended throughout eastern Edmond other than along the Interstate where utilities can be available. If a developer is willing to extend utilities at his cost, a project including commercial may be appropriate to meet the long term service needs in the area. The ability to have public water, fire protection and an adjacent development with similar services producing greater density provides for the best location for future commercial.

Motion by Moore, seconded by Cartwright, to approve this request. **Motion denied** by a vote of 0-3 as follows:

AYES: None

NAYS: Members: Moore, Cartwright and Chairperson Thrash

The next item on the agenda was **Case #Z060083 Public Hearing and Consideration of Edmond Plan Amendment from Urban Estate Dwelling Planned Unit Development and Urban Estate Dwelling Usage to Single Family Planned Unit Development Usage on 698.61 acres extending from Sorghum Mill Road south to Covell between Post and Douglas including a tract of land west of Douglas north of Covell Road. (Caliber Development)**

This Plan Amendment was received prior to the effective date of Title 22 Zoning Ordinance (March 1, 2007). This request is in compliance with Edmond Plan III subject to public utilities being extended at 100% of the developer's cost, plus all easements necessary provided by the developer and the limitation of dwelling units and/or utility service requirements based on the Camp, Dresser, and McKee Utility Study.

The following general planning considerations represent some of the factors evaluated in reviewing justifications for Plan Map Amendments.

1. Infrastructure: There are no water lines or sewer lines currently available to serve this project. The lines that would be needed would need to be extended off site. The water line would have to extend to the water towers at I-35 near Second Street and the water line sizes would be larger than the minimum main standard. The sewer line is also to be extended off site. The owner is responsible for obtaining the utility easements and paying the costs for the water line and sewer line at 100% of his responsibility.
2. Traffic: There are no current traffic counts in this area. The owner would be obligated to provide the right-of-way for the Covell Parkway and the other arterial streets adjacent to the site. Half street widening with curb and gutter is required for the density proposed.
3. Existing zoning pattern:
North – "G-A" and "R-1"
South – "G-A"
East – "G-A" and "R-2"
West – "R-3" and "R-2" and "G-A"
4. Land Use:
North – undeveloped and partially developed Woodleaf Aero Estates

South – partially developed with larger acreage lots
East – Stonegate Addition, partial undeveloped area and large lot unplatted
West – Coffee Creek Estates and undeveloped parcels

5. Density: 6 units per acre.
6. Land ownership pattern:
North – large tract ownership
South – 5 and 10 acre or larger ownership
East – 5 acre and larger ownerships
West – 2 acre ownerships or larger
7. Physical features: this tract involves 698.61 acres. The property has a variety of elevation of a topographic differences, in some cases substantial tree cover.
8. Special conditions: None.
9. Location of Schools and School Land: not a factor, the nearest school would be the new school development at Coffee Creek and Coltrane.
10. Compatibility to Edmond Plan II: the Edmond Plan III has shown the area for single family, the area is not adjacent to utilities, is zoned for 60,000 square foot lots, somewhere between 765 and 831 units could be built on this property as currently zoned, the private extension of utilities was not anticipated with Edmond Plan III.
11. Site Plan Review: plats will be required for the residential, site plans required for the commercial. The PUD Design Statement is recommended to be accurate as to the conditions that would apply to this project and the Design Statement should be amended as a record of the project.

Motion by Moore, seconded by Cartwright, to approve this request. **Motion denied** by a vote of 0-3 as follows:

AYES: None

NAYS: Members: Moore, Cartwright and Chairperson Thrash

The next item on the agenda was **Case #Z060084 Public Hearing and Consideration of rezoning from “R-2” Urban Estate Dwelling Planned Unit Development and “R-2” Urban Estate Dwelling District to “A” Single Family Planned Unit Development District on 698.61 acres extending from Sorghum Mill Road south to Covell between Post and Douglas including a tract of land west of Douglas north of Covell Road. (Caliber Development)**

This rezoning was received prior to the effective date of Title 22 Zoning Ordinance (March 1, 2007).

The developer has amended his request to exclude a larger tract of land zoned “R-2” Urban Estate north of Covell Road extending east to Post Road. The exclusion appears to follow the ridge line between the portion of this land that could provide for gravity flow sanitary sewer into the Coffee Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant and the portion that would require a lift station to have sewer service, east of the ridge line. Edmond Plan III projected the area for single family and Title 21 Subdivisions set out the standard that urban size lots are only acceptable with city utilities. The minimum lot size in single family is 6,000 square feet. The PUD approach allows for the garden homes which with city utilities, may be on smaller lots but the overall density including the open space is within the acceptable standard single family density. In this project, the average density will not

exceed 4 units per acre. The basic development would include 1894 homes. If the commercial did not develop, an additional 250 homes would be permitted for a total 2144 homes. Under Edmond Plan III, if a developer did not wish to extend utilities, the Subdivision Code provided for the "R-2" Urban Estate lot size of 60,000 square feet with wells and septic tanks or the "R-1" Rural Estate lot size of 90,000 square feet with wells and septic tanks. No other utility options are acceptable under Title 21. No water districts could be approved, no lagoons, no private water or sewer systems or any other variation of private utilities. The long term permanent maintenance and dependability of such systems is questionable and costly for individual homeowners.

The staff does recommend that the second paragraph on page 4, #11 regarding utilities of the PUD Design Statement be omitted because of the inconsistent language referencing lift stations or aerobic systems. Lift stations are not acceptable for large lots or for the entire project. The developer does need to extend the water and the sanitary sewer at 100% of his cost and provide the necessary public utility easements. This standard is described in the last paragraph on page 4, #11 of the PUD Design Statement. The "R-2" Urban Estate zoned areas are being excluded from the plat. The developer originally had meetings with the Community Image Forestry staff regarding the use of conservation subdivision techniques or tree preservation particularly the remnant forest. The developer is setting out 64 acres of greenbelt open space remnant forest. It is recommended that a recommendation from the Urban Foresters be considered as a part of this development to retain a significant portion of the remnant forest and that the conditions for protecting this area become an addition to the PUD Design Statement. The owner has provided a general statement but not as per recommendations from Urban Forestry.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moore, to approve this request. **Motion denied** by a vote of 0-3 as follows:

AYES: None

NAYS: Members: Cartwright, Moore and Chairperson Thrash

The next item on the agenda was **Case #PR070017 Consideration of Final Plat for Belmont Park II east of Kelly, just over one-fourth mile north of Coffee Creek Road (Wayne Sadeghy/ Belmont Farms LLC)**

Engineer Keith Beatty representing Wayne Sadeghy is requesting Final Plat approval of Belmont Park II. This addition is another phase of the Belmont Estates, Belmont Villages, Belmont Landing, Belmont Park and Belmont Ridge I Subdivisions. The property is zoned "A" Single Family and the developer plans 34 lots on 12.39 acres. This phase will connect into all existing streets so there will be good connectivity. The lots are generally 80 feet by 120 feet (9,600 square feet). The developer indicates the house sizes will range from 2,800 to 3,600 square feet. The project will connect to full City utilities. The Belmont Additions will connect to both Coffee Creek and Kelly and will ultimately interconnect with the proposed Kelly Lakes Addition to the north. There is not likely to be access to the east because of the Turner Brothers Pipe Yard extending three-quarters of a mile north to Coffee Creek Road. The plat is in order for approval. Previous phases of Belmont Additions are as follows:

Engineer Ernie Isch was in attendance representing the applicant. No one appeared in opposition.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moore, to approve this request. **Motion carried** by a vote of 3-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Moore and Chairperson Thrash

NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Case #SP070026 Public Hearing and Consideration of commercial site plan for an office building in Kelley Pointe Office Park located a quarter mile north of 33rd Street west of Kelly. (Universal Insurance Agency)**

General Description: Tim Clayburn is requesting approval of a new office building consisting of 7,557 square feet on a 28,604 square foot lot. This office building is near the two story MRI building which was the first office built in Kelley Pointe and just north of the Maschino building under construction. This project is part of the MHA Business Park plat.

Planning Department:

1. Existing zoning – “F-1” Light Industrial.
2. Setbacks – the MHA Business Park plat will consist of 3 lots near Kelley Pointe Parkway. The subject lot is in the center of the 3 lot plat and is accessed by private driveway on the south side of the two story building. There is interconnecting driveway access that has all been planned by Clay Farha, the developer of Kelley Pointe. There will be one additional lot north of the subject property near Kelley Pointe Parkway. The subject lot is 150 feet from the nearest street, Kelley Pointe Parkway. The east side setback is 10 feet and the north setback is 20 feet from the property line. The west setback is 65 feet from the shared access private driveway. This project complies with all setbacks. All the land surrounding this property is zoned Industrial.
3. Height of buildings – the maximum height of the building is 21½ feet tall. This complies with the ordinance, “F-1” has no height limit.
4. Parking – 30 parking spaces are required, 28 spaces are provided. There are no extra parking spaces.
5. Lot size – 28,604 square feet, .66 acres.
6. Lighting Plan – 5 light poles are provided. Light poles are prohibited from being taller than 25 feet including the base of the structure. This area is all industrial but it is recommended that the shoebox style lights be provided for to contain ambient light. A pattern of the light fixture style has already been started with the two story MRI building.
7. Signage – one ground sign 6 foot tall 42 square feet could be installed along the private driveway.
8. General architectural appearance – the building is a combination of cut stone, brick and stone accents with some stucco less than 15% trim. The roof consists of composition asphalt shingles. The building will provide a very compatible appearance with the larger MRI office building and the new Maschino building. The roof is pitched normally using a 12 to 3.5 pitch.

9. Sensitive borders – there are no sensitive borders. All of the land within 1/8th of a mile is zoned “F-1” Light Industrial.
10. Mechanical equipment – the mechanical equipment including the HVAC will be located on the ground due to the pitch roof construction.
11. Fencing/screening – no fencing is required adjacent to the lot. The dumpster enclosure is the standard masonry with the sight proof gate.

Engineering Department:

12. Driveways/Parking – this site will interconnect with the Maschino building and the larger office building to the north. All driveways and access management standards have been met.
13. Title 21 water and sanitary sewer plans – the building is being designed to connect with water and sewer which is adjacent to the lot.
14. Drainage Report and related grading report plans – drainage has been designed on a project wide process as a part of Kelley Pointe. All the required grading to match the detention is in order.
15. Street paving and access management – there is no adjacent street paving required. All of the access management as to separation of driveways and interconnection between properties has also been met.

Fire Protection:

16. Fire Prevention and Building Department – This office’s (Fire Department) understanding is that the building is fire sprinklered and it meets code. Major Barnes would have preferred to have the lane for the dumpster enclosure longer, but that conflicts with the Sanitation Department’s requirements. The building is fire sprinklered so it meets the Fire Departments requirements.

Community Image:

| | |
|--|--|
| 17. Landscaping – <u>Lot area =28,606 sf</u> | <u>Landscape provided on plans submitted</u> |
| Ten per cent of lot = 2,860.60sf | 7,385.50 sf landscaping/lawn area |
| Required in front yard = 1,430.30 sf | 2,717.50sf in front yard |
| Plant units required = 229 plant units | 287 plant units |
| Evergreen required = 92 plant units | 197 plant units |
| Front yard plant units = 115 plant units | 138 plant units |

Sanitation Department:

18. Refuse facilities – dumpster enclosure facilities have been provided. The owner did agree to move the dumpster 20 foot to the north to minimize the backing distance of the sanitation truck.

Electric Department

19. Electric – electric easements will be provided as per the plat of MHA Business Park.

Jim Clayburn was in attendance representing the applicant.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moore, to approve this request. **Motion carried** by a vote of 3-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Moore and Chairperson Thrash
NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Case #SP070027 Public Hearing and Consideration of commercial site plan for a shopping center east of I-35 Frontage Road south of 33rd Street on Lil Lane. (Jade Properties)**

General Description: This location falls within the I-35 Corridor but it is also zoned “L-5” Restricted Lake Commercial. The standards in “L-5” apply to many of the requirements such as the pitch roof and the 30% landscaping as set out on pages 6-30 and 6-31 of the new Title 22 Zoning Code. There are also other variances and that is why this item will be reviewed by the City Council.

Planning Department:

1. Existing zoning – This parcel of “L-5” Restricted Lake Commercial was zoned in November, 2006. The uses for “L-5” are attached.
2. Setbacks – The front setback from I-35 Frontage Road/property line is 98 feet, the setback from the east/back property line is 45 feet. The setback from the north is 24 feet to the Lil Lane private street, the setback to the south property line is 31 feet. (There are sensitive borders for this site).
3. Height of buildings – The maximum height of the building is 25 feet and that includes to the top of the towers that are added. The basic building is only 20 feet in height.
4. Parking – The square footage of the building is 19,477.5 square feet. The parking spaces required are 97, the plans reflect 49 spaces. This would be a variance of 48 spaces.
5. Lot size – lot size is 79,216 square feet.
6. Lighting Plan – There are no light poles planned for this building, only building wall pack lights. Wall signs will be internally lighted, there is no ground sign proposed. There is also no fiber optic or neon lighting on the building.
7. Signage – No ground sign, wall signs only in accordance with the codes.
8. General architectural appearance – The building will be brick veneer on all 4 sides. In order to break the front wall elevation, a tower feature is planned at each end of the building and the exterior wall of that will be stone. The roof material on the tower is composition shingle and the tower has a 4/12 pitch. The roof for the main building is flat which will require a variance from Section 22.6.3 “E” Roof Design requiring a 3/12 pitch. This is a “shall” standard requirement so this request will go to the City Council. The owner has an angled shingled roof just above the window height on the front elevation. Adding a pitch roof to a 19,477.5 square foot building will add substantial height. The mechanical equipment will be fully screened from view from I-35 and that was one of the goals of the pitch roof standard was to discourage all mechanical equipment on the roofs along I-35.
9. Sensitive borders – The land to the east, north and south is Agricultural. The owner has submitted a list of property owners adjacent supporting this project. The landscaped plan identifies landscaping materials on the north, east and south sides of the property. There is no access to Lil Lane which is a private residential standard street.
10. Mechanical equipment – located on the roof, screened by the parapet wall, parapet wall is high enough to screen from lane on I-35.
11. Fencing/screening – A sight proof fence is also provided on the east side of the property.

Engineering Department:

12. Driveways/Parking – The existing drive approach will be improved to commercial standard. Only 1 drive will be utilized. There is no drive connecting with Lil Lane, the private street.
13. Title 21 water and sanitary sewer plans – There is no city water or sewer available. The project will operate with a water well and aerobic system. There will be a fire sprinkler system for the building which will be operated with a pump, the on-site water well and a storage tank, which will be buried under ground, to meet all Fire Department requirements. The water tank has been placed under ground as an aesthetic issue, not a requirement of the Fire Department.
14. Drainage Report and related grading report plans – Detention pond is established on private property along the frontage meeting all city requirements.
15. Street paving and access management – There is only 1 drive for the frontage of the property meeting the access management standards.

Fire Protection:

16. Fire Prevention and Building Department – Shawn Thomas stated on 4-5-07, the building will be fully fire sprinklered. No fire hydrants or water lines are in the area, so he will be setting a storage tank and fire pump to supply the system.

Community Image:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 17. <u>Landscaping - Lot area = 79,216 sf</u> | <u>Landscape provided on plans submitted</u> |
| 30 percent of lot = 23,765 sf | 23,891 sf landscaping/lawn area |
| Plant units required = 3.803 PU | 3,820 plant units |
| Evergreen required = 1,548 PU | 1,548 plant units |
| Requirements in front = 1,901.5 PU | 2,370 plant units |
| =11,883 sf | 12,016 sf |

Sanitation Department:

18. Refuse facilities – The dumpster enclosure is located on the southeast corner of the building and meets all the access requirements.

Electric Department

19. Electric – The property will need to be platted for the electrical easements.

Owner Shawn Thomas was in attendance indicating that while the building did have a flat roof not suggested by the I-35 Lake Standards, he felt this was reasonable and that the neighbors supported the building he proposed. He had no sign, no pole lights, he had met the 30% landscaping for the lake requirements. He felt the scale of his building without a taller roof was best at this location with homes adjacent to the property. Mr. Steward asked if Lil Lane would continue through as it does now. Mr. Thomas indicated Lil Lane was actually on his property and it would continue through as a private street.

Chairperson Thrash indicated that the building needed to follow the pictures provided with red brick on the building and stone for the two towers.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moore, to approve this request. **Motion carried** by a vote of 3-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Moore and Chairperson Thrash

NAYS: None

There was no New Business.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moore, to adjourn. **Motion carried** by a vote of 3-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Moore and Chairperson Thrash
NAYS: None

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Suzy Thrash, Chairperson
Edmond Planning Commission

Robert Schiermeyer, Secretary
Edmond Planning Commission