

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

JULY 8, 2021

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 8th day of July, 2021.

Notice and agenda of the meeting was posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <https://www.normanok.gov/your-government/public-information/agendas-and-minutes> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Erica Bird called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Nouman Jan
Steven McDaniel
Erica Bird
Lark Zink
Dave Boeck
Sandy Bahan

MEMBERS ABSENT

Erin Williford
Mark Daniels
Michael Jablonski

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Logan Hubble, Planner I
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist
Beth Muckala, Asst. City Attorney
David Riesland, Transportation Engineer
Jami Short, Traffic Engineer
Nathan Madenwald, Utilities Engineer

* * *

Item No. 10, being:

O-2122-5 – CITY OF NORMAN – NORMAN UTILITIES AUTHORITY REQUESTS SPECIAL USE FOR MUNICIPAL USES, INCLUDING WATER RECLAMATION FACILITY, COMPOST FACILITY, AND POLICE FIRING RANGE, FOR APPROXIMATELY 115.22 ACRES OF PROPERTY ZONED A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 3500 JENKINS AVENUE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Preliminary Site Development Map
4. Pre-Development Summary

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Logan Hubble reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes. One protest letter was received, which represented 4.7% of the notification area.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Nathan Madenwald, the applicant – This is a similar item to the past item, where we're bringing the zoning in-line with current requirements. The addition to this site is at the compost facility we would like to put a scale house there so we can better track what's coming in and out, similar to what's at our transfer station. The solar array would be where the green area is shown on the map.
2. Mr. Jan asked the capacity of the solar array here. Mr. Madenwald responded 1.67 kw.
3. Mr. McDaniel asked what is currently occupying that space. Mr. Madenwald said there's an oil well on the north end of the site, but generally it's an open field. We do have some sludge drying beds, which had been used in the past for bio-solids from the facility to let them dry out and then haul off. We also use that for our trucks. We're still going to retain some of that capacity.
4. Ms. Bird asked what the change to impervious area will be. Mr. Madenwald responded that they have not calculated that, but understand the protest that's been received and we'll be happy to make sure we mitigate that increase.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Allyson Wilson, 1004 Elmwood Street – I own some land in the area and I am concerned – not about the solar panels being done – what I am concerned about is the impervious surface that will be there and the additional flooding that may occur in the area. Currently we have an issue with flooding in the area. There is standing water currently in the area on the west side of Jenkins that we are very concerned about. Adding another impervious surface will lead possibly to this. As mentioned just previously, they don't know what that impact will be. It does also say in the proposal that there is no negative impact. I would like to know how that was calculated, because I am very concerned that there will be a negative impact, not only to our farm, but also to the farm that's closer to that area on the east side of Jenkins.
2. Mr. Jan asked what negative impact they are expecting from this. Ms. Wilson responded the concern is water coming off the impervious surface and going further south and further east off the land. Currently, any time it rains even half an inch, the area floods and water runs across both sides of Jenkins, and it can be anywhere from 6" to 2' in flooding in that area.
3. Kevin Potts, 3620 Barwick Drive – I basically oppose it. First, I want to say I'm for anything that will save the City money, energy efficiency, and all that. I'm all for that. But my sister, Allyson, has already spoken on some of the impact we're having. They say in the description that there's no adverse impact. Well, there has been adverse impact before any construction

has been built in this special use request area. Currently, we've got stormwater standing on our northwest 80-acre hay field. We can't get in there; we can't produce hay. So any time we get that rain, it comes across Dugout Creek, flows through between the water reclamation plant and the trash transfer station. All that drainage comes through, passes on the west side of the Police pistol training range, runs south, crosses under Jenkins, ties into Bishop Creek, which drains 10 square miles of east/central Norman. Everybody knows that area is a flashpoint right now in the City of Norman and what's going on at Stormwater. So I just oppose any construction where there hasn't been a stormwater mitigation plan that's going to be in place and that's implemented. Because those solar panels are going to create impervious surfaces. Any construction, road access, service roads. We've already got problems, and when they do any more construction it's just going to be more and more water coming in on us. I would like to see a stormwater mitigation plan implemented for that area. Because it is impacting us.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Mr. Boeck – On the first one it said 56% coverage – I'm surprised that wasn't calculated for this. I feel like we don't have the information that we need.

Mr. Madenwald – The reason is the panels themselves – rainfall that hits them will fall on the ground, but the ground below it is still going to be natural vegetation, so we're really not adding impervious surface to that.

Mr. Boeck – Well, you pave a road, so it runs off to the sides. In my mind, it's still impervious surface that's collecting water and can come off. There should have been a calculation and there should have been some kind of mitigation plan. They were here last month, or two months ago, on Eaglecliff and the issues there with the drainage off of that residential, and that's a lot more serious. I know that we didn't pass the stormwater plan three or four years ago, which still needs work. We needed to have some information about that.

2. Mr. Jan – I think, technically, we're talking about where the runoff should go. Can we not divert the runoff to perhaps another area where it's not affecting their farm and the problem which is currently happening there?

Mr. Boeck – The whole Bishop Creek is a mess.

Mr. McDaniel – Does this water drain into Bishop Creek.

Mr. Madenwald – It drains through the drainage channel that runs through here on the west side of the property.

Ms. Bird – That does connect to Bishop Creek.

3. Ms. Bird – I think we've already covered it and Dave is pretty good about putting these things altogether. I think we really have seen a massive problem with Bishop Creek that needs to be addressed. I don't know that this is the project that's going to make or break it, but I do think that there's a major issue that needs to be resolved. The Potts family and those neighborhoods back there are having massive problems. The pictures that the HOA showed us previously were very enlightening as to some of those water problems. Maybe even something to do with this former landfill – something that could be a little bit more effectively done with some of that land to help with the Bishop Creek problem. I'd really like to see the City make a plan to help these people in this area of town, because I'd also like to see some of those residential houses be able to be built responsibly without causing some of these water problems for neighboring property owners. I don't know that this particular project is going to really make a huge impact, but I do think City Council will need to know those impervious surface factors, and would like to see some drainage reports – even historic ones on there when this goes to City Council for final approval.

4. Mr. Danner – The only thing I'd like to point out is that there is floodplain on this property. This will have to go through the Floodplain Permit Committee and we will address the drainage in relation to the runoff. Typically we require compensatory storage, so they will have to account for that with any project that they do.

Nouman Jan moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2122-2 to City Council. Sandy Bahan seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Nouman Jan, Steven McDaniel, Erica Bird, Lark Zink, Dave Boeck, Sandy Bahan
NAYES	None
MEMBERS ABSENT	Erin Williford, Mark Daniels, Michael Jablonski

The motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2122-2 to City Council, passed by a vote of 6-0.
