

M I N U T E S

OKLAHOMA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

October 20, 2005

1:30 p.m.

The meeting of the Oklahoma County Planning Commission convened and was called to order by Ms. Cheryl Dorrance, Chairperson, at 1:30 p.m., in Room 103, Oklahoma County Office Building, 320 Robert S. Kerr, with the following individuals present:

Ms. Cheryl Dorrance, Chairperson
Mr. David Richey, Member
Mr. Mike Vorel, Member
Mr. Roger Holloway, Member
Ms. Janet Price, Member

Also in attendance:

Mr. Tyler Gammon, Jr., Planning Secretary
Ms. Ruth Walters, County Planner
Mr. Ray Reaves, P.E., D.E.E., County Engineer
Ms. Gretchen Crawford, Assistant District Attorney

Mr. Tyler Gammon, Planning Secretary, called roll and a quorum was declared.

Mr. Richey motioned approval of the minutes from the meeting of September 15, 2005. Mr. Holloway seconded the motion. Vote taken: Vorel – Aye; Richey – Aye; Price – Aye; Holloway – Aye; Dorrance – Aye. The minutes for the meeting of September 15, 2005, were approved.

Zoning: (Z-2005-04) From: AA-Agricultural and Rural Residential District
To: RA-Acreage Residential District (Z-2005-04)

Applicant: **ALLIANCE 7 DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC**
c/o: CLIFF SMITH, MANAGING MEMBER

The applicant proposes developing a residential subdivision with individual lot sizes one acre or greater in size. The following is the legal description of the property:

A tract, piece or parcel of land being a part of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4) and a part of the North Half of the Southeast Quarter (N/2 SE/4,) of Section Eight (8), Township Fourteen (14) North, Range Four (4) West, Indian Meridian. Oklahoma County Oklahoma, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the NE corner of said NE/4, Section 8; Thence S 00deg10'15" E along the East line of said NE/4 for a distance of 2639.42 feet to a point being 4.00 feet North of the SE corner of said NE/4; Thence S 89deg26'24" W along an existing fence line for a distance of 749.02 feet; Thence S 89deg54'30" W and continuing along said fence line for a distance of 593.62 feet; Thence N 89deg54'56" W and

continuing along said fence line a distance of 597.99 feet; Thence S 89deg59'29" W and continuing along said fence line for a distance of 701.50 feet to a point on the West line of said NE/4, said point being 1.95 feet North of the SW corner of said NE/4; Thence N 00deg10'37" W along the West line of said NE/4 for a distance of 1318.93 feet to the NW corner of the SW/4 of said NE/4, Section 8; Thence N 89deg51'50" E along the North line of said SW/4 NE/4 for a distance of 1321.12 feet to the NE corner of said SW/4 NE/4; Thence N 00deg10'24" W along the West line of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of said Section 8 for a distance of 1321.27 feet to the NW corner of the NE/4 NE/4; Thence N 89deg50'41" E along the North line of said NE/4 for a distance of 1321.18 feet to the Point or Place of Beginning, and contains 120.21 acres more or less.

Location: N. Rockwell Ave, South of NW 234th (Sorghum Mill Rd.)
(County Highway District # 3)

Mr. Gammon gave the Staff Report stating that the applicant anticipated a one-acre lot subdivision with two entries. He stated that there was a subdivision south of the proposed rezoning application, called Rockwell Farms. It was developed in the 1970s and contained one-acre size lots and greater.

Mr. Laxman Godhania, MGR, Inc., stated that the proposed subdivision was 120 acres with 89 lots, three and a half acres of common area, and detention ponds. He stated that they had a letter from Deer Creek Water supplying water, if the developers so desired, subject to the developers providing three well sites. However, they would be drilling two test wells in hopes of individual wells instead of Deer Creek Water. Mr. Godhania stated that there would be 1.3-1.6 acres of recreational area with facilities; homes would be approximately 2000-2500 square feet; and a homeowner's association.

There were several protestors present including Jeanie Ruedy, 22701 N. Rockwell; Donna Andrew, 7501 NW 210th St.; Charles Ward, 21700 N. Rockwell; and Debbie Byrd, 7500 N.W. 234th St. Their concerns included the following:

- The quality of water draining into and/or stopping the flow into Ms. Ruedy's pond.
- Keeping development similar to the surrounding area; proposed density not appropriate.
- School overcrowding.
- Police and fire protection already inadequate.
- Additional traffic and road maintenance.
- Water supply.
- High power lines could be an issue.

Ms. Dorrance asked staff what the percentage of protests were.

Mr. Gammon stated that there was 100% protest from all adjacent land owners. They had signed the petitions submitted to staff and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Godhania stated that the detention ponds would not stop, but slow down the flow, and would have no negative affect on the adjoining properties.

Mr. Vorel asked if the applicant had met all of the requirements.

Mr. Gammon stated yes, the applicant had met all the requirements.

Mr. Holloway stated that he could appreciate the concerns from the protestors. He stated that he felt that the subdivision located to the south, being zoned for one acre lots had set precedence.

Mr. Holloway made a motion to approve the re-zoning of the proposed property from AA to RA. Mr. Vorel seconded the motion. Vote taken: Vorel – Aye; Richey – No; Price – Aye; Holloway – Aye; Dorrance – No. The item was approved.

General Plat: (GP-2005-09) GREYSTONE HILLS

Applicant: **ALLIANCE 7 DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC
c/o: CLIFF SMITH, MANAGING MEMBER**

The applicant proposed developing a residential subdivision with individual lot sizes one acre or greater in size. The following is the legal description of the property:

A tract, piece or parcel of land being a part of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4) and a part of the North Half of the Southeast Quarter (N/2 SE/4,) of Section Eight (8), Township Fourteen (14) North, Range Four (4) West, Indian Meridian. Oklahoma County Oklahoma, being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the NE corner of said NE/4, Section 8; Thence S 00deg10'15" E along the East line of said NE/4 for a distance of 2639.42 feet to a point being 4.00 feet North of the SE corner of said NE/4; Thence S 89deg26'24" W along an existing fence line for a distance of 749.02 feet; Thence S 89deg54'30" W and continuing along said fence line for a distance of 593.62 feet; Thence N 89deg54'56" W and continuing along said fence line a distance of 597.99 feet; Thence S 89deg59'29" W and continuing along said fence line for a distance of 701.50 feet to a point on the West line of said NE/4, said point being 1.95 feet North of the SW corner of said NE/4; Thence N 00deg10'37" W along the West line of said NE/4 for a distance of 1318.93 feet to the NW corner of the SW/4 of said NE/4, Section 8; Thence N 89deg51'50" E along the North line of said SW/4 NE/4 for a distance of 1321.12 feet to the NE corner of said SW/4 NE/4; Thence N 00deg10'24" W along the West line of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of said Section 8 for a distance of 1321.27 feet to the NW corner of the NE/4 NE/4; Thence N 89deg50'41" E along the North line of said NE/4 for a distance of 1321.18 feet to the Point or Place of Beginning, and contains 120.21 acres more or less.

**Location: N. Rockwell Ave, South of NW 234th (Sorghum Mill Rd.)
(County Highway District # 3)**

Mr. Gammon gave the Staff Report and stated that the protestors from the previous item were also protesting the proposed general plat.

Mr. Charles Ward, protestor, stated that he wanted to see the Planning Commission wait on a decision until the Master Plan was finished.

Ms. Crawford stated that the Master Plan was a roadmap that gets modified from time to time, and is not set in stone. She stated that the county had been modifying the old plan and would be until the new Master Plan was complete.

Ms. Andrew stated the lots in the neighboring subdivision may have been zoned for one acre lots but, in fact, they were not one acre lots. She then stated that if the decision on the rezoning was based on the precedence that the neighboring subdivision had one acre lots in it, then that would be on a false premise.

Ms. Dorrance stated that it would be in error to assume that the motion made, seconded, and voted on was based solely on the precedence of one acre lots in the area. There were other considerations beyond that, and not the only reason the item was approved.

Mr. Vorel motioned for approval of the general plat of Greystone Hills. Ms. Price seconded the motion. Vote taken: Vorel – Aye; Richey – No; Price – Aye; Holloway – Aye; Dorrance - Aye. The item was approved.

Review and acknowledgement of Subdivision Bond for Highland Park.

Mr. Richey motioned for acceptance of the Subdivision Bond for Highland Park. Mr. Vorel seconded the motion. Vote taken: Vorel – Aye; Richey – Aye; Price – Aye; Holloway – Aye; Dorrance - Aye. The bond was accepted.

September 2005 Fee Fund Report.

Mr. Gammon reported the fees collected for September 2005 were \$28,514.70. Mr. Richey motioned to accept the report. Mr. Holloway seconded the motion. Vote taken: Price – Aye; Richey – Aye; Vorel – Aye; Holloway – Aye; Dorrance – Aye. The motion was approved to accept the Fee Fund Report for September 2005.

Other Business:

1. Mr. Jim Johnson wanted to know if the protestors met the requirements for rejection of the zoning and general plat with 100% of the adjacent landowners protesting?

Ms. Dorrance stated that it would require a super majority vote of the Board of County Commissioners to approve the zoning.

2. **Discussion with McNayr Paque, LLC. concerning Master Plan.**

Some of the things that staff and the consultants were working on concerning the Master Plan included:

- Would like to meet with each Planning Commissioners individually to discuss their concerns about their districts.
- The purpose of the Master Plan.
- Project goals; Land use Goals.

- Working on the future land use map.
- Working with Staff on a weekly basis.
- Discussed the public meetings that were held and the last one that would be held on Tuesday. Comments from the public included:
 - In some areas there was a desire to have one acre or larger lots; in other areas to have five acre or larger.
 - There was a school district that requested no development.
 - Road conditions.
- Often, road improvement happens after development occurs rather than prior to development.
- Problems and issues that the county would face.
- Learning what requirements could be enforced by the county.
- Working with other agencies like ACOG and ODOT.
- Implementation of the plan.

Adjournment:

Mr. Holloway motioned for adjournment. Ms. Price seconded the motion. Vote taken: Vorel – Aye; Richey – Aye; Price – Aye; Holloway – Aye; Dorrance – Aye. The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Approved this _____ day of _____, 2005.

**OKLAHOMA COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Cheryl Dorrance, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Tyler Gammon, Jr., Secretary