EDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, December 4, 2001 **5:30 P.M.**

The Edmond Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Chairperson David Woods at 5:30 p.m., Tuesday, December 4, 2001, in the City Council Chambers at 20 South Littler. Other members present were Leroy Cartwright, Bill Moyer, Dyke Hoppe, and Elizabeth Waner. Present for the City were Robert L. Schiermeyer, City Planner; Kristi Anthony, Planning Intern; Steve Manek, City Engineer; and Steve Murdock, City Attorney. The first item on the agenda was the approval of the November 20, 2001, Planning Commission Minutes.

Motion by Waner, seconded by Moyer, to approve the minutes as written. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Members: Waner, Moyer, Cartwright, Hoppe and Chairperson Woods
NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was a **Public Hearing and Consideration of an Ordinance to close the east eight feet of the west 10 foot utility easement on the west side of Lot 1, Block 4 of Creek Bend First Addition, 901 Caines Hill Road. (Timothy and Amy Eldridge)**

This item was continued to January 8, 2002, at the request of the applicant.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Hoppe, to continue this request to January 8, 2002. **Motion carried** by a vote of 5-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Hoppe, Moyer, Waner and Chairperson Woods
NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was a **Public Hearing and Consideration of ordinance to close a portion of a utility easement 2709 Spyglass Hill Road, Fairfax Estates. (formerly Rabb, now Wilkerson)**

This item was continued to January 22, 2002, at the request of the applicant.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Hoppe, to continue this request to January 22, 2002. **Motion carried** by a vote of 5-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Hoppe, Moyer, Hoppe and Chairperson Woods
NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was a **Consideration of the Preliminary Plat of Hunter's Creek III located south of Coffee Creek Road, 1/8 mile west of Kelly Avenue. (Hunter's Creek L.P.)**

This item was continued to January 8, 2002, at the request of the applicant.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Hoppe, to continue this request to January 8, 2002. **Motion**

follows:

: Cartwright, Hoppe, Moyer, Hoppe and Chairperson Woods

The next item on the agenda was a **Public Hearing and Consideration of an Ordinance to establish standards for pruning and trimming trees planted as a part of the landscaping requirements in Multi-Family, Commercial, Office, Industrial and Special Use Permits**

categories.

Assistant City Planner Jan Fees introduced Urban Forester Mark Bays with the State Department of Agriculture. He presented definitions of pruning and topping and discussed recognized national standards to preserve the health of the tree for pruning. He indicated that the definition presented in the packet was too broad allowing 3 inch limbs to be cut and at the very most the cutting should involve one inch to even half inch limbs. The definition presented did not identify a size of limb for the pruning. Chairperson Woods asked if there could be a concern about a clear understanding from persons pruning trees as to what the City's requirements are if there is not a size limitation connected to the limbs being trimmed. Commissioner Hoppe indicated he wanted to limit the trimming to retain the shape and crown of the tree. It was noted that the Urban Forestry Commission would be evaluating this ordinance on December 12th and that they should consider the definition of topping and appropriate standards that could be enforced. John Luke from the ENA commented that he fully supports the ordinance but that it needs to be very clear because small business owners might trim trees themselves and unintentionally violate the ordinance. Mark Bays suggested adding diagrams to the ordinance.

Commissioner Moyer commented that he did not feel the penalty was strong enough and was it for each tree or each event. Chairperson Woods indicated he thought it should be for each tree. Commissioner Waner inquired if there would be a fine for not removing deed trees. The city attorney said the maximum fine would be $500. Commissioner Cartwright indicated he felt the language in the ordinance addressed only the landscaping required and not any landscaping over and above the required amount. It was also discussed documenting what landscaping was already present, what has been added and to make sure both are taken care of.

The Commission understood that this matter would return to the Planning Commission on January 8th after the Urban Forestry Commission discussed it.

Motion by Moyer, seconded by Hoppe, to add Mark Bays definitions to the ordinance and to send it to the Urban Forestry Commission and have them return it. **Motion carried** by a vote of 5-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Moyer, Hoppe, Cartwright, Waner and Chairperson Woods
NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was a **General Discussion of Street Connectivity and standards for traffic planning.**

The following goals which were not discussed or defined in the previous Connectivity "index" discussion need to be reviewed by the Commission.
Connectivity goals:

quate fire, police and emergency access including alternate routes c
reasonable response times.
ffic minimizing congestion within the addition or on the adjoining arterial street (s).

3. Base circulation decisions on a long term 20 year+ basis or based on the total development of the subdivision rather than on short term assumptions or issues.
4. Street design should not place undue congestion or burden on one street. If the density of the development or potential trip generation justifies access, then the solution for the new project is that project needs to provide more access to the arterial street or through an adjoining area and mitigate such issues as substandard surfacing on the adjoining street. The solution is not to limit the options of circulation because of

problems such as poor road surfacing or extra costs involved in development. If the access is needed, the developer needs to consider that from the time he purchases the land and needs to recognize the purpose of the city standard.

The street design issues to be avoided include:

1. Single entrance and exit streets particularly serving 180 to over 200 lots.
2. An automatic exception for gated street additions. Standards should be applied evenly and a gated addition would not alter the need for distribution and accessibility.
3. Negotiating the extension of existing streets or a determination of the appropriate circulation for a development based on short term issues, costs or perceived problems. If a stub-out is not to be continued, it should be based on the fact that the number of access points to the arterial are appropriate and that there is reasonable connection from the interior of the neighborhood without unusually long travel distances to the arterial.

Commissioner Waner asked that municipal services including sanitation be added to the #1 connectivity goal. Steve Manek discussed the ITE manual survey regarding the number of lots that should be served by one entrance. The conclusion was there was not a specific number of lots for a single entrance but two entrances per addition or options of travel appear to be a common standard without reference to the number of lots. Kristi Anthony commented that Fort Collins, CO, responded in the survey that they required the second entry to be approximately 660 feet from the first entry. Councilman Charles Lamb indicated that Title 21 Subdivisions is being modified to provide a maximum block length of 700 feet to allow more options for connections and to reduce the increased traffic when there is only a single addition between additions which is what is occurring now. Ronnie Williams representing himself indicated he supported connectivity but knew that each case needed to be evaluated individually.

Chairperson Woods asked that this be placed on further agendas so that improvements can be made in the current practice.

Chairperson Woods introduced Troop 393 and Troop 1 of the Boy Scouts who were in attendance at the meeting working on merit badge requirements.

There was **New Business**. Chairperson Woods announced that there were no business items for the December 18th meeting and that no meeting would be held on that date.

Motion by Cartwright, seconded by Moyer, to adjourn. **Motion carried** as follows:

AYES: Members: Cartwright, Moyer, Hoppe, Waner and Chairperson Woods

NAYS: None

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

_____
David Woods, Chairman
Edmond Planning Commission

_____
Robert Schiermeyer, Secretary
Edmond Planning Commission