

EDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Tuesday, January 20, 2004

5:30 P.M.

The Edmond Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Vice Chairperson Leroy Cartwright at 5:30 p.m., Tuesday, January 20, 2003, in the City Council Chambers at 20 South Littler. Other members present were Elizabeth Waner, Allen Thomas and Suzy Thrash. Chairperson David Woods was absent. Present for the City were Robert L. Schiermeyer, City Planner; Kristi McCone, Assistant City Planner; Steve Manek, City Engineer; and Steve Murdock, City Attorney. The first item on the agenda was the approval of the January 6, 2003, Planning Commission Minutes.

Motion by Thomas, seconded by Waner, to approve the minutes as written. **Motion carried** by a vote of 4-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Thomas, Waner, Thrash and Vice Chairperson Cartwright

NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Case #PR030030 Public Hearing and Consideration of Preliminary Plat approval for Fox Lake Plaza Addition located south of Fox Lake Lane, on the west side of I-35. (Frank Battle)**

The applicant requested a continuance to a date certain.

Motion by Thomas, seconded by Thrash, to continue this request to February 17, 2004. **Motion carried** by a vote of 4-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Thomas, Thrash, Waner and Vice Chairperson Cartwright

NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Case #SP030028 Public Hearing and Consideration of Commercial Site Plan approval for Fox Lake Plaza Shopping Center located south of Fox Lake Lane, on the west side of I-35. (Frank Battle)**

The applicant requested a continuance to a date certain.

Motion by Waner, seconded by Thrash, to continue this request to February 17, 2004. **Motion carried** by a vote of 4-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Waner, Thrash, Thomas and Vice Chairperson Cartwright

NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Case #SP030043 Public Hearing and Consideration of Commercial Site Plan approval for a Wal-Mart Super Center located on the northwest corner of 15th Street and I-35. (Wal-Mart Stores East, L.P.)**

The applicant requested a continuance to a date certain.

Motion by Thomas, seconded by Waner, to continue this request to a date certain of February 17, 2004. **Motion carried** by a vote of 4-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Thomas, Waner, Thrash and Vice Chairperson Cartwright

NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Case #SP030012 Public Hearing and Consideration of an amended Commercial Site Plan approval for Danforth Plaza retail space south of Danforth east of the Wal-Mart Supercenter. (Renaissance Development/Edmond Plaza Associates, LLC)**

The Planning Commission recommended denial of this project because the original owner, Frank Battle, would not agree to a widening lane on Danforth at the Planning Commission meeting in June of 2003. Mr. Battle changed his mind at the City Council meeting and agreed to a deceleration lane on Danforth for the development of this parcel located east of the Wal-Mart Supercenter. The previous Planning Commission minutes and City Council discussion are attached. The Preliminary Plat was submitted to the City Council because this property is zoned "D-1" PUD. The Preliminary Plat was also approved. The current owners, Renaissance development from Hot Springs, Arkansas and Edmond Plaza Associates from Ashville, North Carolina have prepared a final plat but that plat is not ready for scheduling since easements have been requested but not provided to support the plat. The new owners bought the property from Frank Battle and are building basically the same building that was approved but have changed a few standards that are indicated in bold below. One of the major changes is that the current developers are planning to use Wal-Mart's detention area near Santa Fe and extending along the south side of Wal-Mart on their property for their detention. This detention area was oversized and Engineering has already confirmed there is excess capacity to meet the requirements for impervious surfacing of the subject property. Mr. Battle's plan in June showed an additional detention area at the far southwest corner of the subject property. The current owners do not plan to construct that detention area and wish to use the Wal-Mart excess capacity detention area. An easement from Wal-Mart will be needed. Wal-Mart is unplatted and is not likely to be platted so an easement that benefits the subject property needs to be filed of record even though it is a private easement. If this does not happen, it cannot be verified that Title 23 has been met.

General Site Criteria:

Existing zoning – "D-1" Restricted Commercial Planned Unit Development, PUD Design Statement attached. Same

Setbacks – Front setback from Danforth is 100' from property line. Setback from east property line (side yard) is 40' to 44' and the setback from the south property line (rear yard) is 135' and setback from the west property line (side yard) is 125'. Same

Height of buildings – 30'2" to the highest elevation. Front wall is 20 feet, back wall near Park Lane is 15 feet.

Parking –170 parking spaces are shown; 150 required by code not including any restaurant usage. Two restaurants are likely, three possible; 170 spaces are needed for three restaurants. 184 spaces on the plans, 150 required for a 30,000 square foot shopping center.

Building size – 75' by 400' for 30,000 sf. (the PUD Design Statement proposed 40,000 square foot actual construction will be 10,000 less)

Staff Report on Commercial Site Plan Review

Landscape Plan – Same

Calculations - Same

plant schedule listing all plant units – provided
maintenance plan – lawn sprinkler system

Lot area = 198,456 sf.

Ten per cent of lot= 19,846 sf.

Required in front yard= 9,923 sf.

Plant units required = 1,588 plants

Evergreen required = 635 plants

Landscape provided on plans submitted

52,557 sf. landscaping/lawn area

10,352 sf. in front yard

1,588.5 plant units

1,012 plant units

The PUD Design Statement provides for a minimum of 12 foot tall grade A Austrian pines, 75 trees to be planted in a staggered row west of the existing brick wall next to Park Lane east of the fire lane driveway on the east side of the building.

Lighting Plan -

number of poles – 14, 11 as amended

location of poles – plans have been submitted

pole heights (including support base) – the owners propose 27.5 foot tall steel poles

type of lighting fixtures – metal poles, shoebox style

type of illumination – high pressure sodium, gray poles

pattern of illumination for each light

Wal-Mart has some lights that are 30 feet in height. The lights on the east side of Wal-Mart are shielded. All of the 11 light poles need to be shielded on the east side because Wal-Mart's lights are shielded further to the west. The two light poles in the southeast portion of the property south of the building should be limited in height to at least was originally discussed at 17 feet with the shields. All lights shall be shoebox to discourage the spread of light. 25 foot tall lights or shorter would be better. The wall pack lights on the back of the building indicate the spread of light limited to the driveway. The back wall of the building is shorter than originally planned, so this should improve the light containment.

Driveways/Parking – one drive on Danforth to be shared with the property owner to the west; plat will need to show shared driveway access easement.

The original site plan required a deceleration lane in front of the Wal-Mart property west of the shared driveway. That will still be a requirement of this application.

Mechanical equipment –located on the roof, graphic presented to illustrate mechanical setback from the outside wall plus view from backyard of homes to the east. This information will meet the current code.

The revised site plan provides that the air conditioning compressors to be placed on the ground rather than the roof behind the building. Bollards will be placed around the pads. Visually this is an improvement since there is an 8 foot brick wall to the east. The fire lane is wide enough to allow for these to be placed on the ground. There are no dumpster allowed at the back wall and no light poles along the back of the building.

Fencing/screening – existing fence, 8' all brick

Signage – one ground sign 8' in height, 54 square feet, allowed for shopping centers not on commercial corridors; brick base to match the building.

Location – southeast corner drive

Type - brick base monument

Size – 54 square feet indicating Danforth Plaza

Elevations –provided. The front elevation of the proposed building is different than the original building. There is a lesser width of the wall that extends as part of the mansard. There are no drive-in windows and this plan provides for brick on the side of the building facing Danforth, rather than EFIS as shown on the first plan.

number of stories – one

materials used on exterior walls – brick, glass, and EFIS

Flat roof, masonry (EFIS) and window exterior elevation view.

General architectural appearance

Exterior finishes – EFIS and brick. This project has more brick and less EFIS than the original building.

Drainage Report and related Grading Report Plans and Calculations indicating compliance with Title 23 Stormwater Drainage. Revised plans have been reviewed by Engineering in order to use Wal-Mart's detention area. No easements have been provided. This is a major change to the overall site plan.

Refuse facilities – dumpsters are to be located in the southwest corner of the parking lot. No fence is proposed. Additional landscaping is planned around the grouping of dumpsters since the dumpsters cannot be placed in the back of the building near the homes, plus they would block the fire lanes. This is a service area for Wal-Mart and the landscaping is recommended at this location south of Danforth and to the interior of the property. Same

Sensitive borders - A sensitive border is located to the east at the Park Lane Addition. An 8' brick fence has already been located to the east and Austrian pines 12' in height are planned next to the fence as previously agreed. The building setback is 40 to 44 feet. Between the new Bridgewater 1st Addition and the south side of the detention area for the subject property, there is no fencing since Mr. Battle owned the property rather than Wal-Mart and there is no requirement for residential properties to install a sight proof fence. The lots in Bridgewater will back up to the detention area. The homeowners may install their own fences at this location between the Security Self Storage and the existing fence on the south side of the Battle property. Same

Street paving and access management – Danforth is already four laned. This revised plan will still be required to have a deceleration lane on Danforth for this 30,000 square foot center. This project still plans to connect at two locations with Wal-Mart's driveway on the east side of Wal-Mart. The southern connection will require for 5-8 to be removed. Those trees need to be relocated rather than cut down. It is recommended that they be relocated to the front of the property rather than at the back of the property where they are not seen as well. The trees are approximately 3 years old and have matured and survived hot summers and less rainfall than is average for this area; it would be unfortunate if the trees were lost. The owner may wish to plant new trees rather than use the tree spade to relocate them. The access to the fire hydrant is where the trees are located and the Fire Department appears to need the driveway to access the fire hydrant for this 400 foot long building east of Wal-Mart.

Title 21 Water and Sanitary Sewer Plans – The plat provides for extension of water and sewer to City code.

The owners have already started grading the property and do have the erosion control fence in place. They were not familiar that the changes they proposed required a re-hearing. The staff determined that the changes were significant to warrant a hearing and particularly the drainage issue. The owners had not been told about the final plat requirement since the previous owner had the preliminary plat approved. They have initiated the final plat and it is in review, when the easements are provided for the off-site improvements and driveway cross access, the plat can be scheduled. The owners should be aware that occupancy cannot be approved of the building until the plat is recorded and the off-site easements are filed of record. The Planning Commission may wish to have the easements with the site plan because if they cannot be granted, the detention will have to be accomplished on the subject property and the shared driveway would represent a compliance issue for the access management policy.

This item was approved based on the use of Wal-Mart detention, the light poles on the property being no more than 25 feet in height, to close the southern access to Wal-mart and to not install the paved cul-de-sac and parking that was proposed to the south of their building. These items were agreed upon by the applicant.

Motion by Thomas, seconded by Thrash, to approve this request. **Motion carried** by a vote of 4-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Thomas Thrash, Waner and Vice Chairperson Cartwright

NAYS: None

The next item on the agenda was **Consideration of deed approval for two parcels on East Second Street 1/8th mile west of Coltrane. (Best Western)**

No new information has been submitted since the last Planning Commission meeting. Attorney James Kelley represents Mr. Patel, the current property owner. Engineer Glenn Smith would prepare the surveys for any easements or the plat for this project if that is chosen to be the direction to answer the Planning Commission's questions from the last meeting. In review, if the Best Western site will be retained as an unplatted tract, easements will need to be submitted at the time of the deed certification for the shared access on Second Street, the fire lane around the west side of the hotel, and the off-site detention benefiting Best Western that is located on the undeveloped portion of the property. Those easements have not been submitted at the preparation of the packet.

Engineer Glenn Smith indicated he would plat the entire property to include the Best Western but did wish to have the deed approved for the undeveloped piece at this time. The Planning Commission has expressed concern that if the deed was approved, there would be no mandatory requirement under the code for a plat to be submitted for the Best Western and the undeveloped parcel to resolve the easement issue. The resolution of this deed approval is by submitting easements for the shared improvements that benefit both parcels and are required to meet access management standards as well as minimum safety standards for fire access and surface runoff or submittal of a plat for easement documentation purposes. A preliminary plat may not be beneficial at this time, but a final plat is the method in which easements could be described and placed in public record.

Motion by Thomas, seconded by Thrash, to continue this request. **Motion carried** by a vote of 4-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Thomas, Thrash, Waner and Vice Chairperson Cartwright

NAYS: None

There was no **New Business**.

Motion by Thrash, seconded by Waner, to adjourn. **Motion carried** by a vote of 4-0 as follows:

AYES: Members: Thrash, Waner, Thomas and Vice Chairperson Cartwright

NAYS: None

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

David Woods, Chairperson
Edmond Planning Commission

Robert Schiermeyer, Secretary
Edmond Planning Commission