

Brenda Hall

From: William Hickman <hickman@hickmanlawgroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:59 PM
To: Brenda Hall
Cc: Mayor; Ward1; Ward2; Ward3; Ward4; Ward5; Ward6; Ward7; Ward8
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : NOUN Protest Part 2

Hi Brenda – After hearing the presentation, please read these additional comments if no postponement:

A few comments in follow up to the presentation:

1. The massing slides shown by Mr. Reiger do not account for the reality of the site, which requires road access to the site, parking and the required open space under the center city form based code. So, with all due respect, these slides are misleading. Additionally, the applicant cannot build any closer to the neighborhood because the applicant doesn't own the property abutting the neighborhood. Rather, the church owns the property.
2. The height of other structures in the community is irrelevant as they are not located in the form based code. The other structures referenced by Mr. Reiger did not require a variance or any special exception to build to the height identified so these slides are a red herring and should be ignored.
3. The CCPUD is a negotiation and compromise. But, if you listen carefully, the Applicant is asking for you to disregard the height limit in the form based code because he could build a more massive building. In reality, the Applicant is not going above the minimum required to protect the neighborhood.
4. The drone slides do not show the real world impact on the neighborhoods because the trees are in full bloom. Mr. Lambert knew the zoning and the location of the property at the time he bought the property so he should not be surprised by the neighbors concerns.
5. The Applicant assured the planning commission that the exit to Toberman was going to be closed; but, the presentation tonight shows this change in the site plan. And, service trucks accessing from the neighborhood is a major concern because these trucks are loud and often are entering the property at early morning.
6. Regarding communication with Applicant, I sent track changes to legal counsel on Monday, June 15 after not hearing from applicant. My clients waited until late Friday afternoon when Applicant submitted the changed CCPUD and site plan to the City for the agenda and sent it to me. As I said to you council members in my email on Monday, June 15, the City's process should not encourage an Applicant to wait until the last minute to submit the changes to the CCPUD and Site Plan, which discourages public participation and an opportunity for neighbors to actively participate in the process. In other words, by the time the neighbors and I as there legal counsel received the revised documents, the Applicant had submitted them to the City for the agenda that you are considering tonight. As such, the neighbors have not had a chance to discuss these changes with Applicant (and the Applicant has not discussed them with the neighbors).
7. The planning commission's action was not on this same project as it has changed in many ways.
8. Mr. Reiger said the project could go forward with or without the relocation of the thrift store, which would mean that the contract on the adjoining property is irrelevant.
9. Finally, considering the President of the University of Oklahoma has submitted a letter of support, does this create a conflict for the Mayor?

Best,

Bill

Thank you,
William H. Hickman

Brenda Hall

From: William Hickman <hickman@hickmanlawgroup.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 4:34 PM
To: Mayor; Ward1; Ward2; Ward3; Ward4; Ward5; Ward6; Ward7; Ward8
Cc: Brenda Hall; Darrel Pyle; Kathryn Walker; Jane Hudson
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : Protest Noun Project

Dear Brenda – Please read this email for the record tonight for the agenda items addressing the NOUN CCPUD. The questions posed to staff / applicant can also be answered tonight unless the matter is postponed, then a subsequent email addressing these questions can be sent to me. As I previously stated to you, I am not comfortable or available to go to city hall to make comments to council and since the City is refusing to provide me with the Zoom link to join the private conversation between Council Members and the Applicant regarding the NOUN project, I am simply sending you this email as it is the only option available to ensure my clients, which are neighbors impacted by this project, voices are heard by the City. Thank you for your assistance.

Dear Mayor Clark, Norman City Council Members, and City Staff:

On behalf of neighbors concerned about the NOUN Hotel project on University Drive, I am sending you these comments about the requested Center City Planned Unit Development (CCPUD). I will limit my comments to the major areas of concern:

1. **Process.** The Applicant was allowed to present this project to the Planning Commission and to be on the Council's agenda for First Reading with a site plan and a CCPUD that have both significantly changed, which is what you are considering tonight. These changes were submitted to the City on Friday afternoon of Father's Day weekend. The neighbors and I have not had a reasonable opportunity to review these changes and to discuss them with the Applicant. In fact, the Applicant has not sought input from the neighbors or me (and my representation has been known for over a month). Most concerning is the breakdown in the City's process. The City's rezoning application form requires the Applicant to sign a sworn certificate that they either own the property, or have the contractual rights to the property. For the NOUN project, the Applicant's site plan includes property that they do not own. As such, the City should have required the lease agreement with the Church who is the owner of the property upon which parking, fencing / wall improvements, and a portion of the hotel and outdoor space will be located to be provided at the time the application was submitted and before the project was allowed to proceed. This is required by the City's rezoning application form, which also requires this documentation to be submitted thirty-one days before the planning commission meeting. Thus, because this lease agreement was just provided on Friday, this project should now be placed in the pipeline for consideration by the planning commission. Why was this project allowed to proceed without all of the required paperwork being submitted to the City? Did City staff have to do more or additional work because of the late submission of the revised CCPUD, the lease agreement with the Church, and / or the revised CCPUD? Why is the City not allowing the professional legal representative of neighbors participate in the council meeting in the same manner as legal counsel for applicant?
2. **Proposed Permissible Uses – 542 S. University Blvd** (Deviation from CCFBC) –Applicant proposes to add multiple uses that are presently not allowed at this location based on the Center City Form Based Code ("CCFBC"). Page 67 of the CCFBC sets out the uses allowed for Urban Residential, which is the current zoning classification for this site. "Overnight lodging" is the only commercial use allowed in Urban Residential. Any added commercial uses are expanding the uses that were intended for this site.

None of the additional proposed uses that are objected to by my clients are allowed under the Urban Residential zoning in the CCFBC as described on page 32 and 67 of the CCFBC. The additional commercial uses such as the restaurant and bar will have negative impacts on the adjacent neighborhoods resulting from increased traffic, noise and trash.

3. **Height** – (Deviation from CCFBC) - The proposed building is four stories and 54 feet tall. The height in the Urban Residential areas was one of, if not the most, heavily negotiated and discussed topic by the citizen committee that recommended the CCFBC. Additionally, Appendix B – page 87 – Section 520(C)(7) regarding building height for a CCPUD makes it clear that the west side of University Blvd. extending from Boyd to the alley north of Apache shall be a maximum of three stories. Based on the plain language in the CCPUD section of the CCFBC, the proposed CCPUD cannot alter the maximum height restriction set forth on page 30. In fact, the CCFBC and the CCPUD language specifically restrict the height of any buildings at this location to 3 stories and 46 feet along the west side of University Blvd. The specificity of this height limitation and provision in the CCFBC reflects the will of the people that participated in the extensive process to develop the CCFBC, which is why it is so specific. The height of this structure will have a negative impact on the residentially zoned properties nearby and should not be authorized.
4. **Parking / Fencing/ Wall**– (Deviation from CCFBC) - The Applicant states that the project will have at least 94 spaces and will participate in a shared parking with FPC, the owner of the parking lot located on the south and west of the property. The use of the parking lot to the west of the proposed structure raises interesting legal and enforcement issues because the definition of the Property in the CCPUD does not include the property owned by the Church but included in the Applicant’s site plan. So, will the City be able to enforce the provisions of the CCPUD on property included in the site plan that is not owned by the Applicant or defined as the Property in the CCPUD? Further, the use of the west parking lot will negatively impact the residentially zoned properties that abut this parking lot. In order to minimize such negative effects caused by the noise, lights, pollution, etc., resulting from the increased traffic, the Applicant should be required to construct a 10 foot masonry garden wall as discussed on page 20 – 21 of the CCFBC under Neighborhood Manners along any portion of the site plan that borders residentially zoned properties to the West and North. A taller wall is requested because it was originally contemplated that this property would be used solely for residential and not for commercial purposes. Further, the City should require the Applicant to plant trees for the surface parking lots being used for the project as provided for on page 65 of the CCFBC (and as a buffer with the residentially zoned properties). In addition to the wall, the City should require the Applicant to install trees along the western boundary as with the residential lots on Elm and on the north side of the site plan to buffer the residentially zoned properties. The wall and trees are also critical for the northern boundary considering the trash canisters and loading dock face the northern boundary.
5. **Traffic** (Deviation from CCFBC / city standards) –Applicant proposes two curb cuts. Page 13 of the CCFBC prohibits new curb cuts. Further, the additional traffic created by the hotel use is a safety hazard due to the other nearby intersections, and pedestrians. Further, the City’s approval of the traffic, access and circulation plan for the project assumes that White Street on Campus Corner is going to be two-way. The Campus Corner Merchants and property owners do not support White being one-way. As such, any approval of the CCPUD should be subject to White street being converted to one-way prior to any building permit being issued; or, an alternative site plan should be proposed that does not require White Street to be one-way. Further, the multiple access points to the development will create traffic delays on University and increased risk of vehicle collision with the multiple nearby access points to the property. If the City is no longer requiring White to be one-way for this project, please explain why and how this project complies with the City’s requirements for traffic, circulation and access requirements?

We also respectfully request that you continue this rezoning application to your July Council meeting to give the neighbors ample time to work with the Applicant to address these concerns especially should the Applicant considering the recent extensive changes to the project. In the alternative, we respectfully request that you vote against this rezoning application due to the significant number of deviations from the form-based code, which

was prepared after two-years of extensive community involvement, and the negative impacts of this project on the nearby residentially zoned properties.

Thank you for your consideration. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best,

Bill

Thank you,
William H. Hickman



Hickman Law Group

attorneys counsellors mediators

330 West Gray Street, Suite 170

Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Phone: 405.605.2375

Fax: 405.605.2374

hickmanlawgroup.com

I hope that you will postpone this project to ensure that everyone, Council members and citizens have an opportunity to thoroughly review all documents being submitted by the applicant for this project. The lease agreement for parking for this project has been the subject of much concern. Starting with the Pre-Development of April 22nd , the Planning Commission meeting on May 14th and 1st Reading two weeks ago , the applicant has stated that they have one but it needs to be signed by the church. Item # 30 on tonight's agenda, still does not reflect that one exists. We are in the 350' notification area and the terms of this agreement are extremely important to us. If there is, in fact, a signed agreement we cannot access it.

The difficulty in getting specific information regarding this project has been very frustrating. It did not take long to determine that a citizen doesn't stand much of a chance to protect their home when an applicant and his attorney control the process because they are asking for PUD. The inability to obtain information caused us to have to hire an attorney to protect our home and others in the neighborhood. A citizen should not have to do this.

We cannot say enough thanks to council member Hall for the incredible amount of time she has given to us and our neighbors in trying to work toward a plan that offers as many protections possible, given the number of exceptions being requested to the CCFBC, Urban Residential, by the applicant. We also appreciate Council member Holman's time in also seeking protections for our neighborhood.

Jayne Crumpley
423 Elm Ave
Norman 73069

We all agree that the CCFBC allows a hotel at the proposed location, but we dispute the need to eviscerate CCFBC to do it. I am concerned with this project on three fronts. First, as everyone knows, CCFBC was the result of months of hard work and, I hasten to point out, compromise, by a citizens committee that tried to incorporate input from a broad range of the community that participated earlier in the process. The city was sufficiently concerned when initial development did not go exactly as desired, that a 6 month moratorium was declared to try to get back on track. Now, the first proposal to be considered for this location requests numerous major deviations from the code which, as I mentioned before, is already a compromise. The requested deviations range from excessive height to disallowed uses. Bearing in mind that the city regularly urges citizen participation in city decision making, approval of this project would be a slap in the face to all those who spent their time and effort to develop CCFBC in the first place, and in my opinion would certainly discourage anyone who's been paying attention from bothering to participate the next time.

Secondly, I'm afraid that, if this project is approved, it will be much more difficult to oppose future requests for deviations from CCFBC, basically rendering it not worth the paper it's written on and further insulting the citizens who developed it.

Finally, the process by which this project has been vetted has been a travesty. The applicant did not provide and, in fact did not have, a fully approved parking lot lease, a document vital for the proper evaluation of the project by the city (and the public) at the planning commission meeting, nor at first reading before city council, yet the proposal moved forward anyway. I understand that the city received the lease yesterday afternoon, leaving little time for a proper evaluation.

There has also been at least a perceived lack of transparency when dealing with the city on this matter. If not for the tireless efforts of our Ward 4 council person, Lee Hall, it would have been impossible for us to stay informed at all.

For the above reasons, if the decision on this project is not postponed tonight I urge the council to disapprove the project. Thank you!



Mark Crumpley
423 Elm Avenue

Brenda Hall

From: Marsha McDaris <marsha-mc@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 7:51 PM
To: _City Clerk
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : Hotel

Marsha McDaris, 448 College

Considering the plan exceeds height and other issues of the form based code and could set a set a precedence for future PUD's , I hope the council will not approve this project. The 350' protest area is basically a church that stands to make profit off the parking lease and does not include residents in the campus area that will be effected . Too late but I'd vote for postponement without a presentation.

Sent from my iPhone

Brenda Hall

From: Rogers, Cynthia L. <crogers@ou.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 12:06 AM
To: Brenda Hall
Cc: Lee Hall
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : Comments for Item 31 (Noun Hotel) at 6/24/2020 council meeting

Dear Mayor and City Council Members

As a member of the CCFBC steering committee, this application is disturbing on many levels.

This application displays a total disregard for the extensive and intentional planning process which lead to the creation of the CCFBC zoning.

I would like to remind you of two of the specific goals of the CCFBC:

- #2 Stabilize and strengthen mixed-use commercial centers and residential neighborhoods, and
- #5 Ensure a complementary relationship with surrounding neighborhoods.

The zoning map was carefully and intentionally designed with the CCFBC goals in mind. There was only one small section zoned urban residential. This was a hard fought compromise.

The proposed CCPUD would remove the UR zone protections. The PUD requests 4 uses, and only one of those is allowed by right in the CC. Restaurant/bar is NOT allowed in UR zoning. Outside entertainment use is NOT allowed in UR zoning. Retail use is also no allowed in UR zoning.

The PUD request is not for a little flexibility, it is asking for an entirely different zoning category. It would essentially throw out the UR zoning category by setting a precedent and a change in circumstances to allow for future waivers.

Most importantly, approving this would disregard a carefully crafted compromise.

Cynthia Rogers
633 Reed Ave
Ward 4

Cynthia Rogers
Professor of Economics
University of Oklahoma
308 Cate Center Drive, CCDB1
Room 423
Norman, OK 73072
crogers@ou.edu
<http://cas.ou.edu/economics>

Brenda Hall

From: Waters, Michael F. <mwaters@ou.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 6:38 AM
To: _Council Members
Cc: _City Clerk
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : 542 University Blvd. hotel project - please vote no

To the City Council –

I'm writing to plead that you oppose the proposal to build a boutique hotel on the property at 542 University Boulevard.

I have lived in the 400 block of Park Drive since 1982, and have owned the property at 414-416 Park Drive since 1999. This street is a unique part of Norman. It is an extraordinarily peaceful and enjoyable place to live. The narrow one-way street extending from Symmes to the intersection of Elm and Toberman, plus the absence of nearby large-scale commercial development, allows us the privilege of a low-traffic environment where residents can walk unimpeded and in safely throughout the area. We're blessed with extensive tree coverage, an unobstructed view, and century-old houses – many of them (including mine) repaired and renovated at great expense to the owners. The quiet of our area is such that any time of day we can clearly hear the beautiful carillon chimes from OU and the church bells that are blocks away. The night times on this street are safe and placid, and free of distracting glare. I have loved this place so much. It is my home, and I had assumed it would be so for the rest of my life.

And now, I find that most of the wonderful things I love about living here are on the verge of being flushed away. For money.

I attended the Planning Commission meeting to consider the developer's request for a variance to permit this project. The developer's glib, long-winded, happy-talk presentation in support of this project tried to do the impossible – convince us that a major commercial development planted on the doorstep of a quiet street would have no negative effects on the quality of life of people who live there. We were told with a straight face that the noise generated by a development featuring 90-plus hotel rooms, a bar, a restaurant, a live-music patio, the coming and going of cars and delivery trucks, the constant pedestrian traffic, etc., would be “negligible.” We were told, preposterously, that light pollution would be nonexistent. We were shown drone photography “proving” that tree coverage would mask the view of the neighborhood from this development – as if trees leafed year-round. Idiotically, the presentation favorably compared the height of the proposed hotel to that of nearby McFarlin Methodist Church – as if there was any imaginable comparison on the basis of usage or aesthetic quality between the two, or as if there was no difference between the structure of a steeple of a church and that of the top floor of a busy hotel.

The developer's presentation, absurdities and all, seemed intended to do just one thing – get this project rubber-stamped through the city government as quickly as humanly possible. To my dismay, I saw nothing at the Planning Commission meeting that indicated the Commission had any interest in taking the time necessary to make an independent assessment of the effects of this development, or of the claims presented by the developer.

I had hoped that the “neighborhood manners” restrictions of the city's Form Based Code (FBC) would provide our street with some protection from the worst effects of future development. The FBC was written after much work and deliberation. Did the people who put so much effort into this waste their time? Will it now be the Council's position that wealthy developers have a de facto veto power over the restrictions contained in the FBC?

A hotel can be built anywhere, but after a historic residential area has been badly hurt or killed, the damage can't be undone. Those of us who live on Park Drive have seen other parts of central Norman lost over the last decade to rampant redevelopment. Now, it seems, the biggest threat of all has come to within a few houses of me.

One other thing – if you do vote to approve this project, I respectfully ask that you don't do what the Planning Commission did – offer a few empty expressions of "sensitivity" to the residents impacted by it, while giving the developer a green light to go ahead. Voting yes for this hotel, especially in its current form, is a rejection of the people who live here. Don't insult our intelligence by pretending it's something other than that.

But please don't vote to kill the 400 block of Park Drive. Please.

Sincerely,
Michael Waters
414-416 Park Drive
Norman, OK 73069
mwaters@ou.edu

Brenda Hall

From: Darrel Pyle
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 10:57 PM
To: Brenda Hall
Subject: Fwd: EXTERNAL EMAIL : PROTEST--> THE NOUN (R-1920-73/O-1920-52/O-1920-53)

For the file!
DP

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lloyd A Bumm <bumm@ou.edu>
Date: June 23, 2020 at 5:40:32 PM CDT
To: Darrel Pyle <Darrel.Pyle@NormanOK.gov>
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : PROTEST--> THE NOUN (R-1920-73/O-1920-52/O-1920-53)
Reply-To: bumm@ou.edu

Dear City Manager Pyle,

I am writing to PROTEST "The Noun", the boutique hotel project. The project is violating too many principles of the CCFBC and tramples the protections the residents in the neighborhood have fought for. The project does not respect the neighborhood.

As a resident of Norman for 19 years I have been continually dismayed that we study problems and develop solutions, such as the CCFBC (Center City Form Based Code), and then make broad exceptions at the first opportunity.

Why have rules at all if we grant every exception in response to a slick presentation? This is a cool looking project, but is the applicants responsibility to choose a viable site, not our responsibility to bend to the applicant's will.

Better projects will come along. This will not be our only opportunity for a campus corner hotel. If it is truly a viable idea, someone will propose another hotel at a better location in campus corner. An apartment building could easily be built on this site without violating CCFBC principles.

I urge you to vote against this project tonight.

Sincerely,

Lloyd A. Bumm
610 Miller Ave
Norman, OK 73069

Specific problems with the project.

A) The applicant proposes a commercial project adjacent to a residential area in violation of the CCFBC. This area was envisioned to be a transition between the commercial area on the east of University and the R-1 residential area bordering on the west.

--At planning commission the project included an outdoor patio for the bar/restaurant with outdoor entertainment.

B) The project violates the CCFBC height restriction for the west side of University Ave.

C) The project changes the neighboring residential structure to commercial. This was proposed at Planning Commission. This changes was proposed as a "trade" so that they could demolish the building where the Thrift Shop currently stands and move the Thrift Shop into the residential structure adjacent to the north. Yet another example of erosion of the residential/commercial buffer.

D) The applicant does not own their parking. At Planning Commission, the site plan conflates the applicant's property and the surrounding property. The parking they rely on is almost exclusively on adjacent property. Even if they have an agreement today, any assurance that they would always have use of that parking in the future is wishful thinking.

Brenda Hall

From: Valerie Slemmons Mettry <cateringmom@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 8:48 PM
To: _City Clerk
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : NOUN project

I live at the corner of Toberman and Elm, and the 8 ft. wall would be at the back of my property. The church built a 3-foot concrete block wall that divides my parking from the parking lot, and I would like that torn out when they build the 8 ft. wall, which would give me another 1-1/2 ft. of parking, which I need. Also, I would like the contact number of these people so that during the construction of this project, if for any reason I need to contact them about something regarding my property, I have the information in order to do that.

Thank you.

Valerie Slemmons Mettry

Brenda Hall

From: Travis Pawley <pawley82@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2020 6:38 PM
To: _City Clerk
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : City Council Comment - NOUN Hotel Project

Council Members,

I am writing in support of the NOUN Boutique Hotel project that is being proposed on University Blvd. I do not have any connection to this project. I am an architect that has designed several projects in Norman, studied several types of city and state codes, and I participated in the process of creating Norman's Center City Form Based Code. I think the creation of this form based code is a great step in developing our city's core, and I think that this is exactly the type of project that we had in mind when creating this code. Form based codes are created to encourage non-traditional development such as mixed-use projects that interact with an active pedestrian friendly street. They are meant to provide the flexibility to make these types of projects possible, whereas a traditional code may not allow them. The intent of this code is to spur quality development in this area that will increase the quality of life, pedestrian activity, livelihood, and commerce in the area. When we gathered as fellow citizens to form this code, we walked around and put green stickers on project images we liked and red stickers on images we disliked. At the end of that study, it was images of projects like this, that fronted the streetscape with active pedestrian areas and mixed-use ground floors, that were covered in green stickers.

I would encourage the Council to look at the overall intent of the CCFBC, as well as the overall impact of what a project like this can do for the heart of our City, and not get caught up in the details of whether the project is a few feet too tall or isn't exactly what was specified in the CCFBC for that area. Remember, the intent is to spur quality development and provide the flexibility to do so, not to create just another restrictive code.

Lastly, I will say that this is the type of project that is frankly long overdue in Norman. Nearly every major University area has a hotel like this near campus with a quality restaurant. It will replace a blank parking lot and torn down apartments. In the grand scheme, this is a vast improvement for our City.

Thank you,

Travis Pawley
4209 Brookview

Brenda Hall

From: Ann Gallagher <slpanng@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2020 11:47 AM
To: _City Clerk
Subject: EXTERNAL EMAIL : Comment for item 29 (the NOUN)

June 21, 2020

Councilmen, Mayor and City Manager Pyle:

I would like to address some concerns regarding the proposed plan for the NOUN Hotel on South University Boulevard. I don't live in that area but I've been a resident of Norman for 44 years. I've seen changes that are great and many that are not.

I'm not sure why the city bothered with spending two years to develop the Center City Form Based Code when the first or second item that comes up, the plan is ignored. I understand changing to a CCPUD will allow the original plan to be modified by exceeding the requirements. No structure of more than three stories should be allowed. Those were your rules! Changing it now is totally inappropriate. The integrity of Core Norman is essential and historical. It continues to celebrate the growth of Norman. The older homes provide a quality to Norman that is special. It's bad enough to allow the mini dorms that infringe on neighbors properties by allowing them to build to the property line. We are losing Norman neighbors who have been in that area for decades. Why is that right?

Chamber of Commerce supporters (87) and business owners in the area will not be affected by water runoff, light intrusion, noise, and invasion of privacy. Chamber of Commerce has the advantage of the situation as they can send out a massive email to all members requesting that support be given to the project and many members follow the direction given to them by the Chamber. The neighbors (52) do not have that option. Neighbors outside of the 350 foot radius did support their neighbors but their numbers are massively smaller than that of the Chamber of Commerce members. Even the business owners on Campus Corner will not be affected by the development of this hotel. They will not deal with water runoff. They will not deal with light intrusion. They will not deal with the noise. They will not deal with invasion of privacy. To be honest, they don't care about their residential neighbors. All they care about is having a convenience for their businesses.

All required documents have not been provided to the City, nor were they presented to the Planning Commission. At the very least, these items (29, 30, and 31) should be postponed until a new proposal that meets the Center City Form Based Code requirements is presented. A CCPUD is a convenience to avoid what is in place.

Please do not accept this proposal.

Ann Gallagher
2513 Woodsong Drive
Norman, OK

Sent from my iPad