

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

DECEMBER 11, 2014

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Complex, 201 West Gray Street, on the 11th day of December 2014. Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chairman Dave Boeck called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Roberta Pailles
Erin Williford
Sandy Bahan
Dave Boeck
Jim Gasaway
Tom Knotts
Chris Lewis
Cindy Gordon

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Sherrer

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Jeff Bryant, City Attorney
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Shawn O'Leary, Director of Public Works
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development
Manager
Scott Sturtz, City Engineer,
Drew Norlin, Asst. Development Coordinator
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator

* * *

Chairman Boeck welcomed Erin Williford to the Planning Commission.

* * *

Item No. 11, being:

11A. R-1415-31 – ELSEY PARTNERS REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN FROM LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION TO HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF PAGE STREET AND ENCOMPASSING ALL OF PAGE CIRCLE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

11B. O-1415-19 – ELSEY PARTNERS REQUESTS REZONING FROM R-3, MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, TO PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, FOR 4.19 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF PAGE STREET AND ENCOMPASSING ALL OF PAGE CIRCLE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. PUD Narrative with Exhibits
4. Revised Preliminary Site Development Plan (Sign Locations Included)
5. Revised PUD Narrative regarding Signage
6. Renderings of Building with Signage
7. Protest & Support Map and Letters

11C. PP-1415-9 – CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY ELSEY PARTNERS (NSE ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS) FOR PAGE CIRCLE APARTMENTS, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, A REPLAT OF A REPLAT OF A REPLAT OF BLOCK 1, MILLER ADDITION, GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF PAGE STREET AND ENCOMPASSING ALL OF PAGE CIRCLE. ”

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Site Development Plan
6. Pre-Development Summary
8. Greenbelt Commission Comments

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – The existing NORMAN 2025 Land Use in this area – currently the subject tract is designated as Low Density Residential. You have High Density Residential to the north. You have Low Density Residential across the railroad tracks. And then you have additional High Density Residential to the south, with a combination of Low Density Residential and University property to the west. If approved, this tract would take on the High Density Residential Designation as well.

The existing zoning in the area is R-3 for the subject tract. You have RM-6 to the north, R-1 across the railroad tracks, R-3 to the south, and then also R-3 to the west. Existing land use is the multi-family to the north, single family to the east, multi-family to the south, and then there's a combination of some single family and University property to the west.

This is Page Circle, kind of going around the loop there. This is the Ray Apartments to the north. This is the area that would be on the east side of this proposal; the railroad track is there in the distance. This is Page Street with current Bishop Landing on the south. This is Bishop Landing there as well. This is the alley that would be along the west side of this proposal, with the single family houses, which are also rental properties, and I believe there's some garage apartment use in there as well. This is at the corner of Page and Trout, which has the single family here at the corner.

They are proposing 372 units, 865 beds. They are providing 888 parking spaces; that is one per bed with additional visitor parking. The parking garage will be inside of the buildings

which house the apartments. There's also a request on this one – I believe you received a copy of a revised Preliminary Site Development Plan. All this does is show the location of two signs that they're requesting; it changes nothing else about this Preliminary Site Development Plan. And then it also includes the portion of the narrative of the PUD which outlines that the development will follow the Preliminary Site Development Plan for all signage. There are also two elevations that show where those signs will be located.

We did receive letters of protest. We did also receive areas of support within the notice area, which brought the protest to 18.8%. With the continued change in the neighborhood – the University has continued to buy property to the west of this subject tract. As you can see, there's the three there on Trout, I believe, are the single family homes that the University does not have control of and are not renter facilities, and then, of course, the multi-family complex to the north, and then there's a single family over there on the east. But with the continued change in the neighborhood component, the University ownership, and the rental properties, this area does support an infill. Staff supports the rezoning request as well as the resolution. So Ordinance No. O-1415-19, Resolution No. R-1415-31 are recommended for approval. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have. The applicant is here with a lengthy presentation for you, so you can ask them questions as well.

2. Mr. Boeck – Do you have a slide that shows the University ownership?
Ms. Hudson – I do not. The applicant does.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Chris Elsey – It's a pleasure to be in front of you here. I see a lot of familiar faces. We've been trying to get something built here in Norman for some time, so this has been a long time coming. We're excited to be in front of you today.

I did want to mention the Revised Site Development Plan that Jane had mentioned with our signage. She was gracious enough to work with us on that, and so we are submitting that revision.

I wanted to first give you a brief background on who we are. It's my brother and I; we're the owners of Elsey Partners. We are a vertically integrated student housing development company. By that I mean that we have an in-house architect; he's here this evening as well. We design our own properties. We act as our own general contractor. We build them, and then we also manage them. We started in 2005. I went to school at Kansas State University and I currently live in Manhattan. Since 2005 we've been building infill projects around universities. We currently have projects that we're working on just up the road in Stillwater and also in Lincoln, Nebraska – about 500 beds that are going to be coming online this year.

Our big thing is walkability. We feel like communities are better if people can walk places rather than drive places. That's where we build all of our developments; we don't build anything that is not within a five-minute walk. To me, that's what walkability means – within a five-minute walk. And that's why we're excited about this location. That's why we're here in Norman today and why we're in front of you right now is we feel that there are no new student-oriented properties that are within a five-minute walk to the University. So within this five-minute radius you can see you've got the campus, Campus Corner, and also the stadium.

Jane, I think, did a pretty good job in her presentation. I'm going to walk you around. This is our subject tract. Here are the railroad tracks again. Boyd is here running west to east, and then Lindsey is down here. Again, to the south is Bishop Landing. I believe right after us there's the Inland American redevelopment proposal. Again, to the east is the 100-foot railroad right-of-way. This is a shot from Boyd Street looking to the south. The Ray Apartments are to the north. And then back to the west you can see the Sarkey's Center there and the OU campus.

Commissioner Boeck, this is the image that you're referring to – your question about the University ownership. The crimson there is the University ownership. So from Boyd down to Brooks and then from Jenkins over to the railroad track there are 118 parcels, and the red and the crimson are either University or rental properties; the blue are the five owner-occupied properties

in this. This is why we feel like this is a good place to build infill student housing development, is because 95% of this area is associated with the University or student housing.

Here's a site plan of the project. This is actually a complete redesign after our neighborhood meeting. It is a 4.2 acre site – 372 units and it's going to be developed in three phases. We hope to start this June and develop each phase each coming year.

This is the current view from Page Street and the alley looking to the northeast. And this is what we're proposing. I laid these on top of each other. I'd like you to look at that and, from our standpoint we feel like this is an improvement and a benefit to the community. Again, Page Circle currently consists of 26 single-family homes that have been converted to rental homes. All of the property owners we have under contract and they're obviously all supportive of the project. These homes were built in the 1950s and, just as the University has grown, they've transitioned into rentals. We feel like a multi-family project is more appropriate for handling the intensity of use for a college student environment, as opposed to a single-family rental home. I think many of you have experienced this maybe in neighborhoods where you have owners and rentals and there's a conflict there because, obviously, the folks that are renting – they're going to be driving up on the lawn, and not taking care of things like they should be, where an owner-occupied obviously has a more vested interest in things.

I'm going to get into some of our responses to the neighborhood input that we had. Through our Pre-Development meeting, we created a new stair-step building height. So this is a graphic to illustrate that. The facades closest to the street are 42', and then they step up in height. It goes from 42 to 50 to 53 and then 60 feet is the building. The highest portion of the structure would be the parking garage and that's dedicated with the orange, and then those red spots are the stair towers up on top and the elevator shaft. So, to answer your question, I think you had mentioned previous for elderly and disabled folks, the elevator obviously provides accessibility to the entirety of the units.

This is a section of that to illustrate that stair-step building height. As you can see, this is the street way back here and then we're stepping the building back as you get further into the property, the building height increases. So that's how we tried to address the concern from the citizens about the building façade height.

Another thing that came up were the setbacks for the property. They felt like our original proposal was too aggressive with the setbacks, so we've adopted more of a suburban setback where you would see with the proposal you just saw with the Legacy Trail, where you'd have more suburban setbacks. The yellow strip around there – that, I believe, is 26 feet and then we created these exterior courtyards going around the structure and those are 55 feet setback from the street. This is a blow-up of that to really show you how we tried to increase that setback and lessen that façade along the west and southern facades – the west, against the alley, and then Page Street. This is a visual graphic of what that entry courtyard looks like. This is approximately 30 feet wide by 55 feet deep. You're standing on the sidewalk looking toward the structure, and you can see how it steps back. Again, there are seven of these that are surrounding on the west, the alley side, and the southern side of the property along Page Street.

This is our open space diagram. We have 34% open space. In our center courtyards – the southern courtyard here we're going to have an infinity-edge two-tiered pool and then actually up here on this parking structure there's going to be – I call it a sunbathing pool. It's a shallower pool where you could place a lawn chair. By doing those – that was another comment we heard from the community was we didn't have enough open space, so we went to 34% open space. I believe the PUD requires a 10% open space requirement. This is just a graphic to illustrate potentially what that rooftop tanning pool would look like.

Here's that entry courtyard that we also redesigned and, again, it's stepping back. Again, this is 55 feet – this façade back here. That's 55 feet from the street.

Our parking – our garage is surrounded by the structure. It's laminated so you won't be able to see the garage from any of the street facades. We do have one stall per bedroom, which is over 200 more stalls than what the City of Norman requires.

Another concern was the traffic and the egress in and out of the property. We did have Traffic Engineering Consultants conduct a study for this. This study was conducted off our original

proposal, which was at 555 units, and we've reduced it to 372 units. So, even with the study that they did at 555 units, they concluded that "the traffic projected to be generated by the new development is not expected to be detrimental to the operations of the intersections reviewed within this study." So that basically tells us that the street network around the property has the capacity and is designed to support the project and this is not going to have a detrimental effect on the surrounding neighborhood. A big portion of that is that -- again, the reason we're excited about this property, going back to the first thing I said -- people are going to be able to walk places rather than get in their car and drive places.

I wanted to back up and give you a brief history. I don't know how many of you are familiar with our attempt to try to work with and get something built here in Norman. We came back here in 2005. We first pursued the University Falls project, which is kind of caddy-corner from the Mont. There was stiff opposition from the neighborhood here to the south on Tulsa. They basically told us that we don't want this here. You're on the wrong side of the tracks. You need to be west of the railroad tracks. So in 2003 we pursued a project right there kind of to the west of the 401 Loft project, just to the north of Boyd Street. Here's the Sarkey's Center right here, so it's northeast of that. That kicked off all of the City Center Visioning Project process that we've all been going through, and I'm sure many of you are familiar with. Basically, the conclusion from that, at least originally, was that this development was too close to Campus Corner and that we didn't want it infringing on that. With the release of the new draft, I think maybe some of this has been supported. But that led us to where we're at now. Again, we're west of the train tracks. We're south of Boyd Street away from Campus Corner. So we've really tried to -- you know, it's taken a lot of effort to get all these parcels under contract, et cetera. And we've really tried to work and listen to the citizens of Norman and tried to locate -- to us, again, density and these more urban style apartment complexes -- they're the right thing to do if they're in the right place. Hopefully, the third time's the charm here. I think, as we've gone along, I'll admit that I think we're getting better and better with our locations.

This is that original modern design that we first proposed at the neighborhood meeting. And, quite honestly, folks didn't like it. So we went to, again, this more traditional design. Again, we had the 33% reduction in units from 555 units to 372 units. We had more urban setbacks, with just two foot variations, and so, again, we created those suburban setbacks.

I think this is really telling. I don't know if many of you have reviewed the new City Center Form-Based Code. This is the Urban General, which basically specifies what they want apartment complexes like ours to look like. Over on this side, you've got what the Urban General -- so this is what, you know, the City of Norman paid this expert, Mary Madden, who does this all throughout the country and we went through all this long process all throughout -- I think it's been almost a year and a half now. These are the criteria that they came up with. So the max height for a façade -- they want the building right up on the property line -- they call it, basically, this buildable edge. Your max height there -- they do kind of step it back slightly, but it's 82 feet. Again, our max façade height is 60 feet, so we're 22 feet less than what the consultant here in Norman is proposing for Urban General here in the city. Their setbacks are 0, and again our setbacks -- we're at 26 feet and 55 feet. The open space is at 15% and, again, we're at 34%. The parking provided for the number of units and beds that we have on our project -- the consultant would recommend that we would only need 475 stalls and we're proposing 888 stalls. So we're really trying to make an effort to go above and beyond even what this consultant is recommending to try to get this thing -- to try to work with the citizens, to try to work with your community and try to get something that -- we want to be good neighbors and we want to try to work with folks.

This is the urban boundary. This is the City Center. Sean had referred to this earlier when we were talking about the railroad tracks. He's got a good memory. That's correct that this is that urban density that they're talking about and it is adjacent to the railroad tracks.

We're going to zoom in on this little block here. This is Jenkins and Duffy. The City Center plan did not -- it's all north of Boyd. But if we were -- this is me extrapolating it south toward our property. So if you would take this same basically here along the railroad tracks -- and we've got the railroad tracks here adjacent to our property. They're proposing this urban core here. Here

along Jenkins they're also proposing it. And then here along Duffy. So we would basically propose that – you know, you've got the University adjacent here. This is the alley that's coming right through here. So I would propose – if the consultant were to study this area, I would conclude that they would maybe come to a similar conclusion as this.

This is the intersection there. So this is Duffy and Jenkins, so they are proposing right here on this corner – the railroad tracks back here – is to have an 82 foot tall building right here. Across the street is a single story home and there's single story homes over here as well. And all of this is closer to – there's a lot more owner-occupied folks north of Boyd Street and around Duffy and Jenkins than there are around the University here. So these are the two – you know, south of our property is the current Bishop Landing apartment complex and the folks that you're going to hear from next are proposing a project similar to ours. So your consultant is telling you that they think it's a good idea to put an 82-foot tall building right here, and, again, my building right here is going to only be 42 feet tall, so I'm almost half the height of what they're proposing.

I'm going to walk you around the building here. This is from Page Street and the alley. This would be the main pedestrian thoroughfare where most folks would walk. We are proposing parallel parking along the alley. That was a result of the Greenbelt Commission had recommended that. They had also recommended parallel parking along Page Street, but in working with City staff they did not support that, so we removed that. Here's from the southwest. Again, this is the top of Bishop Landing. This is the entry into the parking garage as it goes down, and then this is the parking garage that rises up above it. From the street, you wouldn't be able to see that garage. Here's from the southeast looking back toward the property. You can see all these exterior courtyards as it goes in and out. This is from the railroad tracks. This is Bishop Creek down here; this is really heavy vegetated right now. There's a ton of trees in here. So the majority of this whole façade would be covered with vegetation. And this is from the north. This is looking kind of from the Ray Apartments looking back toward the structure. Here's another shot from the west. Here's the seven exterior courtyards and the entry courtyard. I think that does it. So I'm open to any questions or clarifications.

2. Mr. Boeck – It looks like you've got an elevated first floor. What's the basement? Is that more units? For your last project you had actually sub ...

Mr. Elsey – Yeah. So that's like a garden level. If I can back this all the way up. Here you go. So if you see this garden level here – this is basically where our units are starting here. Basically there's another – there's kind of a half window basically right down here that would be daylighting right here. That's a unit.

Mr. Boeck – What's on the top? Because they show four levels.

Mr. Elsey – This is the upper floor. There would be some mezzanine apartments there, so basically like a two-story apartment. It's kind of like a lofted bedroom. College kids think they're pretty neat. It's got a big window in it.

3. Ms. Gordon – Isn't this City Center code based on being in Core Norman?

Mr. Elsey – The City Center, yes.

Ms. Gordon – Okay. And this is outside the core, right, quite a bit?

Mr. Elsey – Just south of it.

Ms. Gordon – Well, I'm looking at the regulations here and it says determine if property in question is located within the form district. If not, this code is not applicable.

Mr. Elsey – Yeah, I mean, there's nothing in the City of Norman that addresses buildings of this scale. And so this is basically what – I mean, that's why we went through this whole entire process and this whole high density discussion was to try to come up with some set of guidelines to help guide development of this nature. So I'm taking the guidelines for development of this nature and I'm trying to basically show you, okay, this is what we have.

Ms. Gordon – I understand that, but I think my question is those guidelines, it's my understanding, were developed for if you are in the more kind of downtown city thing – not an area where you are basically more residential, which you are – whether it's rental or not, it's

much more residential than core downtown Norman. In which case, once you get into that, then having these kind of super-tall ...

Mr. Elsey – Okay. So you think this area up here – you think this neighborhood here – I want to go back to this picture here. I'd shown you the urban area that you're saying is urban.

Ms. Gordon – I'm saying that's what the City Center Urban General thing you are discussing is saying ...

Mr. Elsey – Okay. So you – is this urban? So your consultant is saying this is urban. There are single family homes all around this thing. There's apartment complexes all around my building. So I'm saying that I think this site is more urban than the site that your consultant is saying that's urban.

Ms. Gordon – I appreciate what you're saying. But if you're going to sit there and say let's listen to the consultant, then you can't go say let's not listen to the consultant and not agree with what they're saying is urban.

Mr. Elsey – Well, they just haven't addressed ...

Ms. Gordon – You can't have it both ways.

Mr. Elsey – They just haven't extended – they just haven't addressed ...

Ms. Gordon – Ah – so they haven't gotten there yet and you're getting ahead of them for them?

Mr. Elsey – Well, yeah. I mean, they haven't addressed this area.

Ms. Gordon – Okay. I just wanted to question. I hadn't heard about that yet. I hadn't looked into it yet and I just saw it and I just wanted to see where we were on that. That's all I had.

4. Ms. Pailes – I feel a distinct disadvantage because I haven't seen the draft of that. So I feel totally disadvantaged here.

Mr. Elsey – I think it's posted on the City website.

Ms. Gordon – It's online. I'm looking at it now.

Ms. Connors – The Center City Visioning Project is ongoing and we do have a draft of the Center City Form Based Code that has gone to the Executive Committee and the Steering Committee for review. Once it went to the Steering Committee we posted it online. So it is online for review. It's certainly not a final draft. We're still working on it and the only thing I would say about what Mr. Elsey is indicating is that there are regulations that they're proposing, even though this area might be proposed that it could be developed at these densities doesn't indicate that it will be. And it, of course, will take many, many years for that form based code to come into reality.

Mr. Elsey – I guess my attempt at providing that information was that's the guidance that so far has been provided to the City of Norman, to the staff, et cetera. I was just trying to call that to your attention – that this is what's out there. This is – we've been going – I mean, honestly, our projects – the past two years – that's what kicked off this whole discussion. That's why I bring up this urban design standard, is because that's the reason we're even – why we're even going down this road and why we've spent the past two or three years even discussing these things is because projects of this very nature. And so that's why I bring it up.

5. Ms. Pailes – I have a simple question. It's 372 units. How many beds?

Mr. Elsey – There are 872, I believe.

Mr. Knotts – Are those twin beds?

Mr. Elsey – Twin beds? No. No. In our leasing, we only allow one resident per bedroom.

Ms. Pailes – So you don't rent to married couples? Actually, you have to rent to married couples.

Mr. Elsey – Yeah.

Ms. Pailes – So actually there are more than one person per bedroom if you have a married couple.

Mr. Elsey – Yeah. With – I mean, predominantly we're renting toward students. And so, with our students, we limit them to one person per bed.

Ms. Pailes – Unless they're married.

Mr. Elsey – Unless they're married, yes.

Ms. Pailes – That plays into the parking and the cars and the traffic. Because there are potentially ...

Mr. Elsey – Yeah. I mean, I've been doing this ten years and, I mean, college students like their privacy. I think the perception out there is that you're going to have apartments that have, you know – it's a two-bedroom apartment and it's got six kids living in it. I think a lot of that perception comes from your experience with single-family rental homes, where they've got a lot more kids. It was originally designed for a family of four and now there's six or seven kids living there. But it has been my experience that people don't over-occupy. I mean, that's why we put one bedroom and one bath is because people value their privacy.

6. Ms. Pailes – So attracting students – what's the price range for your apartments?

Mr. Elsey – I would say in the four bedrooms we'd be about – so this includes everything: cable, internet, electricity, water, trash – we'd be looking at about \$550 going up to, probably for a studio apartment you're looking at about \$750.

Mr. Boeck – So when you're saying a four-bedroom, that's \$550 per room?

Mr. Elsey – Yeah. \$550 per person. Correct.

Ms. Pailes – Do you give students a break? How do you attract students specifically? Do they get a break on rent?

Mr. Elsey – Well, I think really the attraction for students is just the location of the property. Because it's within a stone's throw – I think it's only 300 feet from the University.

7. Ms. Pailes – One last one before the public speaks. The detention pond is under the parking garage?

Mr. Elsey – No. That was in an earlier design. We have since – let me get back to my site plan. It's basically on the north side in this fire lane. It runs along here. It's underground.

Ms. Pailes – Okay. It's totally covered. I mean, basically it's a culvert.

Mr. Elsey – Yeah. Correct.

8. Ms. Gordon – So the traffic impact study and saying that the road can handle that amount of traffic. Is that based on experience or just best case scenario that most of the people here are going to be walking kind of thing? Because, I mean, even if they're walking to classes, if they're mainly students, I mean you still have night time, weekends.

Mr. Elsey – I can have Todd Butler come up here and explain their process in more detail to you. But we had originally submitted – there was a study done up in Minneapolis around student-oriented properties and is how they determine, with apartment complexes, they have a trip generation number, basically. And so for a suburban apartment complex it's obviously going to be different than a student housing apartment complex for your trip generation. So the study that was conducted – you know a technical memo up in Minneapolis concluded that a student apartment is going to have about a third the trip generation that a traditional suburban multi-family apartment complex is going to have. Again, the reason is because the students are going to walk to campus rather than have to get in their car and drive to work every day, because the campus is their work. So, in submitting that to the City, they wanted us to basically – because there are no projects that have parking garages here in Norman that are adjacent to the University – they wanted us to go up and study our current projects up in Stillwater, Oklahoma that have parking structures that are adjacent to the university. So they basically went up there, they studied that, and the trip generation was higher than the Minnesota study concluded, but it was less than the traditional suburban apartment complex. So they basically did a site study in Stillwater. They measured all the cars at our complex. It's a 372-bed complex. They measured cars coming in and out of it over a period of days and came up with their trip generation. So we feel like it's a pretty good accurate number. The staff here that are traffic engineers support the project and support the findings in the report. Traffic is a big deal, obviously, and in our neighborhood meeting, it was probably the number one thing. City staff

was really concerned about it, so we really tried to go the extra mile in making sure we got it right.

9. Mr. Knotts – I understand from looking at this that the existing alley is going to be rebuilt – has to be rebuilt.

Mr. Elsey – We will probably come in and pave it. If we back up, you can see where we've got the parking here, this is actually on our property.

Mr. Knotts – What is?

Mr. Elsey – The parallel parking stalls here. So the existing alley basically runs out here. It's currently just an asphalt alley.

Mr. Knotts – I've been down it.

Mr. Elsey – Yeah. We're going to pave it with concrete.

Mr. Knotts – So paving it with concrete, you tear it all out. All the trees come out.

Mr. Elsey – Which?

Mr. Knotts – All the trees. All the trees in the fence line on both sides of the alley.

Mr. Elsey – I would anticipate the – I was just there today.

Mr. Knotts – So it's a very narrow alley and you're going to have to have emergency vehicle opportunities there. So you're going to take out everything. I mean, when you're building a concrete – I mean, I'm assuming it's going to be curb and gutter.

Mr. Elsey – No, it'd be just a panned alley. So it wouldn't have curb or gutter with it. It's going to be like a V-shaped – a concave alley.

Mr. Knotts – So you're going to have the drainage going down the middle?

Mr. Elsey – Correct. Yeah.

Mr. Knotts – Well, I'm worried about the 60 some odd feet that – with balconies that are a great amenity looking into all of those people across the ...

Mr. Elsey – So you're up on the upper floor with that mezzanine apartment – basically there's three units along here that have a balcony. We put those in there as a response from the Greenbelt Commission. They wanted us to have balconies there.

Mr. Knotts – But you've got windows all along there and so all of that – when you get rid of all the vegetation it's going to be hello everybody. I mean, all those people along Trout that have homes are going to lose all ...

Mr. Elsey – The three property owners there. Yeah.

Mr. Knotts – Well, there are three property owners in residence but there are also – every one of those houses is occupied.

Mr. Elsey – Sure. I was there. I think – I know the two to the south of them, they have pretty heavy foliage trees in their back yards.

Mr. Knotts – Two to the south of what?

Mr. Elsey – The two most southern properties on the south side. So, yeah. I went there and I looked at their yards.

Mr. Knotts – Yeah. Well those people in your apartments are going to be watching their grass grow and their dog poop. I mean it's very close. It's going to be very visible.

Mr. Elsey – Well, from here – I'm not quite sure what our – so we would be – from this façade to here and, let's see, we're 30 – I would say we're probably 50 feet from their property line.

Mr. Knotts – And 20 feet up. And 30 feet up.

Mr. Elsey – And 40 feet up. So that would be like a 1:1 slope.

Mr. Knotts – I don't think so. I mean, you'll be able to see everything in their back yards. I just don't think you're addressing that part of this project that would make it work for the residents.

Mr. Elsey – You don't feel like these exterior courtyards that we added along the west side – that's not addressing.

Mr. Knotts – I'm not worried about those. I'm worried about all the vegetation that you're going to take out to rebuild that alleyway and make it – I mean, it's going to be – it's going to be a significant ...

Mr. Elsey – So you're concerned about the trees on the west side of the alley – that we would remove those trees when we replace the alley?

Mr. Knotts – Yeah.

Mr. Elsey – I'd have to go look at it really closely, but I'm not ...

Mr. Knotts – Well, I can tell you that they're old trees. And so all of their root systems are going to be underneath that crappy asphalt alleyway. So when you tear that up to build your concrete alleyway, you're going to kill them or you're going to take them out. I mean, to me, there's just no saving – because they're not really great trees anyway, but they're fabulous trees if you've got people looking in your back yard.

Mr. Elsey – Well, I'm not – okay, so, one, I'm not for sure if the trees – if you were to replace the alley – I don't know if the trees there – I mean, we've repaired plenty of alleys and the trees have not died along them. So the trees may or may not still be there. I'd have to look at it.

Mr. Knotts – Okay. So you've done a fabulous job on that. Okay.

10. Mr. Lewis – Mr. Elsey, welcome. It's a pleasure to see you again. Obviously, from the design that you're presenting to us that is on our screens, obviously on that screen, you're very responsive to what the community needs are. We have talked about high density development in this city for quite some time. We've talked about it way to the north. We've talked about it north of Boyd. We've talked about it on Campus Corner. We've talked about it everywhere. Quite honestly, I cannot imagine that this is not one of the best locations I have ever seen a high density project that's very responsive to a community's needs and desires than what this project is. Obviously, from a profit margin, taking it from 555 units down to 372, you've just cut into that by 33% being responsive to the community. That's having a parking capability when you have roughly 865-875 beds total and you have 888 parking spaces, obviously that's more than ample. When you have traffic studies done that actually are done in a much higher density than what you have proposed right now, obviously that's going to work. So, again, I appreciate you coming forward for the third time in this city and I completely support your project, because I think it's one of the best that I've seen so far. Thank you.

Mr. Elsey – Appreciate that. Thank you.

11. Mr. Knotts – So I think it's a great project, too. It's not a great project; it's a fair project. I'll just lay it out. I think with this project you have created an island of unsaleable property to the west of the alley on the east side of Trout. It's about 140' deep. You put the University ...

Mr. Elsey – I would think – okay, if this project were to get approved, guys like myself or the guys that are going to come up next – that strip along Trout is going to become very, very valuable to somebody like me. So, to me, it's not an unsaleable property. They just hit the jackpot and their property, instead of being worse – you know, I don't know ...

Mr. Knotts -- \$500,000 – it's a million now.

Mr. Elsey – I'm not sure what those houses are appraised at, but it would be probably double the value, at least, to somebody like me.

Mr. Knotts – So why doesn't someone like you buy those properties and make it ...

Mr. Elsey – I offered that to them.

Mr. Knotts – And make this project go from Trout.

Mr. Elsey – Sure. Yeah. I called the three folks that are the homeowners there. I called them yesterday. I told them about our project. I wanted to try to hear from them firsthand what their concerns were. And that's something that I mentioned to them. I was, like, you know, if this project goes through and it's a success we would have an interest in purchasing your properties and developing another project.

Mr. Knotts – I think you create a widow and orphan situation here because, with the increased population that you're going to be putting on Page Circle, the increased population that Bishops Landing is going to have, you'll never be able to close Trout. The University is the most likely purchaser within – unless you do it tomorrow – of this property. I don't think they can do that and it wouldn't fit a – that's too small a strip to make it work for a large-scale unit.

Mr. Elsey – So the design of that – you couldn't do what we're currently doing. It would have to be a podium structure – so similar to the 401 Loft project. Because your depth there on those lots – there's about 150', I believe, or a little less. I think it's 140. So the depth of that lot, you're not going to be able to fit a parking garage where you wrap it. So you'd have to build a podium structure which is similar to the 401 Loft project where you basically have the parking underneath and then the units above it. So, again, I guess I don't feel like we're creating – I mean, from those three property owners, I think they would be in a very well-positioned spot for selling their properties to individuals like me or other developers, because it is – it's right next to campus. It is developable land and it's – we've already paved the way with high density development right next to it. So I'll just disagree with you.

Mr. Knotts – And I'll disagree with you.

Mr. Elsey – I think it's a highly viable piece of property.

12. Mr. Lewis – I do have one question, and apologies I didn't ask this sooner. I see that there's a lot of green space around the new complex and I know that you have mentioned – and correct me if I'm wrong – to the north there is an underground detention pond which would house gray water. Has there been any consideration given to – in regards to the environment – using that gray water to water the out vegetation?

Mr. Elsey – We haven't gone into any design on that.

Mr. Lewis – Would that be something that you would consider?

Mr. Elsey – Potentially. Yeah.

Mr. Lewis – Perfect. Thanks.

Mr. Knotts – But that isn't gray water in there. It's storm water, right?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

1. Stephen Weichbrodt, 1400 Classen Boulevard – I live just to the east of the proposed rezoning area. And the questions that I have is – how many floors is the buildings going to be? I mean, is it going to be 8 floors? I know he said 60' was the height of the buildings. The parking garage was even a little bit higher, as I recall. So my question is what is the height of the finished buildings and how many floors are there.

Mr. Boeck – 60 feet.

Mr. Weichbrodt – Okay. And then the parking garage would be higher than that?

Mr. Boeck – I think he said 80 feet.

Mr. Weichbrodt – 80 feet. Okay. The units on Page Circle – I guess there's 26 lots there, which would accommodate roughly maybe 100 people at the most, if there were four people in each one, and we're proposing a development with going from 26 lots to 372 units, which will accommodate 850 people, or something like that.

Mr. Boeck – That's the numbers he threw out there.

Mr. Weichbrodt – So we're going from 100 – that seems like quite a jump in population for that one area. And, as far as the traffic flow, I know that the railroad tracks on the east – when the trains go through there you're just deadlocked there. If you try to go west to the University to the stoplight at Jenkins and Brooks Street – that's a real long light. It's hard getting in and out of that at certain times. The only place you have to bail out to is Brooks Street or Boyd Street, and those are not real good thoroughfares, either. So I would question the traffic flow. I'd like to see how the traffic patterns would flow. I didn't realize those were available or I would have come and seen those site plans and things. A lot of my questions were addressed previously, as far as how does it compare to the proposal that was done across from The Mont, because that was a very similar type of proposal it seemed like. And, as far as the necessity of the building – I guess the target market is student population. Correct? That's who we're going after. And the student population at the University of Oklahoma, I'm guessing, is about 22,000? Does anybody know?

Ms. Gordon – 27.

Mr. Boeck – 27 – 29.

Ms. Gordon – 27-ish.

Mr. Weichbrodt – Oh, is it? It's up that high? Okay. Well, that was my question, because back when I was going to school it was 20,000 or something. I thought it was still about that and there wasn't a lot of student growth. But apparently there is. So I can see where the need would be there for something like that. That's about all my questions, I guess. I guess my biggest concern is the height and whether or not it's needed as far as the student population. And then I had some other questions concerning the development that's adjacent to it that's being proposed tonight, because that's another 1,000 – close to 1,000 people. I can't remember what it was – 430 units or something. But that's a different proposal. But that seems like a lot of build-up in a small little area to me. That's my questions.

2. Mitch Baroff, 421 Park Drive – I guess my biggest question, and I have not done any preliminary research to understand what's going on here, is that currently there's some zoning for that particular piece of land. I'm not sure what the master plan for the City has in mind for that property – if it's going to be a little more dense or not dense. But I'm in an R-3 area and I think we can get like 28 units per acre on that. And we're talking about, what, 50, 60, 70 units per acre? I mean, is it even close to what the current zoning is?

Mr. Boeck – No.

Mr. Baroff – So what gives them the right to come into our community – even if you lived in the community, I would say the same thing – and not go by our rules – our zoning rules and try to make an area quite a bit more dense than it currently is, because I know just because I've lived in the area for like 25 years, the streets are already tough to deal with and this is just one proposal out of one next door, the one we talked about on Constitution. I think maybe we need a core type of study of outside the core area also to see how we're going to deal with traffic. Because you know the only way out of town is Highway 9, which isn't really great, and it's not going to be improved in that area to the interstate – they're improving it to the east. And getting down Classen is becoming a joke. Lindsey is Lindsey. Boyd is Boyd. Going through residential areas. So, you know, and the look and the density of that building is intense. So I think the City almost has to step back and punt and expand this core thing and do a real traffic study and get real highways around this town, because we just can't handle it. This is a community that's – you know, I've been here 50 years now. I came to college here and it's the same streets that we've had ever since. Nothing has hardly been improved except for section line roads that have gone to four lanes. But, anyway, the rules are the zoning – current zoning. Maybe the master plan allows zoning to be a little more dense. And you can't change the rules. That's my opinion.

3. Pam Faubion Troup, 10200 East Apple Valley Road, Oklahoma City – I grew up in Norman and received my degree from OU. My mother is Olvna Faubion and she owns property on Page Circle. She would be here tonight except she's in the hospital. If she were here, she would proudly tell you that she served on the Board of Adjustment for the City of Norman for many years. My mom and dad started purchasing houses on Page Circle in the late 60s and the early 70s and they now own 11. I, in fact, in college lived in one of those houses. I think it's a perfect location for student housing. It's close to the University. I know the Elseys have worked with the Planning Commission staff and listened to the neighborhood to really try meet and address all of the concerns. I'm here just to voice my mother and my support for the project. I think it's a nice, modern day housing that continues the tradition of student housing that they started. I know the Elseys have told you they have done successful projects in several other cities. It's already a multi-family area, for the most part. And I just hope that you will support this project. Thank you.

4. Angela Atkins, 1115 Trout Avenue – I live with my husband and two children. We own the house and live there. Many of my initial concerns for the development, such as lack of setback from the alley, the aesthetics, the original aesthetics, and the lack of landscaping, have been addressed by the developer and I appreciate the changes they have made. My main concern at this time is the impact of the development on the east side of our property with this project, the Bishops Landing redevelopment on the south, and then OU's ever-increasing development

on the west across Trout. When we purchased the property, I was well aware that OU could one day encroach on our property. It was extremely disheartening to learn of development encroaching from the other side, too. I am also hoping that the lower income individuals and families currently living in the two areas will be able to find suitable affordable housing elsewhere, maybe in the houses vacated by the students moving to the new apartments. The staff comments indicated that this area is now predominantly rental properties rather than owner-occupied so this development will not matter. When we purchased our home in 2001, it was a rental property. However, just for the same reasons that they said this was ideal for students, it was ideal for us. I worked at OU and it is in walking distance to our school at Lincoln, and also, if we had to, to our church at First Baptist Church and all of campus. It was an affordable, historic property that just needed a little love. It had a yard with trees. It was close to my work. It's in walking distance if we choose or need to do so. More of the houses there now are rentals, but it is still a low density residential neighborhood. It still has a residential feel, since most of the houses are still within the number of people that would live in a family. It is not a subdivision kind of neighborhood, but we didn't want that. Adding this development will make it less likely that families and individuals would ever want to rehab the houses along Trout and live there full-time. The main detriment to the neighborhood has not been the renters, but the actual removal of houses, although for now we do have a new grassy park across the street. It can be difficult to live there. It is an older property, so we share our driveway and our garage with our neighbors. The vehicle traffic for cars going to OU or cutting through from Brooks to Boyd can be quite heavy and that, combined with the foot traffic down the alley and Trout, make it crucial that one the grown-ups in our house is outside with our children in the back yard. Despite what the traffic studies say, this will only get worse with the proposed development. There will be more people on foot trying to cross Trout to get to campus and in their cars trying to get to stores and other amenities in this town that people with disposable income like to use. Most of that is on the west side or the north side of Norman and requires driving. Many of them will also work, especially to pay the higher rent required for this property. Those working anywhere off campus will drive. I do agree that there will not be a mass exodus at rush hour, but it will be a constant stream of cars with even more difficulty exiting off of Brooks or Boyd, especially when there is a train. Despite this, the benefits of the location and our house far outweigh the negatives. When I was thinking about this situation, it reminded me of a book that I have for my child when he was a boy. And this is the picture. This is what it makes me think of and this is my concern, because we are getting crowded out.

5. Kathleen Sandefer, 1117 Trout Avenue – I'm the owner and resident at that location and I have lived there and owned it for 25 years. Since Angela stated most of my basic concerns, I'll just hit the high points. I guess my primary concern about the entire development is just the sheer density of the number of people and cars that will be there after it's completed. And I do have to talk somewhat about the other project too, because you can't really talk about one without the other. This would be about 1,500 more people all of a sudden – 1,600 vehicles with young drivers. And that's a little bit different from what you might experience otherwise. The City recognized that the neighborhood character has changed over time and the staff recognized that and that's true; it has. But this would be like a bomb going off. You know, we've gone through gradual transition from more rental homes, more University property. Actually, right now the situation in that neighborhood is probably more stable than it has been for a while. And we've always thought of ourselves as being part of the broader neighborhood on the north of Boyd and even on the other side of the railroad tracks, but now it's as if we're being carved off and isolated and that really concerns me. And the points that Tom Knotts brought up about the property values – I know it's uncertain what that will be, but right now it doesn't seem like leaving one row of houses – it's not very good for residents and it's not very good for development, so what is it – what will it be in the future for people that own those homes? Or own that property, even if they don't live there. So the isolation of that strip is one of my primary concerns. The construction is going to last for three years – can you imagine? Three

years of construction for this parcel. That's a lot of construction to endure. It's not a very good project. I hope that you'll reject it today.

6. Girma Moaning, 208 Dollina Court – As a resident of Norman, a former OU student, and have family members who have recently graduated from the University of Oklahoma, and then my brother will be attending fall of '15, I believe that this is a development that is long overdue for the City of Norman. When you look at it from an environmental standpoint, this fixes a lot of the concerns that people have been addressing, because when I was an OU student I had to drive across town to fight for parking at OU and I always wished that I could have an off-campus opportunity that would allow me to walk both to work and to my classes on campus. There's a huge generational shift going on where young professionals are not looking for cars as their primary mode of transportation. If you look at developments within the metro and around the region that are like this, for example, apartments in downtown Oklahoma City, which is nearly 300 units, very similar design characteristics, you can go there on the street any time of day and the traffic impact is very, very minimal. In fact, I would strongly argue that it's increased because so many people are utilizing foot and bicycle traffic. As far as property value, if you do studies of these as these go in, it drives up the corresponding property values because other investment opportunities can come in and, once one takes place, there's others and we're not utilizing City resources to just continue to spread out further and further and further and put more cars driving further distance on the roads. So I strongly support this development and I think that Norman, being the third largest city in this state, I think that it is extremely long overdue and will provide numerous benefits to the City and to the residents of Norman and the student population.

7. Lyntha Wesner, 616 Tulsa – But I'm going to ask you to use your imagination because I'm actually speaking here for Paul Minnis and his wife Pat, who many of you know because you've served with him on the Planning Commission. Let me read you a bit of what Paul points out. As residents of 1129 Trout for 24 years, we strongly oppose the Page Circle project and, while not thrilled with the Bishops Landing project, it's less objectionable, except for the effects on Bishop Creek's flood plain. And he – the whole thing – I think that people who live here have to look at the whole area of what's happening here. Many of the owners, or the two that have mentioned it, have talked about construction and the problem with increased traffic. I'm going to talk about one of Paul's biggest concerns is the transition in density. One of the foundations of the Planning Department's recommendations is that the area is in transition. True. What it fails to discuss, in my opinion, is the scale of transition. The scale of "transition" of density is staggering. The Page Circle project would increase density from about 80 to 900 -- over a ten-fold increase. The Bishop Creeks Landing would go from 400 to 1,100, nearly tripling the density. This isn't infilling; it's in-cramming. The two plans call for 2,000 people on 11 acres; 2,000 people are nearly 2% of Norman's current population crammed into a very small area. The density of the two projects is equivalent to 120,000 people per square mile. This is 10 times higher than the density of Chicago. If Norman wants to emulate such paragons of urban planning as Mumbai, Bombay, Manilla, Calcutta, then these are good plans. Specifically, this density is higher than the density of Manilla; almost twice the density of Calcutta; more than twice the density of Mumbai; more than four times the density of New York City; and about ten times the density of Chicago. The safety issues of the traffic study argues the traffic in and out of the Page Circle project will not have bottlenecks such as morning or evening rush hours. Maybe. What the report does not address are emergency situations. The Page Circle project has only one way in and out and on a small side street. The developers will widen it one foot to the minimum. In an emergency, is this street really adequate for emergency vehicles and 900 residents to get in and out of the complex safely? The proposed fire lane will help, but is it sufficient? I doubt it, because access to the fire lane is still dependent on the alley of Page. One could argue that the alley just east of Trout could be a second backup route, however we have witnessed for 20 years the traffic in the alley during game days, the closest analogy to times when large numbers

of cars try to use the alley and the alley is neither effective nor a safe route when that many cars try to use it. Appreciate your time.

8. Andy Newman, 1210 Woodstock Court – I represent trustees of First Presbyterian Church. We own the house at 403 Page Circle. It's been a great mission project for us for 20 years. It's a transition home. We transition homeless families through that home to hopefully get back on their feet. It's hard to maintain that old home because most of those homes in there are 60 years old, and at least 22 of the 26 are low-end rentals beside ours. Our goal is to find a better home to maintain our homeless project, and all proceeds from this sale will be restricted to that purpose. It's one of our City's biggest problems – is our homeless community. Our town is growing and we need these units. I'm a realtor in this town, as I know Erin is, and this town is growing at such a rate that we need more apartment complexes. One thing I haven't heard people talk about – and you're starting to see it – is these existing complexes are starting to do an awful lot of renovation to be sure they can keep themselves full. So that's good for the City also. I've dealt with these young men on several other projects in this group. I went up to Stillwater and saw their two projects up there – they're excellent. Didn't go to Lincoln, Nebraska – that's a little too far. We haven't talked about the taxing implications to the City and County. This is a \$50 million project, and that is the ideal spot for this. And, by the way, you may not know Tom is a great architect, along with being a great wine producer. There's a concrete alley, Tom, between Jenkins and I think it's Santa Fe right behind Eufaula that I just sold a piece of property over there. Those nice paved alleys with the little V in there – they work great. And if you want to go look at that one, you can. I know that these young men are going to do their best to have a good paved alley back there, with the parking on their property, and will do the best they can for the people that live on the other side. Whether those folks know it or not, President Borren has bought everything down Page now and it's just a matter of time before he buys all that property on Trout. And this project will increase their property value eventually. Thank you.

9. Cheryl Clayton, 503 Tulsa Street – Basically I live on the corner of Tulsa and Classen and if anybody can appreciate the traffic problems in that area it's me, because a good bit of the time the only way I can even get in and out of my house is just the grace of the Norman drivers. And, fortunately, they seem to appreciate the fact that I need to get in and out, but it's hard to do between two lanes. What brings the neighborhood out against the Elsey projects every single time is the sheer mass and scale of it. And I don't think any of us would contest the fact that that might be a good area for an apartment complex. If you look at the Bishops Landing project, it's 430 units on 7.4 acres – that's 58 units an acre. If you look at the Page Circle one, it's 372 units on 4.1 acres – that's around 91 units an acre. That's half again as big. It is the mass and scale of this that is so objectionable. If the developers at Bishops Landing can make a project viable at a much less scale – something that's more acceptable to the community, then surely the same thing could happen here. Thank you.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. Ms. Pailles – I have some figures that relate to some of the things asked by the audience. One of the keystones here is student apartments. If they're student apartments, it's walkable. That makes the traffic less of a problem. Okay. In 1984, OU had 22,000 students. In 2014, it had 24,000. That is students on campus, not total – and this is from the OU Fact Book. So we have increased 2,000 students in 30 years. In the last couple of years, between 2009 and '10, there was a decrease of 0.5%; between '10 and '11, there was an increase of 1.4%; between '11 and '12, an increase of 1.1%; '12 and '13, a decrease of .9%. 80% of OU students receive financial support. Can they afford these nice apartments? I'm not sure. The student body does not grow that rapidly. I'm not saying students wouldn't live here; they'll move out of other apartments, perhaps – perhaps not. Perhaps we will have a more varied group of people, not just students. In recent years, 2012 – 930 multi-family units were added to Norman; and 2013, 260; and 2014, 925 units were added. We have no dearth of apartments. In fact, in 2012 one of the things in the Planning packet commented that the City has already met its projected quota for

apartments estimated for 2025. And estimated need was for 1,742 multi-family units and we had already added, at that time, 2,121. We don't need these apartments. They may be occupied. Students don't need them. There aren't that many students. They are hopeful that enrollment will increase next semester, but we can't count those students until they get here. Okay. So perhaps we have at least 900 people. That's a fair estimate for the Page Circle Apartments, should they be built. And that is a massive scale. It is. That's two times the density of Calcutta. That's a lot of people. And they all have to drive occasionally. Maybe they can walk to school. Fine. As I said, 80% of the students have financial aid. Most of them work. So they walk to school but they've got to drive to work, got to drive for groceries. You show me a 19 year old male with a car and I'll show you driving. I walked around Page Circle and counted; there are – there's 21 units there; there were 36 cars. So, yes, they are close. Now, that's good. The cars were there. Maybe they'd all walked to class, but they have cars and they drive them.

Okay. So is that going to be a problem? Well, the moving forward draft appendices for transportation in Norman – now, none of these figures address Page Circle/Trout because those were not part of the study. These address other streets that they would need to take to get out of this area. These are places that have recognized difficulties. These are things that are going to be addressed at some point. These are traffic snarls that are on the list to be addressed. However, you have Boyd to Brooks noted at peak failure. You have Constitution, Jenkins to Classen – that's a bit south – nearing capacity. You have Miller to Boyd nearing capacity. You have Flood to Chautauqua peak failure. We have Classen to 12th peak failure. Jenkins to Classen peak failure. Asp to Jenkins nearing capacity. This is not the time to add more people to this area. There may be a time to do that; this is not it. First, we need to solve the problems we've got and the problems are in a City document. It would seem you solve the problem before you add the people. This is a huge number of folks to stick on these streets that are already failing.

So do we need the apartments, in terms of students? No. Can we plan on students actually being there? Not necessarily. Can we plan on them walking everywhere? It's relatively unlikely. Will they have an impact on the traffic? Yeah. I think so. Then there are some other issues. Okay. No need. Not this time. And perhaps not this place. I admit to being totally knee-capped by the draft proposal; I did not know about that. I apologize. But, again, this is outside the area. There was a comment in there that this is outside the area of Campus Corner that they had previously attempted to build in, but on May 27, 2013 committee members voted to table high density zoning, et cetera, et cetera, until the visioning had been completed for Campus Corner, downtown, and surrounding neighborhoods. So – I mean, the visioning didn't end with commercial area in Campus Corner. Do I have to stop? I have some more to say.

2. Mr. Lewis – I will just reiterate again that we're looking at a development that has been very responsive to our community, has tried three times – this is its third time – to bring a development of this magnitude to the University of Oklahoma. As it being perfect – 100% -- nothing is perfect. No developer can get everything 100% perfect. Are there things that could be changed? Absolutely. Very minimal. One of the things about the coming and going of automobiles is this is a student complex; we're not going to see a mass outflow or inflow of vehicles. The majority of the students, again, Mr. Elsey clearly explained is within a five mile walk to the University. Many students will be walking. As the gentleman spoke a moment ago of graduating from the University and your brother, I believe you said, is coming to the University. I, as well, graduated from our great university and it would have been a pleasure, instead of living down on south campus, to be able to live within a five mile walk to the University and leave a car and not have to have the challenge of the parking that has greatly improved at the University, but still is a challenge. So, again, I think Mr. Elsey and his group has brought forth a great project for our community, has been very responsive to the community's needs and desires of what it wants and needs to look like. Can it be perfect? No, it's not perfect, but it is pretty darn good. So thank you again for bringing it forward.

3. Mr. Gasaway – It's my understanding from the presentation that this unit holds 865 beds, so at least that many people will live there. Let there be no mistake about it, this is a college dormitory. 865 beds is larger than Adams Center, one of the 12-story towers on the OU campus. It is not as large as Walker Tower, but it is larger than Adams Center. So in the middle of an area that has a lot of residential activity, we're being asked to plant a college dormitory. And for those of you that think that college students don't drive, go stand around Walker Tower and Adams Center any time of day or night and watch the traffic. College students may not necessarily drive to campus, but they do drive everything else that's more than five blocks away. I have a college daughter; I promise that's the case. And we're asking everyone in this college dormitory to exit down Trout Street, which is a two-lane street that we're expecting to handle that amount of traffic. It's not built to handle that and the streets that Trout feeds onto are not meant to handle that amount of traffic. Kind of in the background I hear our former colleague Paul Minnis talking about tearing down a residential neighborhood. Granted this neighborhood over the years has changed from owner-occupied to much rental, but all of us have rental property in our neighborhoods. They are still residential neighborhoods. Rental property does not change that category. Those people are residents also. And those are affordable houses that college students or college students with families are able to live in. And we're talking about tearing those down. My last comment is I always try and think about what people in the area, even outlying the designated impact area, see. People for miles away – this is probably as tall as a six story building. I mean, it may not have six stories, but by the time the parking garage bumps it up from the bottom and the top, it's about that tall. People from miles away – that will be their view. I used to live west of campus and when OU built the Elm Street parking garage we fought that tooth and nail and lost. It's not a bad looking building. They did an outstanding job. But when you walk out on Cruce Street and look down there, you're looking at a five-story brick wall. That's what you see is a brick wall in your neighborhood. So, for those reasons, I'll be voting against this project.

4. Mr. Knotts – It is pretty brick, though. I'd like a point of clarification if I could. There are three phases. What are those phases? Are they areas?

Mr. Elsey – There would be three phases on the development. Let me get to the site plan here. You can see the line here; this is the phasing line. So phase 1 would be this portion of the building, and we would build 60% of the parking garage with phase 1. So we would build basically the lower floors. We'd finish out this courtyard with phase 1. Phase 2 would be this section here, and we would finish out the rest of the parking garage, which would be approximately 60% of it. And then phase 3 would be the section along the railroad tracks.

Mr. Knotts – So you think you can build phase 1 in one year and move in?

Mr. Elsey – Yes. We just did it in Stillwater.

Mr. Knotts – Okay. Thank you.

5. Ms. Pailles – You can't look at this without looking at Bishops Landing, too. Just a point of clarification. It's not Bishops Creek that it's on – that is a tributary to Bishops Creek. The two together across a relatively narrow street, which is Page – it becomes a cement canyon. I'm from Phoenix; I'm familiar with cement canyons. And the question is, is that something we in any way want? Density has its virtues; it makes full use of your infrastructure, your streets, and your underground pipes are full. But I don't know that that obviates every other consideration. There's a city north of us – nobody wants to live there; they all want to live in Norman, which has the atmosphere of a town. You can choose to maintain the atmosphere of a town; you don't have to default to city densities.

Chris Lewis moved to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1415-31, Ordinance No. O-1415-19 with the amended site plan showing sign locations and amended PUD Narrative addressing signage, and PP-1415-9, the Preliminary Plat for PAGE CIRCLE APARTMENTS, A Planned Unit Development, A Replat of a Replat of a Replat of Block 1, MILLER ADDITION, to City Council. Roberta Pailes seconded the motion.

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

YEAS	Chris Lewis
NAYES	Roberta Pailes, Erin Williford, Sandy Bahan, Dave Boeck, Jim Gasaway, Tom Knotts, Cindy Gordon
ABSENT	Andy Sherrer

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-1415-31, Ordinance No. O-1415-19 and PP-1415-9 to City Council, failed by a vote of 1-7.

* * *

RECESS 9:38 to 9:45 p.m.

* * *