

CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION

October 18, 2016

The City Council of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in a study session at 5:45 p.m. in the Municipal Building Conference Room on the 18th day of October, 2016, and notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Municipal Building at 201 West Gray, and the Norman Public Library at 225 North Webster 48 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

PRESENT:	Councilmembers Allison, Castleberry, Chappel, Clark, Heiple, Hickman, Holman, Karjala, Mayor Miller
----------	---

ABSENT:	None
---------	------

Item 1, being:

PRESENTATION FROM MARY MADDEN, AICP, FORM BASED CODE SPECIALIST WITH FERRELL-MADDEN ON THE CENTER CITY FORM BASED CODE RESULTING FROM THE CENTER CITY VISIONING PROCESS.

Ms. Susan Connors, Director of Planning and Community Development, said in May 2012, the City Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee (CPTC) directed Staff to convene a series of community discussions on the future of high density residential development in Norman. The process began with the High Density Summer Discussion series held on June 11, 2012; June 28, 2012; July 9, 2012; July 26, 2012; August 13, 2012; and August 31, 2012. After the meetings, at the direction CPTC, Staff began to create a High Density Residential Zoning District and an ordinance based on findings from the Summer Discussion Series Final Report; CPTC input; Ochsner Hare and Hare (OHH) Economic Vitality Analysis; and interviews with other communities and individuals engaged in high density development projects.

In June 2013, CPTC received comments from the Norman Economic Development Coalition (NEDC) and the University of Oklahoma (OU) regarding a desire to engage in a collaborative and inclusive approach to creating a vision for the Campus Corner and Main Street corridors that was different from the High Density Zoning District being discussed. Through a Steering Committee, the City created a boundary that included 42 blocks generally located on Tonhawa Street on the north, the railroad tracks on the east, Boyd Street on the south, and a west boundary between Elm Avenue, University Boulevard, Flood Avenue, and Main Street. The City approved a contract with the National Charrette Institute that included sub-consultants Opticos Design and Ferrell-Madden, which was jointly funded by OU to create a Form Based Code (FBC) for the area. The FBC was generated through a Steering Committee of 15 members that included executive sub-committees whose responsibilities included “administering the project, developing and setting meeting schedules, processes and procedures for the timely and efficient operation of the Steering Committee.” Ms. Connors said the Steering Committee included architects; neighborhood representatives; Councilmembers; representative from OU; business owners; property owners; traffic engineers; and developers. She said the Steering Committee met 15 times from February 2014, through June, 2016.

Ms. Connors said a Visioning Charrette was convened because Staff did not feel the current zoning regulations could handle the modern demand for infill development and the significant community disagreement about market-driven proposals for infill development in the past. She said the professional Charrette process is a good technique available to articulate community supported vision into a document. Building community support through the Charrette process was to be followed closely by the development of land use regulations known as the Center City Form Based Code (CCFBC).

The City hosted several public meetings and used diverse hands-on techniques to gather community input on a vision for the future of Norman's Center City area. The City also hosted an intensive, week-long visioning charrette to maximum hands-on participation, opinion polling, and relationship building around the future of Center City. Community input became the foundation for an illustrated, well-articulated, community supported vision that laid the groundwork to develop land use regulations that allows the vision to be built.

Ms. Connors said over 140 people participated in the Center City Vision kick-off meeting on March 26, 2014, and over 225 people and more than 40 drop-in visitors participated in the Visioning Charrette events held from May 12 through May 16, 2014. The Community supported vision was identified by community centers; improving and prioritizing the public realm; repairing and stabilizing existing neighborhoods; providing housing choices; and integrating a holistic transportation strategy.

Ms. Connors said the primary goal of the Charrette process was to create a 42 block area that was walkable and objectives to reinforce that goal were to define centers that included the two primary centers of Campus Corner and University Boulevard/Main Street intersection, which was believed to be a strong anchor to the western portion of Main Street. In Campus Corner they were identifying the strengths of Boyd Street and University Boulevard, but also wanted to have a network of mid-block non-vehicle pedestrian spaces. One of the major ideas was to change Boyd Street from four lanes to two travel lanes with a middle turning lane, two bicycle lanes, and parking on the north side of Boyd Street. The Steering Committee saw opportunity for a residential development along Gray Street because there seemed to be a lot of empty space along Gray Street. Another discussion that took place was about transforming Main and Gray Streets from one-way to two-way. Main Street would be changed from three one-way lanes to two travel lanes that would include vehicular and bicycle traffic, a turning lane in the middle, and maintain parking on both sides of the street. Gray Street would be changed to have a median and bicycle lanes as well as widening sidewalks to create pedestrian spaces. A traffic engineer in the Steering Committee identified economic benefits for removing one-way streets and provided an example of that from West Palm Beach, Florida, on Clematis Street where property values increased, commercial rents increased, rents increased, occupancy increased, and \$350 million in private investments was attracted to the area.

Ms. Connors said another major discussion was about providing housing choices to encourage creative density missing middle housing. Characteristics of missing middle housing includes small, well-designed units; off-street parking does not drive the site plan; lower perceived densities; small footprint buildings; simple construction; creating community; and marketability.

Improving the public realm is important moving forward to make the street a strong presence in order to draw people to the street to walk. Some of the anchor streets identified as possible walking spaces that connect the area include University Boulevard, Asp Avenue, Duffy Street, and Symmes Street. She said planting trees is also important to provide distance between the street and sidewalk to protect pedestrians as they are walking, which creates a different character to the street. The Steering Committee felt that University Boulevard was a prominent location because of the focal point of the Methodist Church with sidewalks and greenspace, but also felt it was important to create active frontages along the edges so there were no blank walls. There was also discussion in the Charrette regarding James Garner Boulevard and Symmes Street being an opportunity for a Farmers Market or other temporary uses because there is a wide right-of-way and empty spaces that might be good for temporary uses.

Ms. Connors said parking should not dominate perceptions so the street frontage can be active by placing parking garages behind the store fronts or residences. Incubation of local businesses was also discussed and a proposed location for that was Main Street and Santa Fe to redevelop the vacant lumberyard. Another idea was to have food trucks or temporary commercial areas in different seasons that would fill spaces until they were redeveloped.

Ms. Connors said providing transportation was an important part of the discussions and some of the ideas included transitioning Main and Gray Streets from one-way to two-way; locating shared parking garage locations at Centers; developing Asp Avenue as a Festival Street; creating a road diet on Boyd Street; enhancing bicycle connectivity; reducing and right-sizing parking requirements; enhancing transit services; and adopting complete street policies.

Councilmember Castleberry asked what a Festival Street was and Ms. Mary Madden, AICP, Ferrell Madden, said a Festival Street is a street where the curbs would be easily removed so the street could be easily closed for events, but on a day to day basis the street would still carry traffic. She said a Festival Street would have more flexible uses. The primary idea is that the street would not be 100% closed to automobiles so it could have a plaza or festival feel when needed.

Councilmember Clark left the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Ms. Madden said the Charrette process was all about building the community vision and the types of development people would like to see for the Center City area. After the Charrette process Ferrell Madden began drafting new development regulations known as the FBC. She a Charrette Vision Master Plan or a Comprehensive Plan will have policies, goals, and regulations, which are needed to move forward. Zoning is one of the primary regulations for implementing the type of development wanted, so at the end of the day, FBC is a type of zoning ordinance. She outlined the contents of the CCTFC as General Provisions; Administration, Application Process, and Appeals; the Regulating Plan; Building Form Standards; Urban Space Standards; Parking and Loading Standards; Building Functions; and Definitions.

Ms. Madden said zoning was born at the end of the Industrial Revolution because of the various problems, such as noxious uses, and the idea of separating uses was developed. Early zoning ordinances really focused on separation of use to prevent bad things from happening and were not considering the intended outcome. By the middle of the century, communities were really experts at separating housing from everything else and mass producing what was being built, which is fundamentally still being done today by building grocery stores and shopping centers in one area and housing in another.

Ms. Madden said Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and dwelling units per acre are really measuring tools that statistically tell you what is there, but they do not tell anything about the form or character of the development. A lot of communities believe design guidelines are all that is needed, but design development simply focuses on the wrong things. The Regulating Plan provides a public space master plan with specific information on development parameters for each parcel and how each lot relates to the streets, greenspace, plazas, pedestrian pathways, etc., and the surrounding neighborhood. The Regulation Plan may identify additional regulations and/or opportunities for lots in specific locations.

Building Form Standards (BFS) establish basic parameters governing building form, including the buildable envelope and certain permitted and/or required elements, such as shop fronts, balconies, and street walls. The BFS establishes both the boundaries within which things may be done and specific things that must done and shape the street space or public realm through placement and form controls on buildings. The applicable standard for a building site is determined by the street frontage designated on the Regulating Plan.

Urban Space Standards ensure coherent street space and assist builders and owners with understanding the relationship between the public realm and their own building. These standards set the parameters for the placement of street trees, sidewalks, and other amenities or furnishings within the street space. They also set recommended configurations for the vehicular part of the street and other public spaces such as greens, squares, and plazas.

Building Function Standards define the users allowed and/or required on ground floors and in upper floors, correlated with each Building Form Standard. Because the CCFBC emphasized form more than use, it includes fewer, broader categories than those provided in the larger Norman Zoning Ordinance.

Parking and Loading Standards provide goals and requirements to promote a “park once” environment through shared parking and encourage a pedestrian friendly, walkable Center City Forum District. Ms. Madden said there are ways to deal with parking other than parking garages, but parking should not be exposed to the street. A park once environment will enable people to conveniently park and access a variety of commercial, residential, and civic enterprises in pedestrian friendly environments by encouraging shared parking. The Parking Standards include minimum and maximum parking requirements as well as on-site and off-site parking requirements. No loading facilities are required; however, loading facilities should be provided to the rear and/or alley side of buildings.

Ms. Madden said the Building Form Standards establish a range of development intensity and character within the Center City Form District (CCFD) specific to each individual frontage that consists of Urban General; Urban Residential; Urban Storefront; Townhouse/Small Apartment; and Detached.

Urban General frontage is the basic urban street frontage, once common across the United States. The purpose of the frontage is to develop multi-story buildings placed directly at the sidewalk or behind small dooryards with one or more entrances and windows across the façade. The uses range from commercial to residential, municipal to retail and restaurants, and combinations of all of the above. There could be several buildings lined up shoulder to shoulder filling out a block or on smaller blocks, a single building might fill that block face. This frontage is designated in the most intense areas of the Center City District and it is anticipated there will be significant pedestrian traffic along these blocks.

Urban Residential frontage is designated on the Regulating Plan where Urban General standards apply except that the building cannot be greater than four stories and 51 feet in height and the uses are limited to residential and related support services, such as lobbies, leasing offices, resident exercise facilities, etc.

Urban Storefront frontage represents the prototypical “main street” form with shopfronts along the sidewalk and a mix of uses above. A high level of pedestrian activity is anticipated so it is a subset of the Urban General frontage with more specific requirements at the street level such as the ground story uses being limited to retail sales or service or professional service within the first 20 feet; ground story height of 15 feet; single panes of glass not permitted to be larger than ten feet in height and six feet in width; ground story windows may not be made opaque by window treatments or tinting; and shopfront can extend up to 24 inches beyond the façade, but not project into the clear walkway.

Townhouse/Small Apartment frontage is of moderate intensity often created by a series of smaller attached structures configured a single-family residential or stacked flats. The character and intensity of this frontage varies depending on the street space and location of the required building line (the buildings may be placed up to the sidewalk with stoops or further back with small dooryard gardens and/or front porches). Similar in scale to the townhouse and row house, a small apartment is of limited size and can also be used to transition from the more intense areas of the CCFD to adjacent single-family neighborhoods. It is anticipated that the pedestrian activity along these frontages will vary considerably based on the time of day and week.

Detached frontage is represented by the traditional single-family house with small front, side, and rear yards along a tree-lined street. Structures are one to two stories in height with pitched roofs and front porches. Its purpose is to protect the character of existing single-family neighborhoods.

Ms. Madden said the Regulating Plan functions as the zoning map for the Center City area and is the “key” to the codes moving forward and includes more than land use categories. She said the Planning Director is responsible for categorizing all uses and if a proposed use is not listed in a use category, but can be said to be reasonably similar in impact on the CCFD the Planning Director should treat the proposed use as a use under that category. If a proposed use is not listed in a use category and is fundamentally different from any other listed use, the use should be prohibited. Uses include residential, commercial, and civic, but the one thing the FBC does differently is that it does not base use on the parcel.

When determining whether a proposed use is similar to a use listed, the Planning Director should consider the following criteria:

- The actual or projected characteristics of the proposed activity in relationship to the stated characteristics of each use;
- Types of vehicles used and their parking and/or loading requirements;
- The likely impact on surrounding properties; and
- The intent of the CCFD

Ms. Madden highlighted existing zoning districts in Center City as C-1, Local Commercial; C-2, General Commercial; C-3, Intensive Commercial; RO, Residence/Office; I-1, Light Industrial; R-1, Single Family; R-3, Multi-Family; PUD, Planned Unit Development; and MUD, Mixed Use Development. The proposed FBC would have few zoning districts and higher development standards, but the range of uses would be broader, e.g., residential component in C zones. She said there would be more opportunity for mixed use by right. Another big difference is parking and the proposed parking standards address that.

Ms. Madden said over the past 27 months, the Steering Committee has been very hands-on and has recommended the following:

- Policy Decisions
 - Mandatory rezoning
 - Implementing parking strategy before including Campus Corner in CCFBC District (public-private shared parking structure)
- Regulatory Standards
 - Heights – designated in specific locations
 - Fewer “frontage standards” than originally proposed (based on input from local developers)
 - No detailed architectural standards
- Administration
 - Creation of Center City PUD option
 - Neighborhood representation on Development Review Board (DRB)
 - Establishment of fee waivers and other incentives for using CCFBC

Councilmember Castleberry asked if any current zoning rights would be lost and Ms. Madden said if there is a “use” allowed prior to FBC, that use would still be allowed. Councilmember Castleberry asked how that would affect “height” because right now in C-3 a building can be as high as the developer wants it to be and Ms. Madden said it is explicitly stated in the FBC that C-3 could still have unlimited height and no parking requirements, which was a recommendation of the Steering Committee.

Mayor Miller asked if Ferrell Madden has worked with any cities that wanted to save historic homes or small duplex apartments in the FBC Districts and Ms. Madden said not really, but the City could take an extra step in some way to specifically address preserving historic homes, otherwise that decision will be left up to market economics. Councilmember Holman said some of the areas discussed by the Steering Committee, such as Boyd Street, Jenkins Avenue, DeBarr Street, and Monnett Avenue are designated as historic neighborhoods on the National Registry, but are not recognized on a local level and he understands that local recognition has more protection and meaning. Ms. Madden said local enforcement of a local historic designation would have more power. She said being on the National Registration of historic places only comes into play if federal funds are being expended. Councilmember Holman said people in the DeBarr historic neighborhood could possibly apply for grants to fix-up their properties, but many of the historic structures are gone or have been significantly altered to the point where they are not historic any longer. Ms. Madden said local protection of historic neighborhoods would be an administrative decision.

Councilmember Castleberry said it is his understanding that if a person followed the FBC, the plans would be approved administratively, but if they did not follow the FBC they would have to bring their plans to Council for approval and Ms. Connors said that is correct.

Councilmember Hickman said part of the importance of the FBC came about because of a proposed high density housing project on the west side of University Boulevard that is not in the C-3 exemption area, but there is no parking solution so if a multi-story, high density structure was constructed at that location there would be nowhere to park. He asked what other types of zoning are in the area and Ms. Connors said C-1, C-2, and R-3. Councilman Hickman was concerned about the R-3 zoning and Ms. Connors said the Steering Committee was unable to come to an agreement on how the exempted area would be developed unless there was a parking solution whether that was a commercial or residential project. Mayor Miller asked what concerned Councilmember Hickman the most and he replied that if the exemption is only going to pertain to C-3 then why not limit the requirements to the C-3 parcels instead of drawing an arbitrary line for the exemption area. Ms. Madden said the exemption was not intended for C-3 only, the exemption was intended for a geographic area, which is much larger. Currently, the Campus Corner area has a bunch of different base zoning districts and the idea was that the area should move forward holistically, but if someone wanted to redevelop under the base zoning they could do so under the current requirements. She said if they are located on the west side of University Boulevard, they are not exempt. Ms. Connors said there are very few parcels zoned R-3, as most parcels are primarily zoned C-1, C-2, C-3, office, or residential/office. The Steering Committee felt that commercial redevelopment was the best solution until parking could be accommodated in a better manner. Ms. Madden said high density residential is not a permitted use in C-2 and C-3 so they cannot currently move forward with that. Mr. Jonathan Fowler, member of the Steering Committee, said the Steering Committee felt that C-1 and C-2 did not meet market dynamics based on lack of parking so no one would want to do those types of projects. The Steering Committee looked at the Campus Corner area as one geographical base to be developed in a whole so it made sense to have the exemption until such time as a parking structure could be constructed then bring the other parcels into the fold of the CCFBC.

Councilmember Hickman said, currently, a certain percentage of property can be impervious surface and asked if that is being carried over into the FBC and Ms. Madden said yes, Ferrell Madden tried to sync that with existing regulations. She said there is a movement to get away from paving an entire lot or front yard.

Mr. Russell Kaplan, 4503 Chukkar Court, said there was a provision in the Building Form Standards for small apartment/townhouse and single-family that he is concerned about and that is the first floor being a minimum of 36 inches above the sidewalk. He finds that to be a problem for accessibility, universal design, and aging in place. Ms. Madden said that is something Ferrell Madden is very aware of and has worked with a lot of communities on to make sure there are ways to achieve the elevated ground floor. Ferrell Madden always encourage communities to use if they are trying to create compact residential development in an urban

location. She said if you have people walking along the sidewalk and looking into your bedroom window it tends to work against everything that is trying to be achieved. She said it is absolutely a design issue and there are ways it can be done at the building level. She said 36 inches may be the wrong number and the City could try 24 inches or 12 inches, but in place after place where she has worked it is a trade-off of how to achieve accessibility while not creating a place that is less than desirable for residential use.

Councilmember Allison asked if that regulation was due to privacy or appearance of the building. Ms. Madden said the regulation is multi-faceted with privacy for the people who live in the unit, but it also impacts the street because this leaves places with blank walls (no windows) or windows with shades drawn 24/7 distracting from the overall look from the street. Councilmember Holman said an overwhelming number of existing houses in the proposed FBC area are raised above the ground for those very reasons. If you drive the streets in core Norman almost all of the long standing houses have large front porches with stairs and a lot of people with disabilities live in core Norman so he can understand this concern. Mayor Miller said accessibility may be something the City will have to deal with on a case by case basis.

Ms. Joy Hampton, The Norman Transcript, said the homes Councilmember Holman is talking about do create accessibility issues. If the buildings are built up to the sidewalk that does not leave much room for ramps so how does the City deal with that since the City does not want to encourage inaccessible places to live? Ms. Madden said in the purely residential areas, the buildings are not being built to the sidewalk so not every building is at the sidewalk. She said there are many ways to accommodate changes in elevation inside the building and if someone is building a ramp that is usually a retro-fit to an existing building. If you construct the ramp at the time of construction there are lot more ways to accommodate that and it is very much an individual project design issue. Ms. Hampton said when talking about making a community more walkable, connecting transportation corridors, and providing a missing middle that is a big draw for people that may have disabilities because those are the very things they want. Are there currently federal regulations in place for multi-unit accessibility? Ms. Madden said the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) may or may not apply depending on the type of structure being constructed.

Councilmember Clark returned at 7:00 p.m.

Mayor Miller said tonight Council is hearing recommendations from the Steering Committee, City Staff, and Consultants so there is still much discussion left on the subject. She said Council needs to decide if they want to adopt the FBC, make amendments to the FBC, conduct public meetings, etc. What are the next steps? A lot of work has gone into this and it has very positive implications for redevelopment of the center part of the community, but Council needs to move to the next step. Councilmember Holman said after more than two years of working on the FBC he would like to move it forward. Ms. Madden said the FBC is about a holistic, place making environment and encouraged Council to look at the FBC as a whole and to not focus on one or two aspects they may not like.

Councilmember Holman said one of the reasons the Steering Committee did not look at architectural guidelines is because it would have taken an additional 18 to 24 months. Councilmember Hickman disagreed and believes design standards could be put into place in a very short period of time. He served on the Historic District Commission and they utilized design standards, which he felt are very transferable, comparable, and similar to what could be utilized for the FBC. He said there are communities with FBC that have design standards and DRBs, especially for residential properties, and there are abutting residential properties in the FBC. He said there are currently efforts to downzone these areas so having a group of knowledgeable citizens to provide assistance in the architectural design standards will be important to ensure this area has a common, comparable look from a mass, scale, and other related type perspectives. He said the Historic District's require a demolition permit so notice is given and the structure cannot be demolished until the proposed new structure has been approved and requirements that trees stay in place, which are not in this proposed FBC. In

Historic Districts the plans have to detail how development will be done around historic trees or what new trees will be planted in their place. He said many of the oldest trees in Norman are being butchered and destroyed for development. He appreciates all the hard work by the Steering Committee and is not criticizing their work because the FBC is an outstanding foundation, but there are a few items that could be added for the residential areas so the fabric of the neighborhoods is not negatively impacted. He has requested these requirements several times as the Ward Four representative and the Planning Commission Chair has requested them as well. Mayor Miller did not really know if the tree issue should be part of the FBC because ordinances can be created regarding trees.

Mayor Miller asked Ms. Connors to talk about the design standards and Ms. Connors said design standards were specifically discussed during the meetings and the Steering Committee specifically decided they did not want architectural design standards because the massing is taken care of through the FBC. There were several members of the Committee that were very adamant that they did not want a singular design and did not want everything to be uniform. She said design standards would also slow down the process because another meeting would have to be held for the DRB so the administrative process gets somewhat lost. Councilmember Hickman said subset meetings of the Steering Committee were held with R-3 developers and there was an agreement that the R-3 community would not object to design standards and a part of that discussion was related to the streets mentioned earlier. Councilmember Allison said the FBC area does not need design guidelines to look like the University North Park Tax Finance Increment District (UNPTIF).

Councilmember Allison asked about the administrative process, when is it administrative and when do they have to go to the DRB? Ms. Connors said every application will go through the development review process; however, that will be an administrative process that includes one citizen in attendance to ensure the Code is being followed. Once the plans are approved, a building permit is issued, but if the developer does not want to follow the FBC there would be a public hearing process to rezone the property to a Center City PUD. Councilmember Allison asked if the administrative process would bypass Planning Commission review and Ms. Connors said yes. Councilmember Allison asked if it can really be called an administrative process when a citizen is involved in the review and Ms. Connors said yes because the meeting will be open to the public and the public can ask questions.

Mayor Miller said there are a lot of new Councilmembers who have not had time to absorb all the information and tonight several Councilmembers have brought up points they want discussed. She said another Study Session needs to be held and asked that everyone read the material to make sure they understand what is being proposed. She said more public input can be garnered at that time as well. She said if major changes are going to be made then the next steps will be slowed down and this will take more time. Councilmember Hickman said time is of the essence and he is sensitive to that, which is why he stated his frustration regarding the design standards, but he is leaning towards holding a public meeting then meeting again in a Study Session.

Councilmember Heiple said in the four years he has served on Council, the FBC process has been the most involved public engagement he has never seen. He said this is a vision that does not need to be bogged down with details. Council needs to look at the big picture and this needs to be looked at with a telescope, not a microscope. He understands Councilmembers concerns, but at the same time this has been a two to three year citizen input process that Council needs to respect.

Councilmember Clark apologized for missing most of the presentation due to a personal commitment, but said feedback she has received is that time is of the essence. There are a lot of vacant storefronts right now on Main Street and people want to move in but they want to know what they are moving into. She feels Council should move forward even though she understands Councilmember Hickman's concerns. Councilmember Hickman said he is ready to move forward with a public meeting.

Mayor said another meeting will be held in a larger room to include public questions and comments. She said Councilmembers need a chance to ask questions as well after they have had time to read the proposal. Councilmember Karjala agreed and said she has questions, but she is not prepared at this time to ask those questions.

Councilmember Clark asked the timeline for the meeting and Mr. Steve Lewis, City Manager, said that will depend upon room availability and consultant's availability, but the meeting may have to be moved away from Tuesday since the Tuesday meeting schedule is full. He suggested a Thursday night meeting to be held within the next two to three weeks.

Councilmember Holman said the FBC came about due to a multi-unit project in Campus Corner and there is demand for these types of development in that area and developers are trying to meet that demand so current construction of these types of projects are a consequence of delaying this decision.

Items submitted for the record

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Norman Center City Form Based Code," dated October 18, 2016
2. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Norman City Center Vision – Center City Form-Based Code, City Council Study Session," dated October 18, 2016
3. Center City Form-Based Code, Norman, Oklahoma, September 2016

* * * * *

The meeting adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

ATTEST:

City Clerk

Mayor