

PRE-DEVELOPMENT INFORMATIONAL MEETING

JUNE 27, 2019

COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL

6:30 P.M.

Committee Members Present:

Councilmember Holman
Lee Hall
Keith McCabe
Jim Adair
Byron Morris

Staff Present:

Jane Hudson
Beth Muckala
Anais Starr
Ken Danner
Todd McLellan
Carrie Evenson
Roné Tromble

Public Present:

Dave Boeck
Juneann Murphy
Brad Summers
Will Mattoon
Dustin Graham
Kristi Van Ness
Matt Richardson
Russ Kaplan
Peter Petromilli

Jayne Crumpley
Birthe Flexner
Ed & Susanne Corr
Mac Britt
William Sullivan
Daryl Hammack
Chris Croslin
Elizabeth Bevel
Joyce Green

Kamala Jolly Stewart
Lloyd Bumm
Steve Jones
Tammy McCown
Larry Nolan
Sarah Iselin
Lyntha Wesner
Brad Worster

Ms. Hudson – Good evening, everyone. Let's go ahead and get started. We're a couple minutes late. We've got one hour to go over this. My name is Jane Hudson. I'm in the Planning Department here at the City of Norman. Welcome everyone. Thank you for coming.

I'm going to give you a brief presentation of the proposed changes that the committee came up with moving forward to City Council for the Center City Form-Based Code that's currently adopted, and it does have the administrative delay in place right now.

How many people are familiar with the form-based code? So some of you got notices and you're just not sure exactly what is going on. Okay.

What's the adoption date on the front of that book? July of '17? In July of 2017, the City of Norman adopted what they call the Center City Form-Based Code. It was within a core area, which I'll show you on this map. One of the main things that it did in this area is it changed the form and the location of where the new buildings were going to be located. Some design criteria was established. Some height. I'm trying to think if there's anything else. Different uses were allowed in comparison to the Zoning Ordinance that was in place prior to that. The Center City Form-Based Code allowed different uses in closer proximity to one another. I'll go over some of that, but really what this meeting is tonight is to outline the changes that the committee came up with and, again, moving forward to City Council.

In January of this year, we went to City Council and they established the administrative delay, which I said is already in place. This is the Center City study area, so this is the area in the pink outline that is covered by the Center City Form-Based Code.

This is the Regulating Plan that's currently in place. You'll see those colors on there. The blue is the Townhouse/Small Apartment, the red and the orange are really set aside for more commercial and office uses, and the yellow is the single-family residential uses.

This is just a history of the code itself. The City of Norman, in conjunction with the University of Oklahoma, had a Memorandum of Understanding to work together to hire a consultant to look at how we could move forward with a document in this area that I showed you that would possibly better suit some of the development that was being constructed. We had the kick-off in 2014. We had a charrette and many meetings and many committee meetings, and it concluded before City Council in July of 2017. Again, we have the administrative delay in place right now. Through that administrative delay, an ad hoc committee was established – and I've asked them to sit up here in case you might have any questions. This is a few of our members; we're short a few. They can answer any questions that you might have about some of these amendments that they discussed at their committee meetings.

This is our schedule that we're on right now. The administrative delay expires on July 29, so we're getting this forward and getting it in front of Council for their July 23rd meeting, and that's when Council will actually vote on it. We have a Special Planning Commission meeting set for July 8th; it will be in this room at 6:30. The City Council meeting on the 23rd will also be in this room at 6:30.

This is a definition, or an outline, of the goal of the Center City Vision Project and Plan, was to reset the conversation and provide some guidance for future development and redevelopment in the Center City area. The Form-Based Code is intended to implement the purpose and goals of the Plan by providing implementation tools for the Center City area. The Form-Based Code is a zoning tool; it's a different type of zoning tool than many of you are used to seeing, as opposed to the straight R-1, R-2 and R-3 zoning districts.

Center City Form-Based Code is composed of the Regulating Plan, and those are the areas that I've showed on that map that had the blue and the red and the orange. Then there's Building Form Standards that require the buildings to have windows, welcoming entries, and it's more of a connection between the pedestrians on the sidewalk and the buildings coming closer to the sidewalk, so you have more activity and more connection between those on the street and those in the buildings.

At the January meeting, when staff presented to City Council, we had been implementing the code for about two years. As we were receiving applications, we realized that there were some questions from the Code that was originally adopted that we needed some answers and we needed some additional direction. This is almost the same PowerPoint that I presented to them back in January, and I was really happy that we were able to address the majority of the questions that we had. I just went through and I outlined how some of those challenges actually were addressed through the committee's discussion.

One of the concerns that we were hearing from the community was the stormwater runoff issues. In the document that will be presented to City Council there is Part 9, which is a new section, and that does address the 65% coverage for new

construction. Sixty-five percent coverage is required across the entire City of Norman if you're in platted areas – R-1, 2, 3 and so on and so forth. The committee established the 65% coverage within the Form-Based Code area.

Another one of the challenges that we faced in dealing with some of the design professionals, was the design professional could read the complete and discrete, Part 4, section and get one interpretation and staff could get another. We were really struggling with how to give direction to the design professionals of what they needed to be bringing forward to get reviewed by the committee and get their Certificate of Compliance so that they could get started on their project. One of the things that came from that meeting is that the complete and discrete shall apply as written in the book – so there are no changes with that section.

When the consultant came in and was working with the committee and the community, one of the discussions and one of the understandings moving forward in the community was that we would probably get block development – we would get an entire block, everything would come up to the required build line, which can be about 10-12 feet back from the back of the sidewalk – which historically we have a 25' front yard setback, so these are bringing the buildings closer to the sidewalk. We would get a block development. We would get something that – and, of course, this is very dense, don't get me wrong – but we would get something that would have that connection to the street. It would be a continuous building and it would be a design set forth in the Form-Based Code. However, we weren't getting that. We were still getting the stand-alone, 5' side yard setbacks. Although they were bringing them to the street, we were still getting individual buildings going along. One of the things that the committee has proposed is that in the blue, Townhouse/Small Apartment, at the required build line the building shall be on that required build line for 100% for at least 12 feet in depth. Now there's a possible conflict, and one of the things that we will take forward to City Council is that there's a possibility that if someone comes along and they have a 50 foot wide lot and they want to build property line to property line on the sides, but someone that lives next door to them doesn't want them on their property to do their exterior materials – their façade – we're going to need some sort of an allowance – depending on what Council decides on – some sort of an administrative variance in those cases, or they might have to come forward and ask for a CCPUD, and that would go to City Council for approval.

One of the other things was the evaluation of the TIF. When the committee ended, there was discussion to, after this is all done, have the committee continue their discussions on what things need to be addressed continuing on with other items. One of the things is the Project Plan, which is the TIF. So they will continue on with discussions on that to determine how that can best be utilized in this area.

Another thing that the community was concerned with was the parking impacts. You'll see in another slide that they're requesting a special use in some areas, but if you have more than three bedrooms, you have to have one parking place per bedroom on-site. We've had a lot of the developments that have had five and six bedrooms on one side, so you've got 10-12 bedrooms in a duplex, and we could be short some parking. That's one of the proposals that they have.

Another one that we need to get finalized is if you don't have a building at your required build line there's a requirement to have a street wall, because they want that

continuous look. So if you are not building all the way up to the required build line we have to get a street wall. On corner lots, if you're coming up to the required build line in the front where your street address is, and you're coming down only 65% on your side to allow access to the alley and eliminate any sight triangle issues, we're going to want to get a street wall of some sort to have that continuous look as someone is walking down the street. We don't want a hole as someone is walking down the street.

Also on corner lots, one of the things that the design professionals struggled with was on corner lots the required build line is different on the street address side, where you would have your front door it's typically 10 feet from the back of the sidewalk. However, on the side street, it can be as small as 3-5 feet, and that really doesn't give a lot of room to have a porch, an access, a door and everything. So the committee had proposed that, if you have a corner lot, you only have to have the functioning street entry door on your addressed side.

In January one of the things I was pointing out is that we've had 12 applications, we had 184 bedrooms approximately, and that's a lot of density in the time from July of '17 to current. The committee discussed possibly looking at a special use in this area. While we want the density in the core area, we want the bodies there, possibly we want a different type of density, maybe one, two and three-bedrooms, as opposed to five and six-bedroom units, and something that, if we have a college student living there or a young professional and they have a two-bedroom unit, that can be reused, as opposed to the five and six-bedroom units that might not be able to be leased again. Just different types of density is what they're looking at.

The on-street parking – that will be something the committee continues in their discussion. Also the alley improvements, which would be possibly associated with the TIF information as well.

This is the adopted Regulating Plan. At the committee, they talked about bringing back the Neighborhood Middle Frontage. You can see currently down here at the south end, adjacent to Campus Corner, we've got the blue. If you look at what they have proposed to change, they're talking about bringing the pink back into that area east of Campus Corner. There's one thing that I need to clarify on that. At the committee, it was voted to bring the pink back into that area. As proposed, if you'll look over on your right side, there's still blue left on Eddington and McCullough over there. Part of the proposal that we'll be presenting to City Council is that the pink should continue over on those two streets. I went back and looked at the minutes and the minutes stated that we would bring the pink back as it was, so I put the pink back as it was. There was really an intent for the pink to continue over to Eddington and McCullough, so that's how we will take it forward to City Council for presentation.

One of the other questions that we had in the orange, which is the Urban General, they were allowed to have residential on the ground floor if they had a 3-foot elevation on the ground floor. However, again, depending on where some of those required build lines are, it created a problem getting that 3-foot elevation on the ground floor. What the committee proposed is to remove the 3-foot elevation requirement for residential use on the ground floor, but they would construct the ground floor under the commercial code, so that if a new buyer or even the same property owner decides at some point in the future that they do want to have commercial on that ground floor, it's already built

to the commercial code so it won't be as much of a financial impact for them to go from a residential code where it was built to the commercial code.

In the Townhouse/Small Apartment the proposal is to have a minimum of three units – the blue is the Townhouse/Small Apartment.

Just as a reminder, this is really what I was presenting to Study Session at City Council, this is a living document. That was one of the things that was discussed several years ago when it was being reviewed, is simply that it is a living document and we need to continue to evaluate how the development is coming into this area and make sure that we've got the infrastructure in place that can handle the development. That's key. Make sure the stormwater issues are not impacting adjacent property owners.

This was just a suggestion that we want to continue to evaluate the density, assess the vision, and that the ad hoc committee would continue review.

I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have. Like I said, we've got part of the committee here as well. I know I have one gentleman that wants to speak, so I'm going to go ahead. I've got a recorder I'm going to carry around with me. Sometimes the room doesn't really pick up, so I'll just hold it right here. Please give your name and your address and then just say whatever you've got to say.

Christopher Croslin – At the moment I live at 4208 Hackney Wick Road in Norman. Good evening and thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. I just want to come and explain where I'm coming from and my story here. I'm a Sergeant First Class in the military; I've been in the military for 15 years and I'm currently activated down in Fort Sill. Me and my family live here in Norman; it's where we've wanted to live. Me and my wife grew up here, we both went to the University of Oklahoma, so this is where we want to settle down as a family.

In January of this year we purchased a property that's located now inside the blue zone. When we purchased that property none of these limitations were put in place at the time. It's me and my wife and we have three little girls and we have one baby on the way – so that's four children. When we purchased this property originally, of course, we had the ideal home that we wanted to build and at the time we were going to be able to build that home. We purchased a property and now, with all the limitations that have put in place, we will not be able to build the property that we were wanting to build. Of course, I would want to build a home that would have a bedroom for each one of my children, so that would be a five-bedroom house. Now anywhere else in Norman, we would be able to build this house, but now with the limitations that are put in place, we would not be able to build that house on the property that we already purchased, and when we purchased it at the time we would have been able to build this property. Right now, we have a house at 4208 on the west side of town and it's under contract to be sold. We're moving out of that property on July 15th and will be moving into an apartment complex. At the time whenever we sold this property we were expecting to be able to start construction right whenever we got under contract, but due to all of these new policies and these restrictions, we've had to put that on hold. So now my family – we're going to be moving into an apartment complex that's a three-bedroom apartment with all of our children and a baby on the way coming in October. So the stress is really about to start hitting us. Also, I do commute back and forth to Fort Sill every day; it's a long drive but it's worth it to us because this is where we want to live.

That's why we came back to Oklahoma. Also, there's times where I'm at Fort Sill for multiple days and my family is going to be living in an apartment complex now due to this being a setback to us building, so I'm going to be gone for multiple days with my wife and my children in the apartment without me there. For me, that's a big stressor as the man in my family.

Also on this property we were looking forward to building not only our home but a rental property. I've been in the military for 15 years, so in five years I will be looking forward to retirement. Part of my retirement plan – me and my wife discussed this – was, first of all, the military doesn't have the strongest retirement plan. So to offset that income, we were going to build our property and then build a rental property on that property as well. The new restrictions would restrict us from building the property that we wanted to build as a rental property and, of course, the single-family home that we would want on that property as well. So now me and my family are in limbo because we know that we can't even start construction until this whole process is finished, and if the policies are passed that limit the amount of bedrooms that we can have, we now have to go request a special permit that will cost us even more money. We have spoke to attorneys that have said this could cost up to \$20,000 extra throughout this process to actually get a special permit, and that special permit could even get denied in the process. So this property that I purchased - whenever I purchased it these laws were not put in place – would have allowed my family to build a home that we wanted to build, but now I have this piece of property with this idea that whenever I purchased it I would be able to have the house I'm wanting with the rental property I'm wanting, being able to retire from the military, and now I don't even know if that dream is going to be able to happen.

Like I said, me and my wife, we love living in Norman, but there's nowhere else in Norman where these policies are being put in place that are restricting people to possibly a three-bedroom house for a single home family. Like I said, I have about to be four children and we cannot live in a three-bedroom house. So, once again, we were wanting to build our dream home, and after being in the military for 15 years – after two deployments to Iraq – I've done my service to my country and I was looking forward to that retirement period of my life, and now that's not going to be able to happen possibly in the location that we're wanting because of these new policies. I would just appreciate if you all would just think about the implications that these are having to every type of family who is trying to live in the area, who maybe already has property and they're waiting for these things to pass, and so their whole lives are on hold in that process, and especially for me, a military man who is not with my family all the time. We already have an emotional stress for that, but now there's going to be a financial stress with these new policies put in place. Thank you.

David Cunnard – I live at 942 Chautauqua. Watching what has been going on in the neighborhood in the past couple of years, I find it fairly amazing how sort of a run-down neighborhood of rent houses has turned into something of this size and dimension. I kind of think that we should promote more of this, rather than trying to limit this sort of development. I understand there's an issue that, because of code and because of the selective code enforcement, there's lots of five and six-bedroom like basically boarding houses that are being built in order to provide the density that the market is demanding. They're renting five-bedroom rent houses for \$3,500 a month for a 2,000 square foot rent

house. It's crazy money. The people who are living there – a lot of the people – are there because they want to live in this triangle of everything – University, the music downtown, the restaurants – this sort of urban living that is not provided anywhere else in Norman. So what I understand is there's two basic problems why we aren't providing more of this and trying to spur this further on is because of stormwater runoff, which probably could be solved with spending a few bucks on drainage. Considering how this is improving the value of the dirt, like this gentleman has – I mean this demand is making every lot more and more valuable, which allows the City to collect more and more money to provide the infrastructure, to provide the housing that the market is now demanding. So drain water is one.

Then the other solution I hear is we need to provide for more parking. So people want to live in this area and we're concerned about more cars living in this area, so we're going to demand more parking spaces there, because for some reason we have cars that are going to go homeless if we don't provide – I'm being facetious, of course – but there's no lack of apartment complexes in Norman, Oklahoma that doesn't have sufficient parking. If you drive by the Walmart parking lot you can see acres of unused parking that someone, if they really wanted to park their car somewhere and didn't want to ride a bike or walk, then these options are open. So, basically, it seems like everything is kind of turned around. The demand is for more housing and what we're trying to do is provide for more parking, and it doesn't make much sense to me. Finally, what is the future for parking? We read about Google cars and Uber. Are there going to be more cars in the future? No cars in the future? We've got a serious problem with climate change and cars as it is. So the Norman solution is more parking? I just don't understand that.

These are my comments. I think we've kind of got this backwards. We should be providing more places for these people to spend crazy amounts of money to live here, because they want to live here. Again, the people who are paying \$700 to rent a bedroom in one of these boarding houses is not going to live in Norman if we don't provide this to them. They're going to go live in Oklahoma City – they're going to live someplace where they can walk, bike, live and live in the manner that they wish – not worry about where to park their cars. So those are my comments. Good luck.

Elizabeth Bevel – My question is why did you go from the pink to the blue to the pink? That's my question.

Mr. McCabe – I'll jump out there. My name is Keith McCabe with property that I own in that area. During the original charrette where this area is pink, we could not build a two-story, three-story house with the required build heights that we were limited to from the original charrette, because the build height was 24 feet. You cannot build taller than a two-story house. During these discussions, looking at the way the City is being divided – and all I'm going to speak to is my personal belief here. I saw, as we started doing this and then converted from the pink to the blue, we converted because we could not get the build height. But now with the blue, there's the 100% residential build line, property line to property line, small apartment/townhouse so what I saw was we no longer had the segregated – and I don't know if the word segregated – but these actual developments – it all became one big unit from block to block, so in my head personally

I saw going back to pink with a raised build height – your properties, other properties in that area, will fit in that build height.

Ms. Bevel – Can you go to three stories?

Mr. McCabe – As long as it's under roof. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Bevel – So if I want a garage underneath my personal home ...

Mr. McCabe – Correct.

Ms. Bevel – Then I want a story on top of that and a story on top of that. Is that my three?

Mr. McCabe – As long as that third story is under roofline – or what they call attic story.

Ms. Bevel – Is that thirty some odd? What is the height?

Mr. McCabe – 45 feet.

Ms. Bevel – 45 feet. What are stories now? I can't remember.

Mr. McCabe – Nine feet per story.

Ms. Bevel – So our garage could be – well, that's not very high for inside ceiling heights. I mean, if you wanted a 14 tall ceiling height in your livingroom – you have this nice, beautiful home, like other homes are in the area. So you have a 10 – well, you have a 12 foot ceiling height in your livingroom/kitchen area, and then on your bedrooms you have at least a 10-12 – you know, if you're talking a nice home. Is that going to fit with a garage underneath? Because what has happened is that now you have taken away our parking place in front. The City is no longer going to put curbside parking there. They have taken away the parking. They're taking away the parking because they say you can't get out in the alley. You have to have X number of spaces. What you've done is it's shrunk our property down and now you're shrinking it down again. In my view. Do you have to go for a special provision to have those things done if you want a personal home in the area? Because you've taken away the space.

Councilmember Holman – I would say by converting this area back to pink, we are increasing the current allowable height of the building from ...

Ms. Bevel – Are you allowing me what I need?

Councilmember Holman – I think so.

Ms. Bevel – In the 12-foot and the garage.

Councilmember Holman – So a garage underneath the first floor?

Ms. Bevel – Yes.

Councilmember Holman – Okay. So a garage – how tall ...

Ms. Bevel – You've limited my front. You've limited my back. I have no place for guests. That's why.

Councilmember Holman – Okay. From what I understand, the height limit that we're increasing it to will allow for three stories to fit under your roofline. So if it was a garage, a first floor and then a second floor ...

Ms. Bevel – At nine feet each.

Councilmember Holman – 45 feet.

Mr. McCabe – It's 45 feet total.

Councilmember Holman – We're increasing it to 45.

Mr. McCabe – Please remember the charrette changed it. The original charrette changed everything that we had. This committee tried to straighten out some of the wording. Okay? After we spoke about going to the blue, you can still have a larger home. The build height toward the street was already determined in the charrette. We did not change that. We did not change the build in the back. All we're doing is saying that in the pink you're now allowed to keep the five foot side yard setback on the sides, so we're not going to have in the pink the Townhouse/Small Apartment, which is more toward downtown Main Street.

Ms. Bevel – What will the setback be from the street?

Mr. McCabe – Whatever it is that you had existing before we ever did anything here. That did not change.

Ms. Bevel – So if you're in the blue or whatever it was, it was 10 feet.

Mr. McCabe – And we would be the same.

Ms. Bevel – So it stays ...

Mr. McCabe – It stays the same.

Ms. Hall – The proposed pink you mean?

Ms. Bevel – Whatever it is now.

Mr. McCabe – Because the build line stays the same.

Ms. Bevel – Was that 25? Was it 10?

Mr. McCabe – Well, we were 25 ...

Ms. Hudson – They're looking at the book real quick. I just want to make sure before we say what that is.

Mr. Adair – Jane, I'd add that part of the transition of this back to pink is, I feel, because of changes we've made in the blue. The blue we wanted a higher unit count. What we were getting was duplexes with a very large number of bedrooms. Instead of two units with six bedrooms on each side, we wanted three bedrooms with only three bedrooms on each side. So the blue now requires a minimum of three units. This area went back to pink to permit one or two units. Also, again, my recollection going back to the original committee – a lot of the emphasis I felt then on the pink area when we changed it to the blue originally was there was an emphasis to take that to single family, and the problem was some of us felt that was really impacting the value of what the current property owners were going to get. A lot of these things are selling for \$250,000 and you put that lot cost on a single-family house, it's not going to balance.

Ms. Hudson – As proposed in the pink it's ten.

Ms. Bevel – Ten? Then it goes back to his question about rooms. So it's just my husband and I. We need two offices, a guest bedroom, a room for us, and then we would like to have a media room. Is that within our guidelines? That's what our house would look like.

Councilmember Holman – I don't know if it is defined with the bedroom – if it is defined as having a closet in it. I would think a media room would not count and neither would offices.

Ms. Bevel – So we could not have a media room?

Councilmember Holman – I would think you would be able to, yes. But I would definitely want ...

Ms. Bevel – So we can have four bedrooms – basically two offices, a bed for guests, and one for us – a master.

Ms. Hudson – But as proposed right now the requirement would be to come forward to get a special use if you're doing more than three bedrooms.

Mr. Adair – And her offices are going to count as bedrooms when you all review it. Correct?

Ms. Bevel – So basically you're limiting my lifestyle. That is what you're doing with this. Okay. I don't understand it totally.

Councilmember Holman – One of the things that I've tried to convey in our committee has been the idea, if I was at some point in the future – if I'm financially able – a little humorous, but if I wanted to build a replica of the Addams Family house – real big, old looking, lots of houses and passageways and all that stuff – would I be able to do that anywhere in central Norman? My goal was to try to preserve a way where we could do that. I know this permitting process does add a significant hurdle financially, specifically, to that. But I did want to make sure we could do it. Whether it is the easiest way or cheapest way, that is definitely a concern I think is legitimate on your behalf.

Ms. Hudson – As proposed the definition that is in the Form-Based Code now, says: "an enclosed space within in a dwelling unit that is not a garage, foyer, kitchen, bathroom, dining area, or livingroom that has at least 70 square feet of floor area. Dens, studies or other rooms which are capable of being used for sleeping quarters that contains a closet, or to which a closet could be added, shall also be considered a bedroom" is the definition that's in the book as proposed right now.

Councilmember Holman – So if the media room – what would be different about the media room than a livingroom? Whether it has a closet in it or not?

Mr. Morris – A media room you probably wouldn't want a window, and a window is a required means of access for anything that's going to be a bedroom. So a media room, if it had no window, could not be considered a bedroom.

Dave Boeck – 922 Schulz Drive. Of course, we know where all this came from, is because those people built five-bedrooms with five bathrooms and say it's a single-family residence. We get paranoid about whether it's going to be for a single family or for a whole bunch of students.

The question I have, and I've been bringing it up all along, is in the original development of the Center City Form-Based Code there was a discussion about having a variance to be able to go to the Board of Adjustment if you wanted to build something that was accessible – whether it's an apartment or a house. Obviously, if you have three feet from finished grade to finished floor, you've got six or eight steps – that's not an accessible house. There was discussion well we could ramp it from the back and the parking lot, which, if you know anything about accessibility standards, to require people to go in a back door doesn't really meet the accessibility standards. But that variance, or the ability for a variance, was not put into the original Form-Based Code, so there was no alternatives for people to do accessible apartments or houses. I was hoping that would get put into this adjustment to the Form-Based Code. I've been working, and so has Keith, on an ad hoc committee to put together a visitability ordinance, which would encourage builders to build accessible or visitable houses and apartments. My concern has been, by doing what we've done with the Form-Based Code, we're basically telling people they can't build accessible houses. I think we're leaving ourselves wide open for lawsuits if someone wanted to challenge what's being built on Campus Corner, because

none of it is accessible. We talked about, when we pass this visitability ordinance, then we will have a guideline for builders to build something. But I know one of the developers that's doing Campus Corner work right now would like to build accessible units in the mix of stuff that he's building. I guess the question I have is are you going to allow for the ability to go to the Board of Adjustment and get approval to build on a ground floor – we've allowed that with putting commercial space on the first floor because commercial space has to be accessible, and you can turn those into units if you want to and then turn them back. But in the situation where it's not commercial space on the ground, I guess I'd still like to see us have the ability to allow developers that want to build accessible units in the blue area or the pink area to be able to do it.

Councilmember Holman – That is one of the changes we did make, but just in the orange immediately was before residential couldn't be on the ground floor of orange. Now we're going to allow residential to be on the ground floor of orange but, as you mentioned, built to commercial standards so it could be converted.

Mr. Boeck – But not in the blue area.

Councilmember Holman – Right. I think that is one of the issues that the committee identified as needing to continue discussing was how to go about allowing – I agree. There does need to be a path for if a development comes forward.

Mr. Boeck – Especially if a builder or developer wants to do it.

Councilmember Holman – Absolutely. I agree.

Russ Kaplan – Resident of the City Center Form-Based Code area and rental property owner in the surrounding areas. I have a couple of different concerns that are related, but not tied together. One is the purpose of all this was to help create density in the core. One of my concerns is that, as adopted, the Form-Based Code did not include a coverage restriction at the 65% that Jane spoke of that's present in the rest of Norman. Part of what the committee has put together is to put that 65% back in, and I understand we have stormwater concerns. I share them. My house – the street out front gets pretty thick with all this rain we've been having. But my concern is the limitation this is going to put on our ability to build density in the core, particularly in Section 903, item c, it says that increasing coverage to the 65% requires that the developer account for the increase in runoff between pre- and post-development through their site engineering. That essentially means that if you buy a small single-family home and want to build something else, whether it be a house like the gentleman from Fort Sill was talking about, a larger single-family home, or a multi-family residence, or whatever, there's a significant impact in your costs just hiring the engineer, never mind actually figuring out how to handle that stormwater runoff. That should not be the property owner's responsibility. They should be responsible to keep it below – I can agree to going to the 65 to keep it consistent with what the rest of Norman is. But to put the onus on the property owner to figure out what to do with the stormwater difference between the little 800 square foot house they're tearing down and the 2,200 square foot footprint they're putting back – that shouldn't

be on them and it shouldn't be their cost. So I'm concerned about that for single-family residences and then also for the larger structures that we want to encourage. I think it's a problem.

The other thing that I'm concerned about and, Jane, pardon me if I zoned out, but I didn't hear you discuss the special use permit for four or more bedrooms. You did? I'm sorry. Okay. I didn't hear it. At any rate, that requirement takes away a property owner's or prospective property owner's development by right. Development by right is what it's called in the industry, where, when you buy the property, you know what you can do and you don't have to get special permission. When you take that away and put the property owner or prospective property owner in the situation where they have to go get permission to build a beautiful four-bedroom home, five-bedroom home, whatever, that's a crushing blow to property values and to the prospective free development of the neighborhood. I personally live in a home that I would not have been able to do what I did to it under these rules without getting special permission and, because of that, I would have never bought the lot and would have never taken on the project because it's – you just don't know. You're getting into a can of worms and you don't know what you're going to get if you have to go get permission. So that's what I have to say.

Mr. Adair – Russ, as you know, there was – you were in a lot of the meetings. There was a lot of back and forth between the committee. We voted a lot. There were a lot of compromises on both sides. When we finally got at the end of it, we unanimously voted to bring this forward to Council. One of the clarifications that I asked for in discussing the drainage questions with City Engineer Scott Sturtz – as a land developer, a drainage report is expensive to do. This does not require a full drainage report; it requires drainage calculations. They do have to be prepared by a professional engineer, but staff is working with us, I think, to a fair degree. This area is flat. There's a concern that you're creating a problem for a neighbor. And instead of requiring a full drainage report, which we saw in some early drafts, I think, they have come down to simply requiring drainage calculations, which I think is a compromise.

----- I thought the special use for more bedrooms was so they could force the developers to provide more parking, because they're building six-bedroom units and not having six parking spaces.

Councilmember Holman – I would personally prefer the least amount of parking as possible. If I had my magic wand, we wouldn't require parking at all in this area. But we are in a car-centric area. The intent, as far as I'm concerned, of the special use to have more than three bedrooms was, as mentioned before, what we've been seeing in the area constructed in the last two years has mostly been two units that have six or seven, eight bedrooms. We've seen a couple that have more than ten, I believe, in one unit. The goal was, if that's going to happen, we want to know where it's happening and what's going on with that. If you're going to want to build a unit that has that many bedrooms in it, there needs to be some special consideration, perhaps. So that's where that came from. I would definitely not say it was so we could require more parking. I don't want more parking.

----- -- Well, does that mean you want 'em parking on the streets?

Councilmember Holman – Part of the Center City plan does call for changes or enhancing the on-street parking. One of the discussions we've had is using the rights-of-way that currently exist between the sidewalk and the street to provide – one of our committee members who isn't here tonight, Richard McKown – has actually put it together on his computer and he estimated, I believe, over 1,000 parking spots could be added – on-street parking – without adding any new parking lots, without building a parking garage, which is millions of dollars – that we could potentially add 1,000 or more on-street parking if we do it right along these streets. So I want as least amount of parking required on your property as possible. I don't want you having to cover your whole lot in concrete for parking. I think parking is a waste of real estate.

----- -- I guess I don't really understand what you're saying as far as – where are you creating these parking spaces?

Councilmember Holman – The right-of-way on any neighborhood street in this area – the space that would be between the sidewalk and the curb of the street. Sometimes there's trees in there. It's mostly just grass. The idea is that we could add parallel or angled parking in that area so that people could park in front of these properties, instead of having to parking in the back. Especially since we've eliminated the driveways in the front as was mentioned. By adding the option to park in the front of the properties in the right-of-way. It's probably better if I had a visual to show you; it's a little easier. But that's the idea.

Mr. Adair – The parking requirement in the existing code that's being amended as it exists today, before Council adopts this – the parking requirement today is ½ space if it's one bedroom, 1 space if it's two bedrooms, 1.5 spaces if it's three bedrooms, 1.67 spaces, I believe, if it's four or more bedrooms. The problem – Jane, tell me if I'm putting words in your mouth. The problem we were running into was, when you're getting six, seven, eight bedrooms and two parking spaces, you're creating an impact on the neighbors that is imposing. You're stacking up all the street parking, and it just wasn't something that was anticipated in the original code. So, for that reason, the parking requirements are being upped.

----- -- I agree with you. I didn't like the street parking.

----- -- I'm just curious. You're talking about basically taking away the parkway – the area between the curb and the sidewalk, which is generally – it's a grassed area – a landscaped area, which adds – or actually enhances our ability to control stormwater runoff, and we're going to talk about taking that away and putting in parking spaces. I live on Elm, which is lined with trees in the parkway. Correct me if I'm wrong, but is that what we're talking about here? Is that the solution we're looking at?

Councilmember Holman – An option that's been presented for parking. I would be ...

----- -- An option. Okay. And who's dime is that going to fall under?

Councilmember Holman – I would note that is not part of this proposal. That would not be part of this proposal, but it is something the committee has said if we're wanting to add more parking but we don't want to build a \$30 million parking garage.

----- -- So we're going to add more impervious surface, as opposed to the grass that's already there.

Councilmember Holman – If we add more parking lots – surface lots – that adds more impervious. If we build a \$30 million parking structure, that adds more surface. So this is a way to do it – another way to possibly do it. I would be very opposed to doing it on any of the rights-of-way that have existing trees in them. But there are several streets where there is nothing in the right-of-way and it could be used. But I agree with you. Adding more concrete – any more parking – like I said, I don't want to add any more parking or concrete to this area. But if we're going to, that is an option.

----- -- And would that be on the City's dime? Or is that a property owner?

Councilmember Holman – It would be, in my view, part of the improvements that the Center City TIF would help fund. Yes. Thank you very much for that question.

Mr. Boeck – One of the other things that I left out earlier is we talked about diversity, we've talked about density, and the density that we've gotten is 100% student housing. Obviously, there's more "For Rent" signs around Norman than I've ever seen in the 46 years that I've been here. Jim and I were talking about this earlier, between the University housing and all the apartments that have been built, there's lots of student housing. The group that's been left out are the people my age – seniors that want to move – college towns are the number one place where seniors want to move back to, and we're developing no accessible senior housing around Campus Corner, which is where people want to live. So by making housing accessible, we can make housing – and I was talking to another developer today. The need for two-bedroom and three-bedroom units. Millennials and seniors are very similar in terms of their housing demand. They don't want to drive. They don't want parking spots. They want two bedrooms, maybe three bedrooms, but mostly two bedrooms. And we're not doing any of that, and we could be doing that if we allowed the flexibility. So I'm just bringing that up for the record, that hopefully that will be considered as we go forward.

Ms. Hall – I'd like to just address that, because I think that's been one of the overarching goals when this committee met to look at what some of the shortcomings were in the current code the way it's written. For me, as a community member, and participating in this entire process from 2014 forward, I think one of the better things that's coming out of this package that we're proposing to the City Council is recognizing the need for more diverse housing types. What we've gotten stuck on is a single housing type. All of these different pieces of this puzzle are really intended to encourage diverse housing types –

smaller units, two-bedroom apartments, three-bedroom apartments, one-bedroom apartments that are in quite high demand in Oklahoma City. And addressing seniors, this missing middle housing that we talk about, young professionals that are looking for a different housing type that we're currently not developing right now. To me, one of the things that we're going to accomplish if we can support the City Council passing the package as a whole, is that we're going to see more diverse housing types come out of this, and I think that was a desire of everyone on the committee.

Mr. Boeck – I think developers are responsible, and should be responsible, for all drainage issues that they come up with. And to be able to develop and to say I can develop whatever I want, whether it's a six, or ten, or twelve-bedroom apartment complex and all the parking that goes along with it – that's irresponsible development as far as I'm concerned. There is property values, but we need to look at what the need is in Norman for the kind of housing that's needed.

Dustin Graham – I own several properties around Campus. Just a few things. We talk about diverse housing, but we're talking about property that is adjacent to Campus. Right? So where is a better spot for students that is not adjacent to Campus? This is the area we're talking about. So you guys – or several people, not everybody – is talking about moving students away from this adjacent property and that's where we want them. Right? You want them walking to Campus. You want them walking to the bars that are at Campus Corner – you don't want them driving on the streets drunk from Campus; you want them walking home. Right? So, to me, diversity in this particular area doesn't make a lot of sense. As you just said, there's a lot of rent signs – For Rent signs – around the campus area right now. That's because everything is being drawn in closer to Campus and all of the houses that are in the proximity that students used to rent are no longer renting there, but they're renting in these bigger dwellings closer to Campus, which is what we want. It's actually creating more density and allowing for people who may want to move in these area to buy these properties and have their single-family houses in single-family housing areas. So that's one point.

Affordable housing is another issue. We're talking about the most expensive real estate in Norman, Oklahoma. Affordable housing – it's like yin and yang – they don't add up. It doesn't make sense. I understand you want to make it more affordable, but unless you are giving the developers more incentive monetarily, that doesn't happen. Because developers are building stuff based upon money. With any business, nobody goes into business not to make money, and that's just the bottom line. What else? I had a third point.

Honestly, the gentleman over here that was talking about building his own personal house – that he can't even build more than a three-bedroom house without getting permission, and he has a family of six of them living in a house that he has to go get special permission for. On top of that, what's being proposed is that you have to have a parking spot per bedroom. So his six-bedroom house that he's going to be building – or five-bedroom with a study – whatever it may be that are going to be considered bedrooms – he would have to have six or seven parking spots for his four children. So he would have a parking lot, essentially, on his single-family house, which doesn't make sense. How many houses in Norman have a parking lot? Not very many.

Another point is, if someone wants to build a ten-bedroom house in the City of Norman, outside of this area, can they do so? They can. They don't have to get permission. That's a huge taking of property rights what you're talking about. So it's not just – if we're talking about, oh, the 65% is across the board the City of Norman, okay, yeah, it's across the City of Norman, but so is being able to build what you want to build as well, with bedrooms, etc. That's all I have to say.

Councilmember Holman – I think the intent – the way I would phrase it is I agree that students – the demand that we're seeing – supply and demand – the demand that we're seeing in this area is definitely students, and it makes perfect sense being located between Campus and the downtown area that students and younger folks would want to live in this area. I agree 100%. I think the concern that the City and the neighbors and everything were looking at was are the units that are being built currently reusable for anybody else besides students. What we were seeing, as an example, would be two units with ten bedrooms in each unit. It's very unlikely that either of those units would ever be usable for any other group of people besides students. In 10 years or 20, students might not be liking this area as much. There might be another new, hip area that people like. So the idea was to still have density what we would rather see is if you want to build ten units that have two bedrooms in them each, it's the same density, but those two-bedroom units are much more likely to be reusable for a family or young professionals, or senior citizens at some point in the future. So that's really the intent of why we're trying to change the form of these buildings from two units with many bedrooms to many units with a few bedrooms in each of them is the idea behind that.

I agree with you. Housing affordability, I don't think, is going to be something we see in this area, unless it's incentivized through the TIF or some other means, or through a streamlined process or reduction in permit fees. I would agree that, from what I've seen in other cities across the country, affordable housing in high-demand areas is not going to happen. I don't see a developer coming in and doing it without being incentivized. I think you're absolutely correct there.

That would be my take on a couple of your issues you brought up. I don't know if anybody else wants to add anything. Thank you for the questions, though.

Ms. Hudson – I just want to clarify something. I have someone that wants to speak, so we'll let her speak. But I want to clarify something, and then our time is up.

Under the parking requirements for residential, minimum reserved parking spaces per unit, up to 650 square feet, regardless of bedroom count, .5 spaces; between 650 and 1,000 square feet, 1 space; above 1,000 square feet, 1.25 spaces per unit. I just wanted to clarify that and get it on the record.

Kamala Jolly Stewart – 621 East Hughbert. I live just outside of the Center City area, and I've actually lived on both the west side and the east side of it, just outside the boundaries, for the last 22 years. I am approaching 50, but my husband and I specifically have chosen the homes we've lived in in Norman because of their proximity to this area. My husband – his preferred mode of transportation is bicycle or skateboard, and I would prefer to leave my car in front of my house all the time and walk to the grocery store and walk to restaurants on Main Street or Campus Corner. That's the lifestyle that we choose

to live. I've paid a lot of attention to this, because of my desire to live in an area that's like that.

In response to some of the comments that I've heard, I wanted to just mention a couple of things. The people moving into my neighborhood are young professionals with small children or elementary, middle school, high school children. Some of them are empty nesters, but they choose the area because of its proximity to downtown and Campus, just as we did. But they choose my area more frequently than they do a lot of the areas that have been shown up here because of the number of students, quite frankly. I love students and I love being around college students. I think that they add an immense value to our community. However, I want to live in an area that has a lot of different people. I want to live in an area that has retired people, an area that has young, thriving professionals, an area that has recent graduates and graduate students who are coming in and adding to the community. I want to live in an area where the people who live in a house are friends and operate like their own little community, and that's more likely to happen in a two to three-bedroom house than it is in a ten-bedroom house. And students can live in two and three-bedroom houses. There's nothing that prohibits them from choosing a smaller area. And with the density that's proposed in this area, we are looking to have small apartments and townhomes that would accommodate students in wonderful ways in the small apartments that could be built in this area, which would be fantastic. They could have amenities that very much appeal to college students and would be very attractive. However, if we have nothing but college students living in the area, then we don't have people who are contributing their tax dollars and their professional experience and their community involvement to Norman, and that's really what my impression of the Center City Form-Based Code – that's why we're doing this, is because we want to have a thriving community where people interact with one another and they get to know each other and they benefit from living in such a great part of town.

There were a lot of compromises made. I went to several of the meetings because I do care about this as a long-term resident. I suspect it's going to trickle out around the area as time goes by. It certainly can have an impact on the areas that are outside of the Center City as well. But I think that the diversity of housing is really critical, because it's going to make a more rich and vibrant community all around.

The other thing that I wanted to mention is I hadn't heard anybody say anything about the parking option of – there's a concept, I guess you'd say, called park once. So some of the proposals that were discussed in the committee had to do with having parking spaces that someone can pull in and someone can pull behind them – like you do if you have a single car driveway and two cars are parked akin to that. But that was done specifically to try to limit the number of cars that will be on a single property. I agree with Councilmember Holman, actually. I wish there weren't so many parking requirements, because I think that the green space is a better option, not just for the environment, but it makes for a better place to live. However, I do understand that living in that area, parking can be an issue. So I see that as a compromise and a trade-off to try to achieve some bigger goals, if you will, with this process.

Another thing that was discussed a lot was trade-offs for stormwater infrastructure or ways that would make a property – and I'm sure that Jane can say that much better than I can – but in looking at the ways to reduce the impact of stormwater, and that

there could be a system to kind of like counter that. Like I say, I can't speak to it better than that.

So, anyway, a lot of these things were thought through. And that such a diverse committee came to unanimous agreement says a lot about the compromises that were put forward. So I do want to encourage anybody who has specific questions to ask – like especially about the why all this happened. They were very thoughtful and very detailed and debated very respectfully to get to this conclusion. That's all I had to add.

Ms. Hudson – I just wanted to thank everybody, first of all, for coming out. I've got the scheduled meetings that are coming up. The Special Planning Commission meeting will be July 8th here in this room at 6:30. Then we'll have a City Council meeting July 23rd, again here in this room at 6:30.

I think the majority of you probably received a letter – the notification letter. There's contact information on there. You can give us a call. This is on the website – the document is on the website – one of the links. So if you want to take a look at it. But I welcome you to come back to any of these meetings. The Planning Commission meeting there will be public comment, and again at City Council there will be public comment as well for anybody that wants to.

I thank you for your time. See you next time.

Adjourned 7:45 p.m.