

CITY COUNCIL
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 22, 2012

The City Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met at 5:30 p.m. in the Multi-Purpose Room on the 22nd day of October, 2012, and notice and agenda of the meeting were posted in 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 Gallagher, Jungman, Williams, and Chairman Griffith

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Mayor Cindy Rosenthal
Ms. Susan Atkinson, Planner I
Ms. Susan Connors, Planning and Community Development Director
Mr. Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator
Ms. Jane Hudson, Principal Planner I
Mr. Steve Lewis, City Manager
Mr. Angelo Lombardo, Traffic Engineer
Ms. Leah Messner, Assistant City Attorney
Mr. Shawn O'Leary, Director of Public Works
Ms. Karla Chapman, Administrative Technician

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Tessa Breder, Norman Chamber of Commerce
Ms. Denise Davis, Concerned Citizen
Mr. Steve Davis, Concerned Citizen
Mr. Evan Dunn, Concerned Citizen
Mr. Bryan Elsey, Elsey Partners
Mr. Chris Elsey, Elsey Partners
Ms. Mary Francis, Concerned Citizen
Ms. Joy Hampton, *The Norman Transcript*
Mr. Steven Tyler Holman, Concerned Citizen
Ms. Linda Lankister, Coltrane Properties
Ms. Janice Oak, Progressive Independence
Mr. Cody Ponder, CART
Mr. Rainey Powell, Campus Corner Association
Mr. Sean Reiger, Attorney
Ms. Cindy Rogers, Concerned Citizen
Ms. Teresa Rhynes, Coltrane Properties
Ms. Karleene Smith, CART
Ms. Jamileh Wilcox, Concerned Citizen

DISCUSSION REGARDING A POTENTIAL PARKING MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR CAMPUS CORNER.

Mr. Angelo Lombardo, Traffic Engineer, highlighted the Campus Corner Parking Management System (CCPMS), stating it will be similar to the Downtown Parking Management System (DPMS) on Gray Street and would allow a Parking Service Officer (PSO) with the Police Department to recognize a violation before arriving to the parking lot. He said the CCPMS could include multi-space meters, hand held enforcement devices, and parking space vehicle sensors.

Multi-Space Meter

The cost for 13 multi-space meters is \$130,000 and driver(s) would park and pay based upon the parking space number. The multi-space meter accepts cash, credit cards, tokens, and cell phone payments, as well as, validation by merchants for customer refunds if applicable. The multi-space meter can easily be reprogrammed if management strategy changes, i.e., rate increase, time limit, etc.

Handheld Enforcement Unit

The handheld enforcement units are a lightweight, one-piece handheld system, which can be paired with software specifically configured for Norman’s operational needs and turn citation issuance into a quick and easy process. The handheld enforcement unit can automatically issue citations. The cost per unit is \$18,613, and includes a lithium battery with built-in camera, paper stock, and training.

Parking Space Sensor

The cost for parking space sensors is \$45,000 for 150 spaces or \$300 per space. A parking space sensor tracks individual parking space occupancy and communicates with the multi-space parking meter unit, which resets the meter when a vehicle pulls out of a space with time left on the parking space.

Mr. Lombardo said Staff canvassed the Campus Corner area to research possible locations for the multi-space parking meters and highlighted a map indicating where the meters could be placed. Mayor Rosenthal asked about the location for the parking meters and pay station and Mr. Lombardo said for driver convenience, every 10 – 12 parking spaces will have a pay station located no more than 120 feet from any given parking space. Mayor Rosenthal felt the distance between the spaces and pay station was adequate and would not pose a problem for drivers. She said Staff plans to integrate data experience from the DPMS into the CCPMS, which will be very helpful. She felt it made sense to manage parking spaces in the Campus Corner area, specifically the commercial spaces, because it is a very big problem.

Mr. Shawn O’Leary, Director of Public Works, said the Campus Corner Association (CCA) has indicated they prefer to have a \$1.00 per hour rate for the parking spaces in the CCPMS, which is higher than the proposed \$0.25 per hour rate for the DPMS. However, Council will establish the rate(s) for both areas.

Mr. Lombardo said the maintenance and operating cost for a parking management system would be \$5,000 per year and Duncan Parking Technologies provided a preliminary quote for a pay by the space parking station as follows:

▪ Multi-Space Parking Meter Station (13 units)	\$130,000
▪ Parking Space Sensor (159 units)	\$ 51,675
▪ Installation and Training	<u>\$ 6,000</u>
TOTAL	\$187,675

Mr. Lombardo said the CCA has been exploring additional options and another approach to the CCPMS could be individual smart meters with credit card payment capability. The initial capital cost is slightly lower than the multi-space meter (\$30,000), but the monthly operating and maintenance cost is higher (\$20,000 more per year).

Mr. Lombardo said Staff can develop a Parking Maintenance System Business Plan (PMSBP) under the direction of the City Manager with input from the Community Planning and Transportation Committee (CPTC) and Campus Corner merchants. The plan can establish hourly rates that can be varied based on demand, time limit(s), hours of operation, and commercial loading zone parking space management. Mr. Lombardo said the Campus Corner area currently has parking spaces reserved for commercial deliveries (until 10:00 a.m.), which have been an issue for PSOs to enforce and a PMSBP will help address this issue.

Mr. Lombardo said a funding source will need to be identified for implementation of a parking management system, but currently there is \$133,724.90 in Campus Corner Tax Increment Finance (TIF) funds available that can be used. He said multi-space versus single space versus a combination of both will need to be decided and then Staff can develop a parking plan. Mr. Lombardo said specifications, bid packages, bid advertisement and bid openings would be scheduled and Council would award the bid for the purchase of materials; stating the total timeline would be six (6) to 12 months from start to complete installation.

Mr. Rainey Powell, CCA, said the CCA Board felt that parking issues in the Campus Corner area are different than parking issues in the Downtown area and felt higher rates could alleviate some of the problems. He said generally it is Campus Corner employees and/or University of Oklahoma (OU) students who park and take advantage of the spaces on Campus Corner when in fact the parking spaces are intended for shoppers and/or diners. Mr. Powell said the CCA is suggesting that parking be free for the first 30 minutes; \$1.00 for the first hour, and \$2.00 per hour thereafter essentially to discourage the employees and/or students from parking in a space for a long period of time. He said employees and/or students can park at the Presbyterian Church for \$2.00 per day.

Mr. Powell said there are parking spaces designated within Campus Corner for commercial parking only until 10:00 a.m. in order to accommodate the commercial deliveries, but the current signage on the single pole is not very good. He said people continue to park in the spaces before 10:00 a.m., supply money to the meters, believing that it is acceptable to park in the space, only to return to their cars and find they have been issued a citation for parking in the space prior to 10:00 a.m. Mr. Powell felt a double meter - single pole will allow better and clearer signage indicating the spaces are only for commercial parking/deliveries until 10:00 a.m. and the meter will not accept payment until after 10:00 a.m. He said currently there are 156 meters on Campus Corner and the installation of double metered poles is estimated at \$120,000, which is less than the quote of \$187,675 from Duncan Parking Technologies.

Mr. Powell said CCA received feedback from Columbia, Missouri, which has an area very similar to Campus Corner, stating they had a number of issues with the multi-space meter parking management system. He said CCA feels very strongly that the individual smart meter management system, a single pole with two (2) meters covering two (2) spaces, would work better in the Campus Corner area. He said the rate increase should provide for fairly substantial revenue increase to the City of Norman.

Chairman Griffith asked if the multi-space meter parking management system can be programmed so that the meters can deny payment for a space that is designated commercial and Mr. Lombardo said yes the technology exists for both the multi-space meter system and individual smart meter system. Councilmember Williams felt a negative aspect of the multi-space meter system would be if a person had to keep walking back and forth from their car to the payment center during inclement weather, i.e., person parks, walks 120 feet to make a payment only to be denied because it is before 10:00 a.m., etc. Chairman Griffith agreed and said the parking spaces would definitely need appropriate, visible signage stating *parking spaces for commercial parking only until 10:00 a.m.*

Mayor Rosenthal asked Staff to contact Columbia, Missouri, to get more information on the issues they had with their multi-space parking management system and bring the information back to the Committee. She said she favors the multi-space parking meters and stations, with appropriate signage, because she felt it would help remove impediments to pedestrian access on corners. Mr. Powell said CCA felt making payment 120 feet from the parking space would be an inconvenience to potential customers. Councilmember Gallagher asked Mr. Powell if the CCA researched other city statistics and/or impacts regarding the meter rate increase after the first hour and Mr. Powell said no, but CCA felt the suggestion of having free parking for the first 30 minutes would assist those wanting to make a quick trip. Councilmember Williams asked if there are sensors on the single meter payment system that would reset the meter if the car left the space before the time was up and Mr. Powell said yes, stating that the single meter payment systems would also accept credit/debit payments, as well as cash.

Staff recommends the Pay by Space System (multi-space meters and payment centers) that will also be used in the DPMS because the parking system will offer flexibility for on-street use and the on-street parking in the Campus Corner area could be managed with this technology and would afford parking control consistency for on-street and off-street parking users. The hand-held enforcement devices planned for the DPMS will simplify the tasks associated with enforcement in the Campus Corner area. Chairman Griffith felt the CCPMS should implement the multi-space parking meter station since the same system is to be utilized in the Downtown Parking Lot and agreed with Staff that consistency throughout the city is important. Mr. Lombardo said once the DPMS is established, Staff will be able to collect and give data to Council that can assist with the CCPMS and Chairman Griffith said that will help determine how citizens will respond to a parking management system before moving forward in the Campus Corner area.

Chairman Griffith asked if the parking meters will have an overall time limit and Mr. Lombardo said that particular issue will need to be addressed in the business plan. Mr. O'Leary said Staff will bring back more information, as well as Parking Maintenance System Business Plan (PMSBP) options, which are key to the success of a parking management system. He said once a parking management system is in place, the modern equipment will allow a number of options/changes, i.e., first hour free, parking \$3.00 per hour on Saturdays, etc.

Councilmember Jungman said the need for a parking management system in the Campus Corner area is evident and to have both a plan and funding come together is very nice. He appreciated the Committee's time and hopes to continue moving forward on this topic.

Items submitted for the record

1. PowerPoint Presentation entitled, "Campus Corner Parking Management" Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee, dated October 22, 2012, presented by Mr. Shawn O'Leary, Director of Public Works and Mr. Angelo Lombardo, Traffic Engineer

DISCUSSION REGARDING A DRAFT OUTLINE OF HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL REGULATIONS.

Ms. Susan Connors, Director of Planning and Community Development, said Staff presented the High Density Discussion Series Final Report at the September 24, 2012, Community Planning and Transportation Committee (CPTC) meeting, along with a list of the nine (9) recommended elements for consideration in drafting a future ordinance. She said the elements were based on community input gathered throughout the high density discussion series and were discussed during the CPTC meeting. The recommended elements are as follows:

1. **Encourage mixed uses with high density residential development.**
2. **Encourage a mix of architectural styles emphasizing high quality design that contributes to the overall community character of the area.**
3. **Require architecturally integrated parking decks for new development.**
4. **Develop a comprehensive approach to managing spillover parking into neighborhoods that surround community destinations.**
5. **Require a design review process and develop design guidelines to regulate appearance, building materials, size and placement, etc.**
6. **Require a Traffic Impact Analysis for all high density projects.**
7. **Define areas that are appropriate for high density residential land use. Public consensus was to keep high density separate from blocks with predominantly single family character.**
8. **Define maximum residential density for specific areas such as Campus Corner, Downtown, Porter Corridor, etc. Strongest opinions were as follows:**
 - a. *Campus Corner: allow 40-50 du/ac*
 - b. *Downtown: split between 40-50 du/ac and over 100 du/ac*
 - c. *Porter Corridor: split between under 30 du/ac and 40-50 du/ac*
 - d. *Areas Outside of Central Norman: opinions ranged between 30-40 du/ac to 100 du/ac*
9. **Define maximum building heights for specific areas such as Campus Corner, Downtown, Porter Corridor, etc. Strongest opinions were as follows:**
 - *Campus Corner: allow three (3) stories*
 - *Downtown: allow five (5) stories or over*
 - *Porter Corridor: allow over five (5) stories*
 - *Areas Outside of Central Norman: allow three (3) stories*

Ms. Connors said at the Committee's request, Staff developed a draft outline of High Density Residential (HDR) zoning district, which is very preliminary and intended simply to start the Committee's discussion of the specific elements that should/must/could be included in a future HDR ordinance. She said the Committee expressed an initial preference for the creation of a single zoning category that would allow high density residential land uses in Norman and the draft outline HDR zoning district is structured as a single zoning category.

Ms. Connors said a great deal of input was received at the High Density discussions and Staff continues to research high density residential land use and mixed use buildings throughout the country and in Norman's peer cities in order to identify best practices as well as pitfalls to be avoided.

Adding high density residential land uses in Norman has the potential to be an economic boom to the community, broadening the range of housing options for current and future residents and improving the quality of life for Core Area residents. However, in order to be effective in advancing community goals and achieving broad-based community support, a future high density ordinance must be well-vetted in public meetings in order to craft future regulations that anticipate the impact on all stakeholders. She said any future HDR ordinance will require definitions.

Ms. Connors highlighted the draft HDR ordinance as follows:

General Provisions: The High Density Residential (HDR) zone is a high density multi-dwelling zone. The density will generally range up to _____ units per acre characterized by building heights of up to _____ stories, depending on location and percentage of lot coverage. *Height and stories were left blank because Staff did not have enough time to identify parameters.* Generally, the HDR zone will be located on arterial streets where housing can match the availability of public services and can support commercial areas.

Permitted Uses: Apartments, Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Units, retail sales and service, office, and mixed use building.

Density, Area, Height, Bulk and Coverage Standards: Density is controlled so that housing can match the availability of public services and the availability of commercial areas. In areas with the highest level of public services, the minimum density standards ensure that the service capacity is not wasted and that the City's housing goals are met. Building height regulations may need to be divided into community areas, i.e., Campus Corner, Downtown, Porter Avenue, and Non-Core Area, etc., which would have different maximum allowable heights in order to be compatible in the different areas. Building coverage standards, along with height and setback standards, limit the overall bulk of structures and assure that larger buildings will not have a footprint that overwhelms adjacent development. The maximum building coverage may need to be defined by zone, depending on existing community character and the prevailing coverage of surrounding buildings. Council may want to consider defining both minimum and maximum building setbacks from a public right-of-way or property line to building face in order to allow flexibility in different settings, but still promote a more compact urban form of development and re-development.

Architectural Standards: There is no particular architectural style proposed for high-density multi-family residential structures, but the primary focus should be on constructing a high quality residential environment which encourages a mix of architectural styles emphasizing high quality design that contributes to the overall community character of the area. In general, the design of multi-family developments should consider compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood and measures should be taken to ensure the height and bulk of higher density projects do not negatively impact these lower density residential areas. This section addresses the design guidelines, compatibility, building exterior walls and materials as well as the standards regarding rehabilitation of existing buildings.

Open Space (outdoor area) and Landscape Standards address both public and private space to assure that some of the land not covered by buildings is of adequate size, shape, and location to be usable for outdoor recreation or relaxation to include patios, balconies, courtyards, and play areas.

Public Open Space Standards are to create an attractive public realm such as sidewalks, public seating areas, plazas, areas for public art, and public transit stops. Construction of public open space would be developed by a fee-in-lieu-of payment, which would allow the City to fund and develop public open space in addition to what is required for the project. Public sidewalks are required to be a minimum width of 16 feet.

Landscape Standards are intended to enhance the overall appearance of residential developments and institutional campuses in multi-dwelling zones. The landscaping improves the residential character of the area, breaks up large expanses of paved areas and structures, provides privacy to the residents, and provides separation from streets. Landscaping also helps cool air temperature, intercept rainfall and reduce stormwater run-off, and provide food for people as well as a habitat for birds and other wildlife.

Site Development Standards address general requirements, grading, streets, vehicular access, drives, parking, utilities and storm water. The general requirements state high density residential and mixed use buildings that include high density residential must be located on an arterial street, all high density residential buildings must have direct access to at grade sidewalks, and primary pedestrian circulation.

Lighting Standards will be required and regulated by the Zoning Ordinance because lighting is already adequately addressed in the Zoning Ordinance.

Signage Standards will be required and regulated by the Sign Code because signage is already adequately addressed in the Sign Code.

The general requirements for **Pedestrian Standards** state pedestrian walkways should be separate and distinct from parking areas and drive aisles and include landscaping/trees, lighting and decorative paving at crossings. Streets and alleys should not only connect internally but also be publicly accessible and connect to adjacent streets and neighboring development; anticipate future connections to adjacent parcels to provide future connectivity; and pedestrian and bike paths should be used where street connections to adjacent neighborhoods are infeasible. Pedestrian standards also addressed pedestrian paving, site furnishings and amenities, and pedestrian connections.

Accessory commercial uses in the HDR zone are allowed in order to provide convenient support services to the residents of the building and to encourage a reduction in auto trips. Other topics addressed include: uses allowed, structure types, size, and signs.

Ms. Connors requested Committee direction and said Staff can continue working on high density design guidelines including any additional guidelines the Committee felt would be appropriate. Mayor Rosenthal said one way to deal with high density would be by Plan amendment stating high density would be appropriate in a particular areas, i.e., downtown, Campus Corner, etc., and asked if a Plan amendment would eliminate the issue of specifying the number of stories and/or building height. Ms. Connors said special planning areas could be created in the 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan (LUP) adding special requirements in specific areas for high density residential. She said limited overlay districts having certain elements can also be created for different parts of the City.

Councilmember Jungman asked if the HRD ordinance language would merely suggest building limits and Ms. Connors said it would be up to Council, but felt Staff would make recommendations rather than suggestions. Councilmember Jungman suggested consistency with the MUD density requirements, i.e., maximum allowed density is 30 units per gross acre. He felt high density needs to be well defined for the development community and Chairman Griffith said perhaps a maximum height and/or maximum density should be determined instead of distinguishing between different areas of Norman so that there would be an absolute limit. Chairman Griffith asked if having an absolute limit would simplify an HDR Ordinance and Ms. Connors said yes. Ms. Connors said Staff provided all the options discussed during the high density development public meetings, i.e., maximum heights, maximum density, specific areas, etc., not wanting to jump to a conclusion about what the final high density outcome should be or what the Committee and/or Council may or may not desire.

Mayor Rosenthal asked if other ways to address compatibility of high density relative to its surroundings were researched and whether Staff looked at similar ordinances for other cities. Ms. Connors said yes, some city ordinances created setbacks, street wall height, while others dealt with compatibility using architecture design, i.e., requiring a heavy base and lightening the building materials as they went higher. Councilmember Jungman felt a design review committee would be appropriate to make recommendations concerning high density compatibility and durability because the proposed language was permissive and suggestive. Ms. Connors said language can be less nebulous so that a design review board would not be necessary.

Councilmember Jungman asked if the HDR ordinance is proposing a zoning category or more of an overlay district and Ms. Connors said Council direction was for Staff to propose a zoning district. He asked if the Mixed-Use District (MUD) would go away and Ms. Connors felt a MUD would still be utilized and appropriate in situations when developers wanted to create a broader mixed-use single building while keeping the density lower.

Chairman Griffith asked (regarding accessory commercial uses in the HDR zone) if there is more than one commercial use possible for a residential building would it need to be rezoned as a mixed-use district and Ms. Connors said no because a mixed-use building is acceptable. She said the accessory use is merely being limited to five (5) percent of the floor area and would only be accessed by the tenants in the building, such as a convenience store in a hotel or resort.

Councilmember Jungman said he is concerned whether one (1) parking space per bedroom for residential units is correct and, if it is not correct, a massive overflow for parking could be created. He said if adequate parking is not put into the HDR ordinance, he felt the City would be responsible for

constructing a parking garage. Councilmember Jungman said he certainly did not want that to happen and he did not know what the correct parking space number should be, but felt that the parking issue still needed to be considered and researched going forward. Ms. Connors said during Staff research of other city high density ordinances, the requirement for one (1) parking space per bedroom for residential units was found to be a *high* parking number. Councilmember Gallagher asked which cities were researched and Ms. Connors said Portland, Oregon; Overland Park, Kansas; Boulder, Colorado; Rodgers, New York; Syracuse, New York; etc. Councilmember Gallagher felt two (2) parking spaces, rather than one (1) would be more appropriate. Mayor Rosenthal asked if other cities imposed impact fees relating to high density parking and overflow parking. Councilmember Williams asked what the impact fees would go towards and Mayor Rosenthal said a parking structure if a high density development causes parking overflow impact on neighboring areas. She said she is not for or against a parking impact fee but the issue needs to be researched. Mayor Rosenthal requested Staff bring back research and/or high density ordinances found for the other cities so the Committee could study and compare all the factors, i.e., type of community, transit, available overflow parking, impact fees, etc.

Councilmember Jungman felt the C-3 Special Use zoning category can be a loophole because there are essentially no requirements and asked whether or not language in the HDR ordinance can address that issue, i.e., so that a developer can not request a C-3 Special zoning when submitting an application for a large apartment building simply because it would not have as many requirements and/or regulations. Ms. Connors said C-3 Special Use zoning would not be appropriate in a lot of locations in Norman, so to a certain extent, that is not a widespread problem; however, because C-3 Special Zoning exists in the Downtown and Campus Corner areas, any new applications requesting C-3 Special Zoning within those areas would be appropriate. Councilmember Jungman would like developers to utilize the high density options rather than bend or skirt around them by using C-3 Special Zoning and Ms. Connors said Staff would research this issue.

Mayor Rosenthal said when Denver, Colorado, re-developed their city's downtown area, outdoor plazas were created. She asked, when creating high density, how the City can ensure public open spaces such as plazas within areas that do not have adequate space to do so, i.e., Downtown, Campus Corner, and requested Staff research Denver, Colorado, to see how they achieved it. Ms. Connors thought the City of Denver incorporated some type of a downtown re-development district but would investigate and bring back information to the Committee. Mayor Rosenthal said the proposed HDR ordinance language stated ...“Construction of public open space would be developed by a fee-in-lieu-of payment...” and if there is no space left how can the City make certain that there will be opportunities for some public open space going forward. Ms. Connors said Staff felt the City could consider using a fee-in-lieu-of payment in order to develop/construct something in an area that was appropriate for pedestrians within the community. Councilmember Gallagher said he does not view open space as a 10 feet square on the 10th floor, but rather as outside or an inside space that gives you a vision of the sky and suggested making the requirement for open spaces be *outside*. Chairman Griffith agreed and felt when space allows, the HDR ordinance should encourage outside open space.

Councilmember Gallagher said the proposed HDR ordinance includes a great deal of information for consideration and in his opinion still deserved a lot of discussion. He felt high density will not be suitable for all areas in Norman, stating more research was needed before the HDR ordinance would be acceptable.

Ms. Mary Francis, 850 C Cardinal Creek Condos, said she was concerned about the possible parking issues that can be caused by high density development and felt a HDR ordinance should require low-water use toilets.

Mr. Chris Elsey, Elsey Partners, Manhattan, Kansas, said his company builds high density development and proposed the building height to be 75 feet if the City of Norman requires a parking structure because the building would need to be four (4) and/or five (5) stories tall to make the economics work out. He said if the City of Norman does not require a parking structure then the building could be three (3) stories. Mr. Elsey said regarding the requirement for one (1) parking space per bedroom; the available parking will determine how many people will live in the high density structure; i.e., if the parking is limited it will control the population; therefore, he felt the Committee, Council, and/or citizens did not need to worry about the unit density regarding parking.

Mr. Elsey said he sent Council reports about student housing/apartment complexes that Elsey Partners developed in Manhattan and Stillwater and felt there is a huge misperception that there will be a lot of overflow parking from high density development which is not true and unfounded. He said another limiting factor will be the requirement only allowing high density to be built on arterial streets. He said Elsey Partners is constructing three (3) high density projects in Stillwater and none are built on arterial streets.

Mr. Elsey said he has an item on Council's agenda tomorrow night addressing high density development and as a developer he is frustrated because it seems like Elsey Partners is not getting any feedback from the summer long high density public forums, Council, etc. Chairman Griffith said the Committee, Council, and citizens of Norman are trying to understand high density and while the high density development public forums and on going Committee discussions are necessary, it will take time to develop parameters that will work for the Norman community. Councilmember Jungman said Elsey Partners could voluntarily postpone their agenda item until after the conclusion of the high density discussions.

Ms. Connors said because of the abundance of information that has been gathered and requested to date, she felt it will take Staff approximately 45 to 60 days before a full and useful report on high density will be available. She said Staff will provide a progress report and preliminary draft HDR ordinance at the November 26, 2012, CPTC and Chairman Griffith said at that point, the Committee will decide when to schedule a future joint meeting with the Planning Commission and a future study session.

Items submitted for the record

1. Memorandum dated October 22, 2012, from Ms. Susan F. Connors, AICP, Director of Planning and Community Development, to Chairman and Members of Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee
2. High Density Residential Zoning District Draft 1, Attachment A, dated October 22, 2012

CART RIDERSHIP REPORT INCLUDING SAFERIDE AND EXTENDED SERVICE.

Mr. Cody Ponder, Cleveland Area Rapid Transit (CART), said CART Ridership was down a little in September but he anticipated year to date (YTD) FY13 route to have a 2% increase over YTD FY12 routes. Mayor Rosenthal asked if Norman Regional Hospital (NRH) keeps record of ridership numbers to and from NRH and Mr. Ponder said CART provides NRH a quarterly report of the total trips and passengers to all NRH properties. He distributed the 2nd and 3rd NRH CARTaccess quarterly reports and said he will forward all NRH quarterly reports to the Committee. Mr. Ponder said CART provided NRH with the 2012 number of total trips and passengers for comparison going forward.

Items submitted for the record

1. Cleveland Area Rapid Transit Ridership Totals for the Month of September 2012
2. Letter dated July 12, 2012 to Ms. Paula Price, RN, MPH, MS Director, Norman Regional Health Complex, prepared by Ms. June Van Cleve, regarding CARTaccess trips and passengers to/from NROM for 2nd Quarter 2012
3. CARTaccess trips and passengers transported to/from Norman Regional Health Complex for 3rd Quarter 2012

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION.

None.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

City Clerk

Mayor