CITY COUNCIL
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 22, 2013

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 April, 2013, 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, and Williams Chairman Griffith
ABSENT:	None
OTHERS PRESENT:	Mayor Cindy Rosenthal Councilmember Robert Castleberry Councilmember Linda Lockett Councilmember Elect Greg Heiple Councilmember Elect Stephen Tyler Holman
STAFF PRESENT:	Ms. Susan Atkinson, Planner I Mr. Jeff Bryant, City Attorney Ms. Susan Connors, Planning and Community Development Director Mr. Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator Ms. Leah Messner, Assistant City Attorney Ms. Karla Chapman, Administrative Technician

Item 1, being:

CART RIDERSHIP REPORT INCLUDING SAFERIDE AND EXTENDED SERVICE.

Mr. Doug Myers, OU Parking and Transportation Administrator, distributed a flyer entitled *"Cleveland Area Rapid Transit (CART) Update 2013"* to the Committee. Chairman Griffith asked if anyone had any comments and/or questions regarding the CART Update 2013 and March 2013 CART Ridership report and no comments and/or questions were received.

Items submitted for the record

1. Cleveland Area Rapid Transit Ridership Totals for the Month of March 2013
2. Cleveland Area Rapid Transit Update dated April 2013

Item 2, being:

CONTINUED DISCUSSION REGARDING A DRAFT ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING A HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT.

Chairman Griffith said the Committee has received a great deal of public input regarding high density, both for and against, and asked the audience to forego public input tonight stating the Committee would like to do more intense work on this topic. He said there will be another high density public meeting, before this topic is scheduled as agenda item for Council consideration, at which time the public can address any concerns and/or opinions regarding high density.

Ms. Susan Connors, Director of Planning and Community Development, said at the March 11, 2013, Community Planning and Transportation Committee (CPTC) meeting, the Committee unanimously agreed to eliminate the rooftop garden provision from the proposed draft allowing an eight (8) foot height bonus for construction of rooftop gardens. She said the Committee requested Staff research and/or refine the following topics to include: 1) narrow the district within the Core Area where more restrictive High Density (HD) regulations would apply, 2) identify arterial and collector roads in the Core Area, and 3)strengthen ordinance requirements for active street-level uses and street design.

Item 2, continued:

The following maps were distributed to the Committee reflecting all of the major and minor arterial roads in the Core Area with collector streets noted, smaller district within the Core Area where more restrictive HD regulations would apply, and locations identified within the smaller district (in the Core Area) where High Density Residential (HDR) zoning could meet the locational conditions delineated in the proposed ordinance.

Ms. Connors said Staff created a new zoning category and the HDR zoning would not be an overlay district. She said those seeking high density zoning must apply to rezone their property and any rezoning application triggers requirement for a predevelopment hearing which is followed by a Planning Commission and Council review. Ms. Connors said high density zoning would be granted by Council only if specific conditions can be met. She highlighted the major issues addressed at the High Density Dialogues and the proposed HD ordinance.

Intent and Permitted Land Uses: Staff said the general intent of the HDR Zoning is to promote construction of high quality, architecturally compatible facades built close to the street with parking, private open space, and minimizing impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The permitted land uses include apartments, condominiums, mixed-use building, office, restaurants; no drive-up or drive-through service, retail sales and service operated within enclosed building, and parking garages.

Residential versus Mixed Uses, Location, and Site Development: Citizens indicated they preferred a HDR ordinance to define areas appropriate for high density located on arterial roads only. The proposed HDR ordinance allows the location of HDR on arterial streets or within two blocks of an arterial and adjacent to collector if not fronting on an arterial. All parking drive access shall be located at a minimum onto a collector street and all HDR buildings must have direct access to sidewalks from all non-emergency building entrances that connect to the public circulation system. When proposed HDR site does not front on arterial street, any intervening land use between HDR and nearest arterial must be commercial or office.

Density: The majority of participants at the High Density Public Dialogue felt Campus Corner should have 40 to 50 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). Responses were divided between 30 to 40 du/ac and 100 du/ac for the downtown area and other areas; therefore, 70 du/ac for the downtown and other areas was determined to be the final response since it splits the difference. The draft HDR ordinance proposes: 130 du/ac for Campus Corner, 175 du/ac for downtown, and no maximum for other areas.

Height: Participants at the High Density Public Dialogue felt Campus Corner should have a three (3) story height limit, downtown should have a five (5) story height limit, and other areas should have a three (3) story height limit. The draft HDR ordinance proposes 55 feet maximum for Campus Corner, 75 feet maximum for downtown, and no maximum for other areas.

Setbacks and Architectural Standards: The HDR ordinance will regulate front setbacks, building exterior walls and facades, electrical equipment, service area, and trash. Staff said the architectural standards would prohibit materials, e.g., rough sawn wood, board and batten wood, vinyl siding, exterior insulation finishing system, tilt-up concrete panels, painted concrete block, pre-finished or painted corrugation metal siding, standard single or double-tee concrete systems, smooth-faced gray or stained concrete block, translucent, Plexiglas, glossy metal or backlit vinyl awnings or illumination of such awnings, and reflective or mirrored glass.

Open Space, Landscape, and Pedestrian Standards: Required open space may be individual outdoor areas such as balconies or patios or shared areas such as courtyards and must be a minimum of 20% of the total gross site areas within the project property lines, with 10% of the 20% being landscaped. The pedestrian standards shall be a minimum five (5) feet wide and follow Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility guidelines. The paving materials shall be a minimum of concrete, but enhanced paving materials are encouraged as well as pedestrian activity such as paved walks, plazas, and other amenity areas. Pedestrian amenities are required to connect internal pedestrian areas to public sidewalk system and to adjacent neighborhoods. Walkways should be separate and distinct from parking areas as well as drive aisles and shall include landscaping, lighting, and decorative pavings at crossings.

Item 2, continued:

Parking: Citizens who participated during the High Density Dialogues felt shared-use structured parking should be required and should be architecturally integrated into building design using high quality materials and signage. The draft ordinance proposes structured parking with one (1) space per bedroom, utilizing Section 22:431.5 of Zoning Ordinance for non-residential units. Parking structures will be architecturally integrated with finished matching architectural theme of development and provide visually engaging environment for pedestrians.

Lighting, Signage, Storm Water, and Traffic: The proposed HDR lighting will be required and regulated by the Zoning Ordinance, the signage will be required and regulated by the Sign Code, and the storm water will be required and regulated by the Engineering Design Standards and Specifications. Traffic Studies will be required for all HDR requests and shall conform to current Engineering Design Criteria for Traffic Impact of Developments.

Design Review Committee: Citizens commented during the High Density Dialogues that a design review process and design guidelines to regulate the appearance, building materials, size, placement, etc., be developed for high density. The draft ordinance proposes a Design Review Committee comprised of five (5) members; two (2) architects, planners, etc., two (2) realtors with demonstrated knowledge of urban design issues, and one (1) citizen at-large.

Neighbors for Norman (N4N) draft HDR ordinance: Ms. Connors said following the March 11, 2013, CPTC meeting, an ad hoc group of citizens formed calling themselves Neighbors 4 Norman (N4N) and drafted their own version of a High Density Residential (HDR) ordinance. N4N based their ordinance contents on the City's draft HDR ordinance, on the results of the Scenario Preference Survey carried out during the August 31, 2012, High Density Discussion Dialogue, and on the results of a privately written survey that was selectively distributed to participants at the August 31, 2012, High Density Discussion Dialogue.

The N4N draft ordinance was distributed to the Committee and Ms. Connors said both the N4N draft ordinance and the City draft ordinance seek to regulate the same issues within HDR land uses. The site development limits HDR land uses to arterial streets only, proposes the maximum building height of 37 feet in Campus Corner and elsewhere in the Core Area, and a maximum height of 63 feet in downtown. N4N draft proposes a maximum density of 40 du/ac in Campus Corner, 70 du/ac for downtown, and 50 du/ac in other Core Area locations.

The N4N draft does not require structured parking, but does require two (2) parking spaces per bedroom. The N4N draft proposes seven (7) members for the Design Review Committee, including four (4) professionals, one (1) citizen-at-large and two (2) citizens living adjacent to zones where HDR is possible.

Conclusions: Among the Committee and members of the public, there is general agreement on many issues, but further discussion is needed for density, height, parking, and composition of a Design Review Committee. Ms. Connors said the Committee has received a great deal of public input regarding HDR zoning over the past 10 months. The process began with six (6) bi-weekly sessions of the High Density Dialogues and public comments were received during five CPTC meetings.

Ms. Connors asked for input and guidance from the Committee and whether or not to recommend the Staff proposed HDR ordinance, which would conclude with public hearings at Planning Commission and City Council.

Councilmember Jungman said the direction provided by the citizens who participated in the High Density Dialogues were very clear and now the citizens (N4N) have drafted their own version of a HDR ordinance. He said the N4N draft HDR is not unreasonable and closely resembles the Lawrence, Kansas, HDR ordinance. Councilmember Jungman felt the Staff's proposed HDR ordinance has gotten so far away from what the citizens want and the N4N draft HDR ordinance is viable for our community.

Mayor Rosenthal said Councilmember Jungman made a good point and in her opinion she felt Staff's proposed HDR ordinance has gotten a long way from the citizen input gathered at the High Density Dialogues. She understands the argument can be that the structures can be *"up to"* 55 feet in Campus Corner or *"up to"* 75 feet in downtown; however, those maximum heights can be very scary to established, healthy, single family neighborhoods in the community.

Item 2, continued:

Mayor Rosenthal suggested looking at three High Density (HD) options for Norman, i.e., HD1, HD2, and HD3. She said the HD1 could reflect what citizens indicated during the High Density Dialogues, i.e., lower density structures with a maximum height of three (3) stories such as a three story townhouse without structured parking that could be placed under the first floor, at ground level, or have off-street parking. She said HD3 might be higher density structures with a maximum 75 foot limit and possibly have a parking structure requirement. Mayor Rosenthal felt all projects, whether HD1, HD2, or HD3, would have the requirement of checking the available infrastructure, i.e., streets, water, sewer, and emergency support, as well as the character of the surrounding neighborhoods. She is concerned with a "one size fits all" ordinance could be a very scary idea for many community residents and felt the Committee should fine-tune the ordinance before moving forward.

Councilmember Castleberry asked if the suggestion of having three levels of high density would be defined by the HDR project type rather than the HDR project area and Mayor Rosenthal said yes. Councilmember Castleberry said he agreed with that concept, but wondered if determining the type and/or area would be the role of the Design Review Committee (DRC). Councilmember Williams liked the three HD levels; however, he agreed and felt the duties of the DRC, Staff, Planning Commission, and Council are to determine the type and area for each HDR project. Councilmember Gallagher said the HDR ordinance should be area specific and he liked the idea of giving developers a low, medium, and high option for high density. Councilmember Williams said just because a HDR ordinance might allow a 75 foot height limit does not mean that a 75 foot building will be constructed for every high density project. Chairman Griffith felt giving developers the opportunity to choose from three high density options will allow viability and success.

The Committee discussed and felt all high density projects should be considered on its own merit and require a traffic impact study, with the goal to maintain the current street level of service (LOS). Mayor Rosenthal felt a parking impact fee provides an incentive for developers to go with the lower density. She said a parking impact fee could go to a dedicated fund for a parking structure that would serve the area. The Committee requested Staff draft a HDR ordinance using the following criteria for HD1, HD2, and HD3 as follows:

	HIGH DENSITY 1 (HD1)	**HIGH DENSITY 2 (HD2)**	**HIGH DENSITY 3 (HD3)**
CRITERIA			
Height	37 foot maximum	48 foot – 52 foot maximum	75 foot maximum
Density	40 du/ac maximum	75 du/ac maximum	Unlimited
Parking	On-site parking required; no structural parking required; and no parking impact fee required	No structural parking required; however, optional parking impact fee would provide tradeoff for a parking structure	Structural parking will be required and could be placed under the building; parking impact fee required
Traffic Impact Study	Required and goal to maintain current Level of Service (LOS)	Required and goal to maintain current Level of Service (LOS)	Required and goal to maintain current Level of Service (LOS)
Infrastructure	Public Works and Utilities Departments will continue to review	Public Works and Utilities Departments will continue to review	Public Works and Utilities Departments will continued to review
Retail	No retail	Optional retail	Retail required on lower level
Design Review Committee	Yes	Yes	Yes

Mr. Bryant asked the Committee if this issue needed to come back to the CPTC or forwarded to a Study Session for full Council review. Councilmember Jungman said the timeline included a public meeting and Councilmember Williams asked if a Study Session could include a public meeting. Mayor Rosenthal said that is possible and also suggested inviting the Planning Commission.

Item 2, continued:

Items submitted for the record

1. Memorandum dated April 22, 2013, from Ms. Susan F. Connors, AICP, Director of Planning and Community Development, to Chairman and Members of the Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee, with Attachment A, PowerPoint presentation entitled "High Density Residential Zoning District," dated April 22, 2013; Attachment B, map of arterial roads in urbanized Norman; Attachment C, smaller district within Norman's Core Area where more restrictive regulations would apply; Attachment D, map of places within the Core Area where High Density Residential (HDR) zoning could meet the locational conditions delineated in the proposed ordinance; Attachment E, memorandum dated April 22, 2013, from Ms. Susan F. Connors, AICP, Director of Planning and Community Development, to Chairman and Members of the Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee and *Proposed High Density Residential Zoning District prepared by Ward 4 ad hoc Committee (Neighbors 4 Norman) on High Density*, dated March 19, 2013; and Attachment F, emails from David Boren, Oklahoma University (OU) President
2. Memorandum dated April 19, 2013, from Ms. Susan F. Connors, AICP, Director of Planning and Community Development, to Chairman and Members of the Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee, with Attachment G, *Draft Ordinance for High Density Residential Zoning prepared by City of Norman Staff*, dated April 22, 2013
3. Sign In Sheets for the Community Planning and Transportation Committee meeting dated April 22, 2013

Item 3, being:

MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION.

None.

The meeting adjourned at 7:11 p.m.

_____ _____

City Clerk Mayor