HIGH DENSITY DISCUSSION SERIES FINAL REPORT

NORMAN, OKLAHOMA

JUNE 11-AUGUST 30, 2012

1. INTRODUCTION

In May, the Council Community Planning and Transportation Committee directed City staff to convene a series of community discussions throughout the summer on the future of high density residential development in Norman. The committee gave this direction in response to significant community opposition to applications the City received for very high density residential development in the Campus Corner area.

The committee also requested that City staff work with staff and volunteers from the Xenia Institute, a Norman-based non-profit agency whose mission is to bring people together in a safe place for transformative dialogue. Xenia team members facilitated table discussions at Meetings 2-5 to ensure that all participants' comments were given a fair hearing in the discussion process.

Current Zoning Districts

The City of Norman currently has several zoning districts that allow apartment developments in a suburban setting. RM-6 is the zoning district that has traditionally been used for high density housing in Norman. There is no density cap for this zoning district, but the densities that have been achieved after all the setbacks, parking and landscaping is accounted for, has primarily been in the range of 20 to 25 dwelling units per acre.

Mixed Use Buildings, which require residential and non-residential uses, are allowed as a Special Use in the O-1, CO, C-1, C-2 and C-3 zoning districts. If a mixed use building is approved, the regulations of the underlying zoning district apply, such as setbacks, height and parking requirements, unless the Planning Commission or City Council places conditions on the use which modify the regulations.

The Mixed Use Development (MUD) Zoning District allows higher density residential development and is the only zoning district that has a density maximum of 30 dwelling units per acre. This district also requires a mixture of residential types.

The Planned Unit Development District (PUD) can be used to create any combination of uses on a property. However, this zoning district requires generally a district area of two acres or larger and a minimum of ten percent of the gross acreage in open space. The applications submitted for the high density developments are designed to be on small lots and to provide open areas internal to the developments, therefore, not meeting the requirements of the PUD zoning district.

What is the Purpose of this Report Document?

- ❑ Describe process
- ❑ Report findings
- ❑ Draw initial conclusions

What Was Staff Asked to Do and Why?

The Committee directed staff to engage citizens in a detailed discussion process about community comfort with the idea of higher density residential land use in Norman—not defined per se—just density which exceeds that which has been customary since the adoption of the 1954 Zoning Ordinance.

Public sentiments about high density gathered during the series will allow City Council to craft regulations governing such development that balance market demands for higher density with public concerns about preserving community character and neighborhood integrity.

- ❑ The committee set the following meeting schedule:

Meeting Date	Content/Topic
June 11	Introduction to High Density Presentation
June 28	Compatibility and Location
July 9	Height and Mixed Uses
July 26	Parking and Infrastructure
August 13	Design
August 30	Series Wrap Up Session

- ❑ Begin series with an introductory session on the topic of high density residential development.

- ❑ Follow up introduction with four public discussion sessions based on Council-identified topics as a means to engage and educate the community on issues related to high density development.

  Discussion topics included:
  - Compatibility and Location
  - Height and Mixed Uses
  - Parking and Infrastructure
  - Design

- ❑ Hold a Wrap-Up Session to allow participants to weigh in on various aspects of high density

- ❑ Submit a final report summarizing the process and conclusions

What Did the Discussion Series Accomplish?

- ❑ Using Committee-identified topics, several survey techniques and a facilitated discussion process, staff tested the boundaries of the community's comfort with the idea of higher density development in Norman.

- ❑ Staff also provided the public with a wide variety of information on the subject of high density development as a means to promote sound, publically-supported decision-making about what's right for the future of the community.

2. SUMMARY OF PROCESS, PARTICIPATION AND IMPORTANT ISSUES

Process

Between June 11 and August 30, 2012, City staff held six public meetings on various topics included in the larger subject of increasing residential density in the City of Norman. Materials from each meeting were posted on the City of Norman website a few days after each meeting.

The first meeting on June 11, 2012 was held in the City Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building. Meetings 2-4 and 6 were held in the Norman High School Conference Center. Meeting 5 was held in the Norman High School Library.

During Meeting 1, staff introduced the subject of high density followed by a brief Q&A about the process to follow. Meetings 2-5 included summaries of the previous meeting and presentations about each night's topic(s), followed by round table discussions of specific questions. Two or three discussion questions were provided for each discussion.

Each table discussion was led by a volunteer facilitator from the Xenia Institute. All comments generated during table discussions were written on large sheets of paper by a recorder. Meetings 2-5 concluded with a reporting back of the content of each table's discussion. For Meetings 4 and 5, the reporting-back process was streamlined to Top Five responses for each question from each table. However all table responses were transcribed into documents which were posted on the City website, http://www.ci.norman.ok.us/cm/high-density-development-community-discussion

Participation

According to a compilation of meetings sign-in sheets (Appendix A), 168 individuals participated in a total of six sessions with a low attendance of 61 and a high of 78. Each meeting drew new participants. At Meetings 2-5, participants were randomly assigned to a table as a way to maximize spontaneity and avoid blocks of opinions. Tables each seated 8-10 participants, plus a facilitator and recorder. Staff participation for each meeting included the Planning Director along with 8-10 City staff members.

Meetings were publicized in advance in the two community newspapers of record, *The Norman Transcript* and *The Norman Oklahoman*, by email to all participants who had supplied an email address, and on the City of Norman website.

3. TOP FIVE ISSUES IDENTIFIED FOR EACH TOPIC IN HIGH DENSITY ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

During Meetings 2-5, participants were invited to dialogue about several questions related to the larger discussion topic for the evening. All responses from table discussions were later transcribed into a document (Appendix B). Staff analyzed the compilation of table responses in order to identify dominant themes by topic. Those themes are summarized and briefly annotated below.

1. Compatibility

Participants were asked to describe what they saw as the most important aspects of compatibility and prioritize a list of these elements.

- ❑ Height/Mass/Scale
  The size and scale of buildings matter greatly. Participants were nearly unanimous in their declaration that overly large buildings in the wrong locations are undesirable.

- ❑ Architecture
  A requirement for high quality design and building materials that complimented surrounding structures and neighborhoods was important to participants.

- ❑ Parking
  Participants stressed that it is critical to get the parking right in terms of number of spaces, design, location and functionality.

- ❑ Mixed-Use Development on Infill Sites
  Participants strongly supported the idea of mixed use development on infill building sites as long as design was compatible with surrounding area.

- ❑ Design that Promotes Safety, Accessibility and Sociability
  Participants stressed their requirement that high density buildings and surrounding open space be safe, universally accessible and promote sociability.

2. Location

Factoring in compatibility, participants were asked to recommend logical, likely locations for high density residential development in Norman.

- ❑ Downtown
  Participants observed that downtown already has taller buildings, that mixed use is a traditional land use in downtowns, and that there is growing demand to live in downtown areas.

- ❑ Campus Corner
  Given its proximity to OU, many participants see Campus Corner as a logical place for higher density living.

- University North Park (UNP)
  A number of participants felt that UNP was the best place for higher density because it had a lot of space for development, already had stores for residents' convenience, and would not have a negative impact on existing districts and neighborhoods.

- Close to Arterial Streets and Transit
  Many participants stressed the importance of locating higher density dwellings on transit routes to discourage the use of cars

- Walkability
  Many participants spoke of their desire to promote more compact development that allows people to walk more, use cars less, and be able to achieve daily needs within a walkable neighborhood

3. Building Height

Participants were asked to describe what makes taller buildings attractive or unattractive and if tall buildings could add visual interest to Norman.

- Quality, Variety and Diversity of Design
  Participants stated that if buildings had high quality architecture with a variety of design, they could be attractive contributions to the community.

- Context
  Many participants felt they could support taller buildings as long as they were designed not to overwhelm lower-scale buildings.

- Setbacks and Stepbacks
  A number of participants felt that the use of stepbacks creating a lower street wall was a technique that could accommodate density while preserving community character. Many felt that setbacks were important to separate buildings and land uses or to preserve community character.

- Sense of Place
  Many participants stressed the critical importance of maintaining sense of place, or those special characteristics that make Norman what it is.

- Protecting Neighbors' Privacy
  A number of participants stressed the importance of designing and siting taller buildings in a way that still maintains the privacy of adjacent neighbors.

4. Parking, Traffic and Infrastructure

This session focused on whether the City has sufficient public infrastructure to support additional residential density and on public opinions about parking and traffic. Participant

questions elicited concerns about parking with high density and how to minimize negative impacts of parking on surrounding areas.

- Garages/Decks vs. Surface Parking
  Participants stated that garages/decks were generally a more efficient use of land and were required to accommodate higher density residential uses.

- Decks Wrapped With Commercial/Office Uses
  Many participants stated strong support for the construction of parking decks with on-street retail/office frontage as providing more economic and aesthetic bang-for-the-buck to the community.

- Aesthetics and Design
  A number of participants felt that parking decks could be supported if they were architecturally integrated into new building design, and used high quality materials and signage.

- Traffic and Street Improvements to Accommodate High Density
  Many participants stressed the critical importance of approaching traffic and street improvements as part the a whole with required parking.

- Cost of Construction, Maintenance and Operation for Public/Private Sectors
  Participants observed that, depending on the situation, the cost of parking construction, maintenance and operation should be shared by both public and private sectors.

5. Design: Favorite Places in Norman

Participants were asked to identify their favorite places in Norman as a way to acknowledge the kinds of environments people enjoy and support and what aspects of place need to be protected in the existing community or could be recreated in new development.

- Downtown
  Many participants stated that downtown was the heart of the Norman Community.

- Campus Corner
  Many participants value the "funky vibe" and intimate scale of Campus Corner and appreciate small, locally-owned shops and restaurants.

- Core Area/Historic Neighborhoods
  A number of participants value the community character of Norman's Core Area neighborhoods.

- Brookhaven Village
  Many participants felt that Brookhaven Village has nice aesthetics and an attractive business mix.

- OU Campus
  A number of participants expressed their appreciation for the leafy green, park-like character of the OU Campus.

6. Design: Favorite Places in General

Participants were asked to identify their favorite types of places in general as a way to identify what kinds of environments people like and support and what aspects of place need to be protected in the existing community or could be recreated in new development.

- Strong Sense of Place
  Many expressed the vital importance of a feeling referred to as "sense of place." Places said to have a strong sense of place are those which have a strong identity and character that is deeply felt by local inhabitants and by visitors.

- Places That Promote Sociability
  Many participants value open spaces, both public and private, that promote sociability—people interacting, talking together, children playing, people watching.

- Human Scale Places
  Many participants spoke about the importance of maintaining and creating places—both buildings and neighborhoods—that that are designed at a human scale. For example, big box stores are built at the opposite of human scale.

- High Quality Design with Varied Architecture and Nice Landscaping
  Many participants expressed the importance of high quality architecture, allowing a variety of designs and the importance of nice landscaping as the building blocks of attractive places.

- Places That Feel Safe
  Participants expressed their strong preference for design of buildings, parking structures and public spaces that first and foremost feel safe.

---

4. FOUR-SCENARIO SURVEY

Throughout the 10-week discussion series, participants expressed strong opinions to staff and City Council members regarding their desire to have a mechanism for voting on the idea of high density development in Norman at the end of the series.

In consultation with the City Council Planning Committee, staff proposed a method to accomplish that. After reviewing all of the content generated at table discussions in Meetings 2-5, staff devised four distinct scenarios representing very different approaches to future high density residential land uses in Norman.

At Meeting 6, the Wrap-Up Session held on August 30, 2012, four scenario stations were created around the room. Participants were given an unlimited supply of green and red dots and a single gold/yellow starburst. Each station included:

- A narrative description of the scenario in large poster format
- Sample regulations in large poster format
- Likely impacts with agree/disagree columns in large poster format
- Sample illustrations, diagrams and photographs
- Sheets for posting comment cards

Participants were asked to do the following:

- Consider each scenario and its likely impacts
- Use green dots to agree with impact statements or red dots to disagree with impact statements.
- Use a gold starburst /yellow dot if participant agreed with scenario in its entirety
- Write and post comment cards about each scenario

A fifth station was created to display a large-format survey to seek "tipping points" on public opinion regarding specific issues within the larger issue of high density land use—e.g. building height, number of stories, number of dwelling units, etc. This survey also tested opinions about high density in different geographic areas of the city. Participants used the same green and red dots for this exercise.

Conclusions About Voting Process

While the process of voting on scenarios was effective for many participants, a number of people indicated verbally and on comment cards that they were confused by the exercise. In particular, participants worried that if they agreed with an impact statement as factual, that voting "agree" also implied that they supported that outcome. A number of comment cards reflect this concern (see Appendix D).

Scenario Descriptions

<u>Scenario 1: The Status Quo</u>

The status quo scenario is allowed by Norman's current City ordinances. This development is a three-story walk-up apartment building with surface parking located around the buildings. There are no requirements to screen parking lots from the street. Site amenities and landscaping are horizontally integrated on an average lot size of 10-15 acres. Parking lots are adjacent to the 10-foot street landscaping which is adjacent to the sidewalk. The landscaping strip is primarily grass with intermittent trees.

High density development with this approach would be regulated using the existing RM-6 category in the Zoning Ordinance. On-site amenities might include a swimming pool and small clubhouse, picnic spaces with grills and a basketball court.

The number of parking spaces required is specified in the Design Guidelines. The height of the building is not dictated by Code but is a matter of design proposed by the Developer. There are no design guidelines for the building facades.

Scenario 2: Allow Mid-High Density Residential Development

The Mid-High Density Scenario is a single residential building fronting on an arterial street. The building is sited next door to a commercial building with several small businesses and nearby other retail and restaurants which allows convenience shopping for the residents of this building. This scenario allows a residential density of up to 40 units per acre. The building design is regulated by design guidelines and a design review process emphasizing compatibility with community character.

This scenario allows a maximum building height of 4 stories (50 feet) with a required stepback above 2 stores at the street wall. Building design shall be required to have an architecturally articulated bottom and top. The building will be located at the property line that the building entrance will be directly on the sidewalk.

The project requires structured parking that is unobtrusively located and architecturally integrated into development. Parking requirements are specified in the Design Guidelines.

Street trees along public sidewalks are required. Construction of open space or the provision of street furniture along public sidewalks or elsewhere in the public realm should be provide wherever possible. Private open space in the form of balconies, patios, interior courtyards and other open space for tenants will be provided within the building. Public open space such as plazas could be funded by fee-in-lieu-of-payments, which would enable the City to develop public open space for a larger district such as an entire block. Sidewalks are required to have a minimum width of 10 feet.

Scenario 3: High Density, Mixed Use Development

This scenario requires mixed-use development, allowing commercial/office uses and residential uses at a density up to 70 dwelling units per acre (du/ac), located on an arterial street. This building is located in a section the city where other mixed use buildings exist. This building will enhance and support the pedestrian nature of the area. Walkability is important in the design of this building and surrounding buildings to add activity to the area.

This scenario includes deign regulations affecting the look of the building as well as the neighborhood building setbacks. The design requirement emphasize compatibility with community character and commercial design that activates the streetscape and creates an attractive public realm.

This scenario sets a maximum street wall height of 4 stories (50 feet) in urban settings with a maximum allowable height of 6 stories (75 feet). Building design will be required

to have an architecturally articulated bottom, middle and top and be designed in a form that is generally compatible with surrounding structures.

This project requires structure parking that is unobtrusively located and architecturally integrated into the development. The sharing of parking between uses is strongly encouraged. Parking requirements are specified in the Design Guidelines.

A combination of private open space in the form of balconies, patios, interior courtyards, and other types of open space for tenants as well as the construction open space along public sidewalks or elsewhere in the public realm is required. Construction of public open space could also be developed by a fee-in-lieu-of payment, which would allow the City to fund and develop public open space for a larger area such as an entire block. Sidewalks are required to be a minimum width of 16 feet in order to accommodate outdoor seating or other outdoor gathering space on the ground level of the building.

Scenario 4: Very High Density Residential Development

This scenario creates a very high density residential zoning category allowing up to 100 units per acre in Norman, located on an arterial street. The location of this building provides residents access to areas of retail and restaurant activity within several blocks of the building. The location of the building is intended to encourage walking and promote fewer vehicle trips.

There are minimal design standards. The standards do not address minimal thresholds of compatibility with surround structures. This scenario would set a maximum building height of up to 65 feet (5 stories).

This project requires structure parking that is unobtrusively located and architecturally integrated into development. Parking requirement are specified in the Design Guidelines.

In this all-residential building, only private open space is required, which may include elements such as balconies, patios, and courtyards. Street trees are required along the public right-of-way.

Summaries of Scenario Conclusions

The tables that follow summarize participant responses to the Impact sections of the four scenarios. The summaries use verbatim language from the survey and divide responses into agree, disagree or in-between categories. A statement was identified as in-between if five dots or fewer separate the agree responses from the disagrees.

In each table, the left column identifies survey participants' opinions about the impact statement (i.e. agree, disagree, in-between). Right-hand column includes verbatim impact statements that participants voted on during the meeting on August 30.

Please note that not all statements were positive; therefore, some statements that appear in the agree column are acknowledging that there would be negative impacts from certain aspects of these developments.

All four scenarios shared general agreement on the following issues:

- Requires a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which provides a way to anticipate and mitigate the traffic impacts of development on surrounding areas.
- Stormwater drainage improvements are required for all development and can be managed through various technologies which include both above-ground and below-ground solutions.

Scenario 1: Status Quo

Starbursts or Yellow Dots to Support Scenario Entirely	• 6

OPINION	IMPACT STATEMENTS
Agree	• R-3 zoning has potential to erode low density scale and single-family character of these neighborhoods. • Allows construction of large apartment complexes only where sufficient land can be assembled to meet zoning requirements, including setbacks and off-street parking. • Limits community's ability to increase supply of housing that is located within walking distance of community destinations. • Misses the opportunity to augment the public realm. • Failure to anticipate market demand for housing products not currently available in Norman means the city will be forced to react to each application on a case-by-case basis. • Misses out on a growing demand for additional housing • choices in Norman that could accommodate a broader range of ages and lifestyles. • Has potential to increase the urban heat island effect as more surface parking is created in urban settings. • Promotes overuse of land for parking as opposed to using land to improve quality-of-life uses such as residential, commercial or urban open space.

	• Promotes surface parking solutions, including creation of off-street parking lots in R-2 and R-3 zones.
Disagree	• Does not change the existing community character. • Traffic patterns will continue to develop as currently projected. • Does not require additional regulations. • Maintains consistent process. • No change in regulation required.
In-Between (within 5 dots or fewer)	• Provides private open space amenities in developments. • Limits capacity of neighborhoods around community destinations to accommodate more residences which could become more customers and patrons

Scenario 2: Mid-High Density Residential Development (40 du/ac)

Starbursts or Yellow Dots to Support Scenario Entirely	• 8
OPINION	**IMPACT STATEMENTS**
Agree	• Will increase residential density, particularly around major community destinations, which in turn builds demand for shops, restaurants and enhanced public space. • Allows possibility of "retrofitting suburbia" by enabling higher density residential uses be added to outlying commercial districts. • Will require high quality design that is compatible with overall community character of the area. • Would limit height of building sections which are adjacent to single-family houses to 1 story (12 feet). • Will increase the variety of housing choices available near community destinations, allowing people at different stages of life to live in the neighborhood. • Will require structured parking.

	• Limits overuse of land for surface parking lots in favor of quality-of-life uses such as residential, commercial or urban open space. • Will help create and fund the development of urban public open space in Norman. • May create a mix of architectural styles and building practices along the street which will add interest to the public realm—i.e. the sidewalk environment. • Allows redevelopment of underperforming properties which is likely to increase property tax revenues. • Increases number of residents in areas where such development occurs which will, in turn, increase demand for local goods and services and generate additional sales tax. • May promote the use of creative design solutions for all aspects of development, such as environmentally friendly urban stormwater management techniques. • May diminish demand for other apartments in less central locations. • Will require development of addition regulations to manage development.
Disagree	none
In-Between (within 5 dots or fewer)	• May diminish student demand for apartments in less central locations. • May alter scale and community character of adjacent low density neighborhoods but negative impacts would be diminished by stringent design criteria. • May inadvertently promote disinvestment in larger areas of Central Norman neighborhoods as land is being assembled to accommodate large apartment projects. • May decrease number of car trips as more residential developments are located close to shops, restaurants, offices and community destinations.

Scenario 3: High Density Mixed Use Development (70 du/ac)

Starbursts or Yellow Dots to Support Scenario Entirely	• 13

OPINION	IMPACT STATEMENTS
Agree	• Will increase residential density, particularly around major community destinations, which in turn builds demand for shops, restaurants and enhanced public space. • Requires high quality design that contributes to the overall community character of the area. • Creates more street activity by providing residents with nearby commercial options. • May alter the scale and single-family community character of adjacent neighborhoods though negative impacts would be somewhat diminished by stringent design and siting criteria. • Requires structured parking that could be shared with other users outside the building. • Requires a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which provides a way to mitigate impacts of development on surrounding areas. • May promote spillover parking into adjacent neighborhoods. • May decrease number of car trips as more residential developments are located close to shops, offices and community destinations. • Creates a mix of architectural styles along the street which adds interest to the public realm. • Will require development of additional regulations to manage development. • Allows possibility of "retrofitting suburbia" by enabling higher density residential uses be added to outlying commercial districts. • Limits overuse of land for surface parking lots in favor of quality-of-life uses such as residential, commercial or urban open space.

	• May promote the use of creative design solutions for all aspects of development, such as environmentally friendly urban stormwater management techniques. • Stormwater drainage improvements are a requirement of all development and can be managed through various technologies which include both above-ground and below-ground solutions. • May result in fewer car trips to and from the vicinity which could improve environmental quality around key community destinations.
Disagree	• May inadvertently promote disinvestment in larger areas of Central Norman neighborhoods as land is being assembled for larger apartment projects. • Open space amenities are provided in developments. • May diminish demand for apartments in less central locations.
In-Between (within 5 dots or fewer)	• Will increase volume of traffic onto and off of the site which will have impacts on the entire traffic system in the area. • Will help create and fund improvements to the public realm in Norman.

<u>Scenario 4: Very High Density Residential Development (100 du/ac)</u>

Starbursts or Yellow Dots to Support Scenario Entirely	• 7

OPINION	IMPACT STATEMENTS
Agree	• May alter the scale and single-family community character of adjacent neighborhoods. • May inadvertently promote disinvestment in larger areas of Central Norman neighborhoods as land is being assembled for larger apartment projects. • Has a potential to interrupt the single-family character and scale of adjacent neighborhoods.

	• Has potential to interrupt the intimate scale and community character of existing neighborhoods. • May increase spillover parking into adjacent neighborhoods. • Structured parking will be required where this is developed. • Requires a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which provides a way to mitigate impacts of development on surrounding areas. • Will increase volume of traffic onto and off of the site which will impact the entire traffic system in the area. • Will add trees along public sidewalks. • Will require development of additional regulations to manage development. • Will greatly increase residential density in Norman, particularly around major community destinations. • May encourage the "retrofitting of suburbia" which promotes those areas evolving to become more dense and walkable, adding value to the land and bringing amenities to area residents.
Disagree	• none
In-Between (within 5 dots or fewer)	• May decrease number of car trips as more residential developments are located close to shops, offices and community destinations. • May promote the use of creative design solutions for all aspects of development, such as environmentally friendly urban stormwater management techniques.

5. INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the August 30 wrap-up meeting, participant responses on the surveys, and all the information collected in the discussion meetings, if City Council were to pursue a new high-density zoning district, the following policy elements should be considered:

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 a maximum residential density for specific areas such as Campus Corner, Downtown, Porter Corridor, etc. Strongest opinions were as follows:
    - Campus Corner: allow 40-50 du/ac
    - Downtown: split between 40-50 du/ac and over 100 du/ac
    - Porter Corridor: split between under 30 du/ac and 40-50 du/ac
    - Areas Outside Central Norman: opinions ranged between 30-40 du/ac to100 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 3 stories
    - Downtown: allow 5 stories or over
    - Porter Corridor: allow over 5 stories
    - Areas Outside Central Norman: allow 3 stories

To review all presentations and materials associated with the High Density Development Public Discussion Series go to the City of Norman website:

http://www.ci.norman.ok.us/cm/high-density-development-community-discussion

HIGH DENSITY DISCUSSION SERIES FINAL REPORT

APPENDIX

List of Appendices

A) **Participants List** **page 3**
List that includes the name and email address of everyone who signed to attend Meetings 1-6

B) **Summary of Participants' Comments Meetings 2-5** **page 7**
Verbatim transcription of all table discussion comments recorded during Meetings 2-5.

C) **Compatibility Dot Democracy Survey from Meeting 2** **page 32**
Results of a Dot Democracy survey conducted at the end of Meeting 2 held on June 28, 2012

D) **Stations 1-4 Dot Democracy Surveys from Meeting 6** **page 33**
Results of a Four-Scenario Survey conducted during Meeting 6 on August 30, 2012.

E) **Station 5 Dot Democracy Survey** **page 44**
Results of a Dot Democracy survey conducted at the end of Meeting 6 held on August 30, 2012

F) **Comment Cards from Meeting 6** **page 49**
Verbatim transcriptions of comment cards on various scenarios gathered during Meeting 6 held on August 30, 2012

Participants in High Density Development Community Discussion Forums
June 11-August 30, 2012

0 - Name	Email	6/11	6/28	7/9	7/26	8/13	8/30	
Adair, Jim	jimadair@sbcglobal.net	x	X	x				
Akhmedov, Temur	timouray@netscape.net	X						
Alpers, Ben	balpers@intergate.com						X	
Andrews, Jayna		x	X	x		x	X	
Applegate, Chris	cdapplegate@gmail.com	x	X	x		x	X	
Arbisi, Maurene	Muse1223@yahoo.Com	X			x	x	X	
Averyt, Ed	Edward.averyt@yahoo.com	X						
Bailey, Jim	Jim.bailey@normanok.gov			X				
Bates, Trey	trey@hallbrooke.com		X	x		x	X	
Beach, Kaye	ladyaxion@yahoo.com	x	X		x	x		
Bertsche, David	dbertsche@ou.edu						X	
Beutel, Ann	rochepk@hotmail.com	X						
Blunck, Andrew	Mblunck93@gmail.com				X			
Blunck, Theron	theronblunck@gmail.com				x			
Boeck, Dave	dlb@ou.edu		X	x	x	x	X	PC
Bogan, Joe	Boganjb397@gmail.com				x	x	X	
Bowerman, Jane	bowerman@ou.edu		x			x	X	
Bowers, April	Bsquared417@cox.net	x	x				X	
Bowers, Brett	Bsquared417@cox.net	x	X	x		x	X	
Bowman, Barbara	babsbow@msn.com	x	X	x	x	x	X	
Braly, Dr. Ed.	drbraly@omsp.com	X						
Breder, Tessa	Tessa.breder@gmail.com		X	x	x	x		
Broyles, Bob	Bob-broyles@ouhsc.edu				x			
Bumm, Lloyd	bumm@ou.edu			X	x	x	X	
Bundren, Kara				X				
Buser, Brad	bradleybuser@gmail.com		X					
Campbell, Mark	Artful_mark@yahoo.com	x	X	x		x		
Campbell, Scott	bscottc@live.com			X				
Cannon, Jane	jcannon@opubco.com			X				
Carrie, Gordon	gcl@trekix.net			X				
Castleberry, Robert	rccpa@castleberrycpa.com		X	x	x	x		
Chapman, Karen	kcmorningstar@gmail.com	X						
Clayton, Cheryl	cclayton@sbcglobal.net	x	X	x		x		
Clendening, Virginia				X				
Clifford-Jones, Donna	D3.clifford@connect.gut.edu.				x			
Cochran, Todd					X			
Coker, Jeanette		x	X	x	x	x	X	
Cox. Mark	Marc2011@aol.com	X						
Crosbie, Jacy						x		

Crumpley, Jayne	mjcrumpl@earthlink.net	x	X	x	x	x	X	
Cubberley, Doug		x	X	x		x		
Daniels, Mark					X			Staff
Davis, Denise	Dkdav7@yahoo.com	x	X	x			X	
Davis, Steve	stdavis@teleflora.com		X		x		X	
DiIorio, Ashley				X				
Dikeman, Kristen	kristenmcline@hotmail.com	X						
Dillingham, Carol	Cdillingham1@cox.net		X	x				
Dillingham, Larry			X	x	x			
Doezema, Mary	mdoezema@msn.com	X						
Droke, Julie	jadroke@gmail.com		X	x				
Dunn, Evan	Evad223@gmail.com	x	X	x	x	x		
Edy, Jill	Jedy0766@gmail.com			X				
Elsey, Bryan	bryan@myprimeplace.com			X	x		X	
Elsey, Chris	chris@myprimeplace.com	X		x	x	x		
Erwin, Tom		X						
Fagiano, Paul	Scapolo1@att.net	X						
Farley, Jackie	jackiefarley@yahoo.com	X						
Fenn, Gloria Jean	glofenn@sbcglobal.net	X		x	x	x	X	
Fite, Barbara	Bfite33@yahoo.com	x	X		x		X	
Fite, Dennis	Bfite33@yahoo.com	X		x	x	x	X	
Fowler, Jonathan	jmf@fowlervw.com						X	
Frank, Ellen	Mfrank1@mindspring.com		X	x				
Gallagher, Roger & Ann	rgatpok@sbcglobal.net			X		x	X	CC
Gasaway, Jim	jimgasaway@cox.net		X	x			X	PC
Givel, Michael	mgivel@ou.edu						X	
Goddard, Steve	sgoddard@ou.edu	x	X	x	x	x	X	
Goins, Bob	bobgoins@cox.net	X						
Griffith, Jim	griffithdds@yahoo.com		X		x			CC
Groff, Anne	annbgroff@gmail.com	X		x	x			
Haines, Howard	howardhaines@sbcglobal.net	X						
Hampton, Joy	Jlhampton.jh@gmail.com	x	X	x				
Hardiman, Ty	tyhardiman@mac.com	x	X	x	x		X	
Harvey, James	jfharvey@weblawman.com					x		
Hefner, Connie	Hefner.connie@gmail.com	x	X	x		x	X	
Henning, Joe	Jhenning2@cox.net	X						
Hervey, Karen	Imkc1@hotmail.com	x	X	x	x	x	X	
High, John	John.high@sbcglobal.net		X	x	x	x	X	
Hinton, Mick	mshinton@msn.com		X					
Holman, Stephen Tyler	Stety74@gmail.com	x	X	x	x	x	X	
Hopper, David	jthopper@cox.net			X			X	
Hughes, Jeff	jlhughes@progind.org		X					
Iske, Tamara	tamarayi@aol.com					x		
Jackson, Elizabeth	lix.jackson@sbcglobal.net				X			

Jackson, Vic	badbbunnee@att.net				x			
Jewell, Nadine	jerrynadine@live.com					x	X	
Jones, Louis & Susan	My2girlies@spcglobal.net		X					
Jones, Rhett	Nosurprises33@yahoo.com	X						
Jungman, Greg	Ward4@normanok.gov	x	X	x	x	x	X	CC
Kaplan, Russ				X			X	
Katz, Helen			X		x	x	X	
King, Karen	kking@hellohealthnewsletter.com						X	
Kinnard, David	dhkinnard@hotmail.com		X	x				
Knotts, Tom	info@redbudridgewinery.com	x	X	x	x		X	PC
Komiske, Ken					X			Staff
Lankister, Linda	Lindac11@cox.net	x	X				X	
LaValle, Robert						x	X	
Laws, Peter	plaws@plaws.net	X						
Lockett, Linda			X	X		x		CC
Loughridge, Andrea	Akl2@cox.net		X		x	x		
Maffucci, Bette		X			x	x	X	
Martin, Jane	rocky@goodthingscompany.com				X			
Martin, Rockky	rocky@goodthingscompany.com				X			
Martin, Sylvia		X		X	x	x	X	
McCarthy, Ty	ty@ou.edu		X					
McDougall, Chris	christinamcdougall@sbcglobal.net			X				
McKown, Richard	mckownrichard@mac.com		X	x		x	X	
McLane, James	jemclane@gmail.com		X	x			X	
McLaughlin, June	vjunemc@gmail.com			X	x	x		
Merrell, Birl	Bmerrell6829@att.net	X						
Murphy, Sheena	smurphy@ou.edu		X	x	x		X	
Nanny, Chris	cenanny@sbcglobal.net	x	X			x	X	
Nanny, Mark	nanny@ou.edu	x	X					
Nichols, Erica	Erica.nichols@bankofthewest.com	x	X	x				
Norlin, Drew					x			Staff
Oak, Janice	joak@progind.ord		X		x	x	X	
Oxsen, George	Oxsen1@cox.net				X	x		
Pailes, Roberta	Roberta.pailes@gmail.com	x	X		x	x	X	PC
Parmenter, Tim	Txjac8@hotmail.com				x		X	
Pawley, Travis	Pawley82@gmail.com				x			
Perry, David	N5kuj@aol.com	X						
Perry, John W.	jperry@college.occc.edu	X		x				
Peters, Mary	marympeters@cox.net					x		
Phelps, Erica							X	
Phelps, Paul	Pphelps1@cox.net						X	
Pope, Fred	fredtheopope@sbcglobal.net	X						
Powell Marti, Valli	vpowell@ou.edu	X						
Price, Linda	Linda.price@normanok.gov			X	X	x		staff

Provine, Bob	Rprovine55@cox.net	X						
Rhynes, Teresa	trhynes@cox.net				x			
Rieger, Sean	Sp@riegerllc.com	X						
Riley, Ann	annriley@yahoo.com	X						
Risser, Mark	mrisser@milesrisser.com	x	X	x			X	
Risser, Paul	risserp@ou.edu				x		X	
Robinson, Judy Gibbs	Judygibbsrobinson@yahoo.com			X			X	
Robinson, Valerie	Sooners851@cox.net	X						
Rockett, Bill	Kd5dob@gmail.com			X				
Rogers, Cindy	crogers@ou.edu				x		X	
Rosenthal, Cindy			X	x		x	X	CC
Ross, Nance	skyepigeon@aol.com	X			x			
Rothermel, Eddie	eddierothermel@gmail.com	x	X	x			X	
Salazar, Cory	Corysalazar.96@yahoo.com		X	x				
Schmitz, Fritz & Phoebe		X						
Schraeder, Sam	Zinn4peace@gmail.com	x	X	x		x		
Seale, Tom				X				
Sharp, John	jmsharp@acogok.org				x			
Southerland, Ben	bmsoutherland@yahoo.com	x	X		x	x		
Spaulding, Dave							X	CC
Stone, Tina					x			
Sturtz, Scott						X		Staff
Taffe, Donna	dtaffe@cox.net	X		x				
Thomas, Bob	Bob.thomas.xenia@gmail.com	X	X	X	x	x		
Thomas, Charlie					X			Staff
Tiga, Dyrinch	dyninda@gmail.com	X						
Urbach, Susan	surbach@mac.com						X	
Van Hoy, Cathy	csvh@yahoo.com	x	X					
Ward, Robbie		X					X	
Wesner, Charles	c.wesner@sbcglobal.net	X		x		x	X	
Wesner, Lyntha		X		x	x	x	X	
Whitten, Gail	gailwhitten@excite.com	x	X	x	x	x	X	
Wilcox, Jamileh		x	X	x	x	x	X	
Wilkins, Judith		X						
Williamson, Barrett	blw@blwarchitects.com					x		
Wishard, Dianne						x		
Wood, Don	nedc@nedcok.com	x	X	x	x	x	X	
Woods, Randy	rwoods@strrentals.com	X		x				
Yoch, Nancy	nyoch@buynorman.com		X		x	x	X	
Zizzo, Debbie	dzizzo@cox.net		X				X	

Total		78	67	74	65	61	70	
New Participants			30	19	22	10	9	

Transcription of Table Discussions During the High Density Development Series June 28-August 13, 2012

JUNE 28—LOCATION

- On bus lines
- Near university
- South of Hwy 9
- Near available utilities
- Destruction of older neighborhoods
- Distribution between developers workability 5/10 minutes
- Corners of intersections (major)
- Downtown/main street
- North Park
- Health Plex
- No where in Norman
- Why not low density infill
- Max of 50 units
- No max cap
- Behind Lowes
- Any blighted area
- Any area E/N of urban Norman
- 24th/Robinson NE
- TIF area
- Along RR
- Far E Main – between Classen/12th
- Outside core Norman
- None
- Moore
- ~~Near OU campus~~
- ~~East Lindsey~~
- ~~Not Campus Corner~~
- ~~Not in existing S.F. Neighborhoods~~
- ~~Downtown but not 100 u/ar~~

Reflection of surroundings
Usability/universal design
Limited eligible areas
Campus corner
Downtown
Around university
University North Park

Access to proper utilities
One size does not fit all
Access to transit
    Walkability

High activity locations
Arterial streets
Locations with current high density
Main – Boyd, Santa Fe – BNSF
225/block/2.5 acre
Consider access to rail transit
Borders/perimeters of neighborhoods
Adjacent to industrial/institutional/existing high density
Infill
Desirability to tenants
Main/Peters
University North Park
Campus Corner

- Lindsey (between I-35, 24th SE)
- Campus Area
- University North Park (TIF)
- Gray (between Comanche and Railroad)
- Elm (west) Main (north) Railroad tracks (east) Boyd (south)
- Eufaula to Duffy
- Boyd (between Classen and Jenkins)

Ed Noble Parkway
Center of Norman (easy walking to church, store, medical, etc)
Allow for residents to be able to care for others (parents, friends, etc)
General in Norman – Lindsey, Main, Robinson, 12th & Alameda
Porter Corridor
Area of Norman that allows you to walk
Students – Campus – Hway 9 – Campus Corner
New Hospital (west Norman)
University town center
Central State Hospital

1. University North Park area? Not scaled for walkability
2. Lots along railroad between Main and Duffy
3. In relationship to railroad – possible future for rail travel
4. unique road between downtown and Campus Corner and OU
5. See development that supports continued revival of downtown
6. Campus Corner is mostly 1 story – missed opportunity now. Already zoned for density.
7. Norman has a lot of vitality in place already.
8. Critical mass is needed for successful businesses.

9. Walking radius in relationship to existing amenities (future amenities?)
10. Transit stops can create linkage with critical mass transit oriented development
11. Takes us back to 1940s-50s patterns
12. Infill feels more comfortable than redevelopment
13. Intersection of Classen and Lindsey

JUNE 28--COMPATIBILITY

What are the elements of compatibility from your point of view? What needs to be considered?

Scale
Style
Integration
Buffer zone/Security
Sociability
Noise
Ease of movement
Privacy
Height
Landscaping
Material
Public Space - access to
Variety
Parking
Variety of demographics
Affordable housing intergraded within high density development project

- Scale fitting with surroundings
- Complement neighborhood
- Historic significance, preservation
- Target market
- Future stability traffic can be handled by streets
- Effect on existing community/housing market
- Replacement, gentrification of dilapidated homes rather than high density not all arterial streets should have high density traffic
- Preserving small starter homes because they are affordable
- Traffic and transportation – auto, bike, foot, public

We need to figure out what we need
Comes down to demographics
Not blocking views
Accessibility concerns.
Closest to stores, entertainment
Access to public transit
Height and density – limits based on location
Adequate parking – inc. accessibility spaces
Aesthetics

Neighborhood traffic
Mass and scale
Review ordinances from other university towns

- Accessibility.
- Where projects are located – keep "quaintness" of Norman in mind, right product in right spot. Campus area nearer taller OU buildings
- More established area to be in walking distance of amenities
- Need plan to ensure compatibility
- Remove older buildings to make way – infill
- Create environment to "hold" people in one place
- Put buildings on arterials
- Losing core area homes
- Bring more density closer to businesses
- OU has shown parking garage can look, OK, Campus Corner needs a garage
- Must address parking w/high density infill
- Change in attitude about walking/driving
- Look at Bricktown as an example (walk and pay for parking)
- Need structured parking (expensive)
- Have to go up in core area to park, there taller building to cover cost of land and parking garage
- Solution for replacing some of older complexes (cheaper than rehabbing).
- Need to offer different product
- Place where people can have a pet
- Too many apartments in Norman already?
- Move out of older complex to newer, nice one as older one gets torn down
- Limited services on Campus Corner, will people still drive? Or will trips go down?
- Need more transit services in Norman
- Transit is expensive, drain on City resources

TOP FIVE ELEMENTS OF COMPATIBILITY:
Sense of community/state in community – owner occupied property
Mixed use product
Aesthetics/designs in relation to location
Safety (lighting, design)
Accessibility

Work with existing neighborhood
Height
Density (traffic) limit
Replace older rental units with compatible units
Is high density possible? Where?
Landscaping/Streetscaping
Architecture

Scale compatibility – Buffers
Need long range plan
Consider 50+ u/ac
100 u/ac works where transit available
Appropriate location

- Fit in with neighborhood, traffic, parking
- Doesn't stick out
- Easy to see people when outside (social area)
- Connectivity to people
- Consideration of existing neighborhood, but plan for future
- 1 parking space for apartment
- Cars per capita (a car per bed)
- Large shift in paradigm for community
- Setting expectations for current property owners
- How do you legislate? Write code for compatibility.
- Differential in height with adjacent properties
- "Fad" architecture
- Consideration of long term upkeep
- May be appropriate with certain provisions
- Architecture compatible with surroundings
- Transitional elements (how to legislate?)
- Consideration of infrastructure
- Create positive economics for neighborhood revitalization
- Incentive for opportunities in market
- Build standards in code like other communities
- Size in relation to adjacent buildings
- Walkability/livability

Height differential/setbacks/restrictive light/mass
Material used in construction
Clear instructions as to what high density is
Lack of transportation and services
Livability
Walkability
Services (adequate)
Traffic/parking
Rental vs ownership in neighborhood
Compatibility within unit w/tenants
Consolidation of types of rental
Different styles but work together (preserving neighborhoods)
Low noise level
Small town feel
Feeling of space
Height barrier – not a lot above 2 stores (buffer)

Places of interaction
Privacy – no windows to close
Buildings that don't prevent view – hurt structure already there
Respect with other buildings
Pedestrian need respect
Minimum intrusion
Students and resident living together – place for students, place for Norman residents.

- Drought tolerant landscaping
- Making infill work with existing single family homes, building materials, bulk
- Demographic compatibility (houses, schools – that work well together)
- Compatible with existing infrastructure
- Avoid "big box" parking
- Rather than blank walls, windows on street
- As few restrictions as possible
- Happy medium between cookie cutter and total differences in building styles
- Differences can be very interesting
- Visual compatibility between commercial and surrounding context
- Buildings as landmarks – icons
- Preserve space and sky
- Height changes neighbors perceptions of privacy
- Are tall buildings an urban intense density we want?
- Losing sunlight (sunsets, ice lingers in winter)
- Norman's identity is unique
- Could higher density housing work in University North Park?
- Mixed density use could greatly improve walkability
- Higher density could be added into existing commercial districts
- Walking is not an everyday thing in OK culture
- Higher density needs public space using the City as a "living room" nice settings make whole environment more attractive
- Visibility – preserve open space – heights - don't build too tall
- Infill existing commercial districts
- Scale
- Infill works with whole context – built/infrastructure
- Preserving individual identity compatibility thru differences

JULY 9--HEIGHT

Question 1: What makes the height of a building, taller than two stories, attractive or unattractive to you?

Relationship to surroundings
Context
Heterogeneous exterior
2 + stories is OK

Architecturally interesting (style)
Location of parking
Parking incorporated in building (hidden)
Adequate parking spaces
Scale vs landscape
Scale with other buildings
Setbacks
Architecture
Variety of styles and uses
Context
2 story height difference
Economics
Tall building in historic district is bad
Landscaping
Street type and use (2 lane vs arterial)
Lack of privacy
Lack of feeling of security
OU
Campus Corner
The arts
Stadium
Historic buildings – Sooner Theater
Viable downtown
RR through town
Trees
Pride in unique areas
Norman does not try to copy other places
Distinct neighborhoods
Variation of heights can work in different locations
Differentiation – materials, design, heights
Context matters
Design details matter
Cities grow and develop taller buildings result
View (point of view) of building is critical
Sidewalk canopies shields views and provides amenity
Transitions to neighbors should not be intrusive
Backs of buildings must not ignore the neighborhoods
Design should minimize intrusiveness
Context – sensitive – pedestrian environment not as intrusive as neighborhood settings
Intrusiveness could be measured by protests
Should be different areas that can allow more intensive/taller development

<u>Attractive</u>
Stepped
Compatibility
Open space

<u>Unattractive</u>
Hiland Dairy's fortress-like appearance
Lack of setback

Shade
Balconies
Lighting
Texture
Dynamic & Multi-faceted
Cherokee Gothic
Height does not determine attractiveness
Articulation of entrances
Campus
Downtown Main Street
Hiland Dairy (front yes; rear no)
Art deco buildings on Porter
Historic neighborhoods
Diversity of architecture
    Residential
    Commercial
Art district
Rhythm of streets, sidewalks, trees, diversity of people (incomes, ages, occupations, family types)
Students give vibrancy to town
Parks bike paths
Bike friendly
Compatible with surrounding area
Consideration of privacy of neighborhoods
Blockage of sunlight for landscaping/garden
Must have attractive architecture (sculptural qualities)
Not overly "modern" architecture
Utilization of set backs
Articulation within design
Beneficial for higher rent for developers due to attractive design
Must in area with mix of owners and renters
Balancing height/privacy versus opportunities higher building afford (interesting views)
Room to spread out
Interesting areas (UNP, Ed Noble, Campus Corner)
Different elements of place (unique neighborhoods)
Character of older homes
Not focused on one element
Combination of new areas, campus, retail, older homes
Opportunities for art, jobs
Older neighborhoods with student, faculty, staff, citizens living around each other
Mixed use can create diverse neighborhoods
Diverse population
Had mixed use buildings for years
Large size for Oklahoma (population)
Keeps "small town" feel for size
Shading of surrounding areas – inability to grow grass, etc

No articulation
Shadow
Monochrome
Cookie cutter

Mature trees
Location – residential vs commercial areas
Unattractive in single family areas
Need to be compatible with surrounding areas, keeping with character of neighborhood
Needs buffers
Scale to the lot
Obtrusive in surroundings
Privacy concerns – look into back yards
Window glazing, step backs would help, interesting architecture is a plus
Inappropriate to integrate in existing neighborhoods
Higher buildings ok in UNP
Build higher buildings in NE Norman
Lose what makes Norman "Norman"
Put parking underneath so buildings wouldn't be so high, or on roof
Prioritize high density projects/sequencing
Lower high density, not high, high density

JULY 9
Question 2: Do taller buildings add interest to a community?

Adds livability
Yes (ex: Devon)
Not in Norman
If building is in right place
Height by itself adds interest
Need variety in neighborhoods
Needs gradual increase in height of buildings
Maintenance of buildings must be considered
Yes
In certain areas it might
Detract in near residential areas
Yes in downtown
In commercial areas, not residential
Want the option – use permissible on review
Need design constraints, but not to limiting
Add interest to community?
Height is not inherent to beauty (not a lone variable)
Differing heights is interesting
Tall is efficient land use
Yes/no
Tall buildings where it makes sense
Tall buildings can allow mixed land use which creates vibrant places for people
University
Trees
Small city with big city features or amenities
Campus, Campus Corner and Main Street are distinctive
Boyd and University intersection

Tree canopy on Lindsey
Porter – Porter and Main Street
Again – context – sensitive design and scale and height
Walkability
"Distinctiveness"
We've grown but we've maintained small city attributes
24 hours eyes on the street
Magnetism toward business districts
Yes – 4
No – 4
Relative to location
Create height that "opens up" public areas
Public areas within building (interior areas)
Creativity in public space
Zoning to restrict building areas
City pays attention to details on requirements
"Step down" of height areas
Appropriate policy that speaks to infill high density vs corridor high density
Adequate set backs from street for landscaping, green public areas, open space
Adequate site set backs for neighbors
Not next to residential house
Height can provide economic generation that will allow for more architecture and public spaces
Creates a social scene for people
Must be well-planned to mix with neighborhood and enrich it
Local businesses in mixed use
Economics must work to have mixed use
Stores must serve residential needs
More service-related industries in mixed use areas
Create opportunities to bring people to neighborhoods. Businesses will follow.
Parking must be adequate for mixed use.
Higher density can lead to less auto traffic
Better access to public transportation
Reality of "workability" is doing things differently
Build something without parking (take a "leap of faith")
Public art
Treed streets
University community
Suburban
Thriving art community
Campus Corner, OU plays
Historic Downtown
1/3 of jobs in non-profit industry
Public housing in new high density development
Unique neighborhoods
Water issues
Tornadoes/severe weather

Question 3: What Makes Norman Distinctive?
Parks, landscaping, trees
University
Downtown is vibrant
Retirement opportunities/services/livability
Campus Corner + Downtown
Festivals, art (fun place to live)
Diversity in housing/neighborhoods
OU does not control/over power Norman
Citizens utilize (engage) parks/festivals
Architecture – diversity
Location, proximity to metro area
Locally-owned businesses
Neighborhood schools
Low crime/community policing
Distinction between high density as mixed use – not one and the same
All kinds of retail in mixed use properties
No grocery store in core area
Needs to be well thought out
More intense use of land – how does that get integrated into City of Norman?
More transit options
New option for Norman
Exacerbates existing parking problems
Need to be able to walk to array of amenities
What about guest parking? U-hauls, moving in and out
Impact OU existing traffic patterns
Accustomed to one stop shopping

JULY 26: PARKING, TRAFFIC AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Question 1: What are your concerns about parking if the City were to allow higher density development in Norman?

Garages going underground? Flooding issues?
-Traffic that comes with parking
-Aesthetics of garages
-Free parking in garages? Or permit only?
-Relate parking count to number of bedrooms instead of swelling units
-Flesh out issues with "shared" parking lots
-What kind of parking does different housing types require –
    families v. students
    Rental v. owner-occupied
-Conduct TIAs while OU is in session (more accurate count)
-Sunday traffic/parking issues should be addressed
-Height/scale of structures
-Locate garages on arterial streets
-Disabled parking

-Fumes and environmental concerns - Gas/oil leaks

- Safety concerns
- Including risk of violence
- Price of garage parking
- Price of including safety surveillance
- Over focus on auto at expense of other modes of travel
- Parking garages solve long-term problems, long term savings
- Higher density cuts automobile usage
- Making sure developments provide enough parking
- Environmental impacts, trash with higher density
- Favor free public parking
- Private parking is restricted to private use – not efficient use of public space
- Wasted land with scattered parking pattern
- Urban heat islands with surface lots
- If there isn't enough parking it affects neighborhoods negatively
- Compare crime rates with decks vs surface lots (use OU)
- Could private development pay/share of public parking? Impact fees
- 1.8 spaces per unit is important to continue
- Consider on street parking permits – a tool, an interim tool?
- Meters – how would people pay?
- Are parking requirements the same for apartments vs condos? Fire protection requirements different?
- Different occupants have different parking needs – how to create fair pricing structure?
- Focus on big picture not small details
- Concerned street network can't handle additional traffic

    - Parking on yards and on street
    - Parking intrusion in neighborhood and businesses
    - Safety
    - Concern with scale of garages
    - Location
    - Noise – car doors slamming at night
    - Height – prefer to go down
    - Bicycle parking – less emphasis on cars

right amount of parking for people with disabilities
- not enough parking City wide

-guest parking
-parking based on bedrooms
-traffic, traffic, traffic

A. Why go into already developed areas? Put high density and parking garages in areas not yet develop.

B. Revitalize Main Street?
C. Support Campus Corner area?
D. Don't destroy residential in core area.
E. Who pays for garage? Public/Private?
F. Who benefits – commercial or high density development?
G. Hold standard at 1.8 spaces per dwelling unit (even PUD)
H. Don't want more people packed into an area that's already packed (Core Norman)
I. Will high density development draw students into facilities being proposed?

1. Adequate ADA parking
2. Visitor parking
3. Congestion
4. Location
5. Ingress/Egress location
6. Alleyways – competing uses
7. Traffic flow during peak hours
8. Cost of parking
9. Economic impact on surrounding businesses

1. Who can use the parking
2. Crafting of zoning laws and ordinances
3. Not enough parking for residents in the area
4. Noises/sound of activity at parking lot – vehicle and pedestrian

Traffic to the parking spaces
Who owns the structure? Private or public
Location & possible congestion of ingress & egress
Locations already red for 2035
Where to locate structures?
Parking to be underground in new developments
- no more sprawl – surface parking lots

Will new traffic impact neighborhood?
As structure density parking requirements therefore height of structure must increase and will have a greater visual impact on the surrounding neighborhood.
Discrepancy of 1.8/unit – larger units, visitors, etc.
If building on existing parking lot – where will displaced parking go?
Green construction – lighting, stormwater, etc.

Question 2: If parking structures are the solution to accommodate higher development in Norman, how could they be built to minimize any negative impacts on surrounding areas?

-Wrap garage with residential or commercial use
-Accommodate resident, guest and customer parking
-Aesthetically pleasing, blending into neighbor
-Size/scale
-Landscaping or public art

-Sound abatement
-3 smaller garages instead of 1 large
-Security concerns – well lit
-Cleanliness issues
-Gated – access issues, key cards
-Visitor parking issues if access is restricted
-Fire concerns

- Deep throat entrances prevents stacking
- Traffic has improved in cities that have identified
- Contain parking in buildings
- Emphasize safety, exterior aesthetics, size, compatibility
- Could structure be "hidden" wrapped with retail?
- Design, landscaping, integrated design – within the structure
- Covered walkway can be nice in inclement weather
- Underground parking can be used as tornado shelter

1. Go down
2. Scale – not in established neighborhoods
3. Similar architecture to area
4. Correct locations
5. Glaze windows
6. Not adjacent to single family area – too intrusive
7. Retail at street level with parking below: limit height
8. Limit access points
9. Proper context
10. Encourage public transportations and walking

-wrapped on 4 sides
No exposed levels of parking
-open/free parking, would non-residents use the stalls?
-parking for guest, so they don't park in community (20%) for guests
-bigger spaces for larger trucks
-aesthetics

A) Build away from already crowded areas
B) Run buses to high density areas
C) Run buses from high density to commercial and activity centers
D) Location – up or down construction
E) Open and green areas included
F) Design them as part of the structure
G) Mixed use
H) Wrapping façade
I) Functionality
J) Ventilation – open space or mechanical ventilation
K) Aesthetic design
L) Flood plain – take into consideration
M) Earthquake – take into consideration
N) What gets to park? Does it run?

O) Adequate parking for impact to entire area (residential neighborhood) – not impactful
P) Negative impact on residential neighborhood
Q) Very undesirable
R) No prescriptive codes for entire area (City of Norman)
S) Consideration of neighborhood

Wrapped in retail
Vertical gardens
Aesthetics
Should be located at or near an arterial street that can accommodate the traffic
View of garage area visually shielded by shops, landscaping, etc.
Must hold to a minimum of 1.8/unit
Storm water runoff to be contained/controlled/irritation purposes
Try to avoid traffic jams – traffic study – street improvements
Maintenance requirements – trash, etc.
Utilize existing surface parking lots with public/private partnerships for structures for public use
High density developments should provide their own parking as well as some public parking = or greater than what was removed + development requirement of 1.8/unit

Question 3: Would the requirement that higher density development include parking garages create any opportunities for Norman?

Partnerships between/with City/OU/developer to share parking – help with congestion
-Improve economy
-Improve congestion OU Campus Corner
-Improve aesthetics if done right
-Shaded parking reduces hydrocarbons
-Promote pedestrian lifestyle
- More efficient land use - people closer together - preserve more of our community
- Parking structures will get cars off streets, may generate jobs
- More walking = more spending more accessibility = more commerce
- More walking = more civic engagement
- Concentrate higher density where it will do some good = downtown
- Green, smart design – create something to show off to visitors
- No opportunity

Parking garages are just "vertical sprawl
1. For retail – get parking off the street
2. In proper locations
3. Way to corral cars
4. Pedestrian mall opportunity

joint public and private parking. Private could lease from public
-Norman Parking Authority and private developer could own a joint parking

-disability spaces need to be added
-adequate public parking could bring additional retail

J. Public/private partnership
K. If in downtown, could require part of parking available for others
L. Require more than minimum regulated for the development
M. Underground parking for residents
N. Charge for parking and City makes money
O. Safety is a disadvantage
P. If people knew parking available, might bring more in to spend more money
Q. Public/private partnership
R. If in downtown, could require part of parking available for others
S. Require more than minimum regulated for the development
T. Underground parking for residents
U. Charge for parking and City makes money
V. Safety is a disadvantage
W. If people knew parking available, might bring more in to spend more money

By relieving parking congestion at location of additional public parking is included.
City should charge fees for all parking – not just Main Street
Strategic locations of high density development and public parking structures could positively impact public transportation system
Game day traffic concerns – closed streets – access etc.
Being able to provide parking for more autos in a smaller footprint

August 13– Design

Question 1: What places in Norman do you like and why?

Where	Why
Downtown walkable, sidewalk buffer buildings from parking	
Campus Corner	uniqueness of buildings
Places with WiFi	sociability
Hastings	outside seating, WiFi
OU Campus	seating, trees, clock, nicely choreographed space,
Dog Park	outside seating
Country places (i.e. Lake Thunderbird)	freedom (run dogs, fish wildlife)
Library	

Andrews Park	flow, close to Library, city hall, places to go open space, water park, close to down town
Duck Pond	bridges, meandering sidewalks
Core Norman	residential architecture, historic, no big parking lots
Campus	feel safe, bike cops, underground spaces
Housing on Pickard between Boyd & Imhoff	
Airport	
	Incorporating older existing architecture into newer developments
Ed Noble Parkway Riverwalk	
	Basements
University Christian Church	Pastor

The Mont
- Outdoor space, misting system and heaters

Campus Corner
- Asp between White and Boyd, like angled parking, wider sidewalks are better, big windows right on sidewalk – easier to see merchandise, slower traffic

Andrews Park
- Childhood memories, good place for children

McFarlin Church

Core Area in general
- So much to see, do, lots of diversity
- Flood on West, Lindsey to South, 12th on East, Robinson to North
- Not cookie cutter like Summit Lakes
- Front porches, visiting with neighbors
- Faculty Heights

Brookhaven Village
- Proximity to places to go (shops/restaurants/post office) denser housing
- Diversity in style
- Lots of parking

Reeves Park
- Playground area, Medieval Fair
- Arboretum

OU Campus
Artwork, sculpture, landscaping, architecture, safe/secure
Campus Corner
Attractive, intimate, people-friendly, inviting but parking is a problem

Top 5 - Like

Where	Why
1. Campus Corner	Walk, Scale, Open spaces
2. Downtown Main Street (University – Porter)	Scale, variety, walkability
3. University North & South ovals	Walkability, architecture, building masses, benches
Lions Park	Open spaces, Summer Breeze
Historic/Core Neighborhoods N, E and W of campus	Scale, trees, narrow roads Well maintained
4. Andrews & Reeves Park & Lions Mont	Historic Amphitheater Scale, outdoor dining
Chipolti cut thru	Outdoor dining
Duck Pond	
5. Brookhaven Village	Walkable, smaller/local business Uniform design
Roundabout	Design – Public Art - Landscaping

Don't Like

Where	Why
Ed Noble Parkway	Too many automobiles
Porter Corridor	Poor design – no walkability
University North Park	Too many cars; too many surface parking lots

Number of retirees that rely upon rental property for income.

1. Campus Corner
Walkable
Narrow streets
Big sidewalks
More "human" feel
Better parking would be nice – not necessarily more
Green space
The Mont – Swirl
Owen Field – victories
2. OU Campus because of green space
Blend of architecture
OU – original architecture
Campus area (to Faculty Heights to Berry)
What was here originally should not be destroyed. Destroying an atmosphere/character. Preserve original atmosphere.

If you replace with similar buildings
The charm of original Norman
Good public transportation system
Norman is the best town in OK for wheelchairs
Good accessibility
Adequate ADA parking and accessibility
Do not like University North Park – but might be the best place for high density
Some areas of core Norman are acceptable for high density – but not in or near residential neighborhoods
Campus Corner – can walk to, people around
    Livable place (401)
Cherokee Gothic
Sculptures
Architecture in older neighborhoods
Loves area near Dakota and Berry
Eastside Norman – can walk to drug stores, grocery – sense of open spaces
Campus Corner – charming, relax comfortable
    Feels like home because of Boomer Theater/nostalgia
Open spaces

Downtown
Sooner Theater
Depot
Walking along train tracks
East likes open spaces
    Oil derrick
Likes narrower streets in Berry and Dakota
    Look out for each other
Lake Thunderbird – open space should never be developed
Likes smaller town feel – higher density for big cities
Like dedicated bike routes and lanes
Biking and walking need to be supported by development
Need to maintain open space well landscaped (fountains etc and space with no development)
Street trees should be maintained
Like scale of architecture in down and Campus Corner
Like architecture of Campus Cherokee Gothic
Neighborhoods, Campus Corner Eastside
Secure, ambiance
    Must have things I like to do
    Must be able to bike
    Feel children are safe
Feel safe – Nature
    Refreshing to soul not a lot of people around
Walk everywhere and feel safe even at night
Smaller scale is comfortable

Like to be out in nature.
Like views
Parks with places to sit where you don't hear traffic
No trash – need trash cans
A sense of connection like urban environment
Like Main Street – Campus Corner because livable
Like walkable scale
Buildings need to be well maintained
Relaxed pace – no hustle
No smoke
Not crowded
Quiet enough to hear bells chime
Like sound of train
People recognize at grocery store
Small town feel
Connection to history - Heritage
Quiet
Small town feel – not overcrowded
Safety
Nature scenic view (open space)
Walking and biking
Emotional connection to history of place

Legacy Trail
Walkability
See various parts of town
Good scale
Variety of scale
Visually interesting

West Norman (specifically 48th and Tecumseh)
Wide open spaces
Close to stores

Campus Corner
People are encouraged to walk
Unique to Oklahoma
Variety of uses
Lots to do in a small area
Architecture
Small surprises
Small vistas
Small frontages
Outdoor seating areas
Holes-in-the-wall places

Downtown
Territorial-era architecture

Consistent environment
Harmonious

Midway Market
Mixed use in a neighborhood
Menu

University-area Neighborhoods
Variety of architecture
Walkable
Shady
Central Campus
Beautiful architecture
Sounds and sights
Very green
Cool and shady
Walkable and bikable

Brookhaven Square
Nice design
Not walkable
Linear and horizontal
Starbucks is not a drive-thru
Starbucks and Cool Greens have nice outdoor seating area—well used

Carriage Plaza
Comfortable scale
Nice masonry and lighting details
Heavily landscaped
Shady

Southridge Addition Neighborhood
Nice variety of architecture
Shady
green
1. Campus Corner
Walkable
Variety of uses
Human scale

2. Downtown
Architecture

3. University-area neighborhoods
Variety of architecture
Shady
Walkable

4. Central Campus
    Shady
    Cool
    walkable
2nd Friday Art Walk
    See friends
Campus Corner
    Good flow
    Sense of community
Sooner Theatre and area
    Architecture
Legacy Trail
    Walking
    Biking
    History

Fire House Art Center/Lions Park
    Great family activities
    Would like to see underground parking
Train Depot
    Architecture
Montford Inn and other Bed & Breakfasts
Casa Blanca
    Scale and style
Andrews Park
Reaves Park
Sutton Wilderness
Many neighborhoods
Summer Breeze
    Diversity
Area between Main/Classen/Lindsey/Flood
Campus Corner
Student Union
Classen Boyd area
Downtown
Events at Robinson Crossing/Brookhaven
Lions Park and Andrews Park
Legacy Park when built out
Lake Thunderbird

Question 2: What makes you feel comfortable when you are in what you consider to be a special place?

Where - Anyplace	Comfort Factor
L.A. Observatory	middle of metro on mountain

	top, can see city
Saltgrass Restaurant	atmosphere, honey butter, game on tv
Petroleum Club Restaurant	height, view
Devil's Mountain	whimsical
Gay bar	safe, not sports bar
Chouse	concerts, refreshments, sociability
	Feelings of: safety, open and all accessible, space, free, security, place, whimsy, aesthetics
Amarillo	street art
Westend Market Place Dallas	dynamic light show
Bricktown	integrated businesses within the area
Galveston Boardwalk	enough space for lots of people, do not feel crowded
Las Vegas	connecting overhead and underground walkways
Dallas	light rail
New Orleans	trolleys

Parking lots with landscaping
Welcoming atmosphere
Safe environment
Intimate
Plaza atmosphere
Landscaping (public art) to break up spaces
Patios at restaurants
Stevens Street in Calgary
Pocket Parks
Shade from buildings
Plaza or Central Square
    With park in middle
    Boston Commons
    Kansas City

Movement, opportunity to watch people
Economic viability to make areas vital
Attractive to investors

Question 1 Summary:
Mont
Campus Corner
Core Area/Neighborhoods

Question 2 Summary:
Safety
Socially welcoming
Outdoor space
Landscaping, treed,
Plazas, patios, public art
Successful, viable

Trees
History
Green space
Nature
When people know you
Neighborhoods (W of campus, E of campus, N Flood Street)
Livable streets
Accessibility (transportation, walking, mobility device)
Safety
Good lighting
Predictable social events
Adequate traffic control in high density developments
Sense of community
Neighborhood atmosphere
With increased population, Norman has maintained its "small town" feel
Historical neighborhoods
Planning and marketing analysis

Human scale
A place with anchors (e.g. Campus Corner has McFarlin, Whitehand Hall, OU)
Mature landscaping
Level changes at a human scale (e.g. seating walls) that respond to terrain
Texture and variety in architecture
Urban open space
Presence of landmarks
People-watching places
Concentration of civic resources around OKC Museum of Art
Utica Square in Tulsa
Shady
Shops dominate the visual environment
Parking recedes into background
Riverside Drive in Tulsa
Honors the river landscape
Outdoor seating areas
Intimate scale
Walkability

Heavy tree canopy in urban environments (like Sacramento)
Built environments that relate to the past and the natural environment
Contrast in modern and historic buildings when scale is compatible
Woodbury, CT
    Huge variety of residential architecture 1600-2000
    Loosely controlled historic district
    Pleasing blend of old and new
Don't like idea of design regulations in general
1. Human scale
2. Mature landscaping
3. Variety of uses
4. Variety of architecture
5. People-watching places

Diversity
So many good things to do
    Presence of museums, sports, art, concerts
Sense of community
Need safer bikeways
Manageable traffic
Mobility
Civility of residents
Europe safety and mobility
Depot
    Architecture and green space
Peaceful, soothing setting
People watching
Well-designed public space
        Myriad Garden
Water—features—natural
Safe
Clean
Accessible
Accessible by public transportation
Washington DC parks—all work together
Outdoor café options
Weather
Florida—weather, golf, oceans
Colorado—Colorado Springs serenity, quiet, mountains, cool
Gunnison, CO—zero crime rate
Charleston, SC—beauty, history, romance
San Diego—weather, food, boardwalk, downtown, ocean
Washington, DC—public spaces, always something to do, walkability, history

COMPATIBILITY PRIORITIES JULY 9, 2012

Appropriate size & scale for site 9	Not intrusive on surrounding neighborhoods 36	Allow height & density based on location 25	Universally accessible design 5
Aesthetically attractive buildings 3	Preserve what's unique about Norman 8	Preserve small town feel 7	Allow for architectural contrast 6
Protect views 1	Create spaces for public interaction 8	Environmentally friendly design 7	Improve walkability 17
Preserve core area neighborhoods 39	Adequate parking for increased population 3	More housing choices 6	Architecture compatible w/surrounding context 6
Appropriate location 8	Avoid fad architecture – use timeless design 2	Infill existing commercial districts 9	Provides public space 6

SCENARIO 1		
Neighborhood Impacts	**Agree**	**Disagree**
Does not change the existing community character.	3 green	9 red
R-3 zoning has potential to erode low density scale and single-family character of these neighborhoods.	1 Red 14 Green	7 Red
Allows construction of large apartment complexes only where sufficient land can be assembled to meet zoning requirements, including setbacks and off-street parking.	12 Green	12 Green
Traffic Impacts		
Requires a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which provides a way to mitigate the traffic impacts of development on surrounding areas.	16 Green	6 Red
Limits community's ability to increase supply of housing that is located within walking distance of community destinations	1 Red 16 Green	6 Red
Traffic patterns will continue to developed as currently projected.	1 Red 6 Green	11 Red
Public Amenities Impacts		
Provides private open space amenities in developments.	7 Green	4 red
Economic Impacts		
Limits capacity of neighborhoods around community destinations to accommodate more residences which could become more customers and patrons.	14 Green	9 red

Regulatory Impacts	Agree	Disagree
Does not require additional regulations.	2 green	16 red
Public Amenities Impacts		
Misses the opportunity to augment the public realm.	18 green	1 red
Land Use Impacts		
Failure to anticipate market demand for housing products not currently available in Norman means the city will be forced to react to each application on a case-by-case basis.	2 Red 18 Green	1 red
Misses out on a growing demand for additional housing choices in Norman that could accommodate a broader range of ages and lifestyles.	19 green	5 Red 1 Green
Has potential to increase the urban heat island effect as more surface parking is created in urban settings.	24 Geen	1 red
Parking Impacts		
Promotes overuse of land for parking as opposed to using land to improve quality-of-life uses such as residential, commercial or urban open spaces.	17 green	2 red
Promotes surface parking solutions, including creation of off-street parking lots in R-2 and R-3 zones.	1 Red 8 Green	3 red
Zoning Impacts		
No change in regulation required.	2 green	14 red

Stormwater Management Impacts	Agree	Disagree
Stormwater drainage improvements are required for all development and can be managed through various technologies which include both above-ground and below-ground solutions.	12 green	3 red

SCENARIO 2

Land Use Impacts	Agree	Disagree
Will increase residential density, particularly around major community destinations, which in turn builds demand for shops, restaurants and enhanced public space.	1 Red 12 Green	3 red
Allows possibility of “retrofitting suburbia” by enabling higher density residential uses be added to outlying commercial districts.	14 Green	1 red
May diminish student demand for apartments in less central locations.	5 green	10 red
Neighborhood Impacts		
Will require high quality design that is compatible with overall community character of the area.	22 green	2 red
Would limit height of building sections which are adjacent to single-family houses to 1 story (12 feet)	19 green	3 red
Will increase the variety of housing choices available near community destinations, allowing people at different stages of life to live in the neighborhood.	22 green	1 red

May alter scale and community character of adjacent low density neighborhoods but negative impacts would be diminished by stringent design criteria.	2 red 9 green	7 red
May inadvertently promote disinvestment in larger areas of Central Norman neighborhoods as land is being assembled to accommodate large apartment projects.	4 red 7 green	10 red 1 green
Parking and Traffic Impacts		
Will require structured parking.	12 green	1 green
Limits overuse of land for surface parking lots in favor of quality-of-life uses such as residential, commercial or urban open space.	16 green	1 red
Requires a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which provides a way to mitigate impacts of development on surrounding areas.	15 green	
May decrease number of car trips as more residential developments are located close to shops, restaurants, offices and community destinations.	16 green	12 red
May promote spillover parking into adjacent neighborhoods.	3 red 17 green	2 red
Will significantly increase volume of traffic onto and off of the site which will impact the entire traffic system in the area.	1 red 16 green	6 red
Public Amenities Impact		
Will help create and fund the development of urban public open	13 green	13 red

space in Norman.		
May create a mix of architectural styles and building practices along the street which will add interest to the public realm—i.e. the sidewalk environment.	25 green	16 red
Allows redevelopment of underperforming properties which is likely to increase property tax revenues	11 green	4 red
Increases number of residents in areas where such development occurs which will, in turn, increase demand for local goods and services and generate additional sales tax.	1 red 14 green	6 red
Stormwater Management Impacts		
May promote the use of creative design solutions for all aspects of development, such as environmentally friendly urban stormwater management techniques.	14 green	3 red
Other Impacts		
May diminish demand for other apartments in less central locations.	11 green	4 red
Regulatory Impacts		
Will require development of additional regulations to manage development.	24 green	

SCENARIO 3

Neighborhood Impacts	Agree	Disagree
Will increase residential density, particularly around major community destinations, which in turn builds demand for shops, restaurants and enhanced public space	1 red 24 green	1 red
Requires high quality design that contributes to the overall community character of the area	19 green	6 red
Creates more street activity by providing residents with nearby commercial options.	19 green	
May alter the scale and single-family community character of adjacent neighborhoods though negative impacts would be somewhat diminished by stringent design and siting criteria. May inadvertently promote disinvestment in larger areas of Central Norman neighborhoods as land is being assembled for larger apartment projects.	2 red 18 green 1 red 9 green	4 red 21 red
Parking and Traffic Impacts		
Requires structured parking that could be shared with other users outside the building.	1 red 10 green	3 red
Requires a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which provides a way to mitigate impacts of development on surrounding areas.	15 green	
Will increase volume of traffic onto and off of the site which will have impacts on the entire traffic system in the area.	3 red 13 green	10 red

May promote spillover parking into adjacent neighborhoods.	3 Red 16 Green	6 red
May decrease number of car trips as more residential developments are located close to shops, offices and community destinations.	22 Green	14 red
Public Amenities Impacts		
Will help create and fund improvements to the public realm in Norman.	9 green	9 red 1 green
Creates a mix of architectural styles along the street which adds interest to the public realm.	12 green	4 red 1 green
Open space amenities are provided in developments.	7 green	5 red 1 green
Regulatory Impacts		
Will require development of additional regulations to manage development.	21 green	2 red 1 green
Other Impacts		
May diminish demand for apartments in less central locations.	6 green	11 red 2 green
Land Use Impacts		
Allows possibility of “retrofitting suburbia” by enabling higher density residential uses be added to outlying commercial districts.	10 green	2 red

Limits overuse of land for surface parking lots in favor of quality-of-life uses such as residential, commercial or urban open space.	15 green	2 red
Economic Impacts		
Allows redevelopment of underperforming properties which is likely to increase property tax revenues.	10 green	2 red
Increases number of residents in areas where such development occurs which will, in turn, increase demand for local goods and services and generate additional sales tax.	13 green	1 red 1 green
Environmental Impacts		
Allows redevelopment of underperforming properties which is likely to increase property tax revenues.	13 green	3 red
Increases number of residents in areas where such development occurs which will, in turn, increase demand for local goods and services and generate additional sales tax.	9 green	1 red
May result in fewer car trips to and from the vicinity which could improve environmental quality around key community destinations.	15 green	8 red

SCENARIO 4

Neighborhood Impacts	Agree	Disagree
May alter the scale and single-family community character of adjacent neighborhoods.	11 red 12 green	3 red
May inadvertently promote disinvestment in larger areas of Central Norman neighborhoods as land is being assembled for larger apartment projects.	8 red 9 green	9 red 1 green
Has a potential to interrupt the single-family character and scale of adjacent neighborhoods.	5 red 4 green	4 red
Has potential to interrupt the intimate scale and community character of existing neighborhoods.	**12 red** **10 green**	**3 red** **1 green**
May increase spillover parking into adjacent neighborhoods	10 red 8 green	2 red
Traffic and Parking Impacts		
Structured parking will be required where this is developed.	12 green	2 red
Requires a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) which provides a way to mitigate impacts of development on surrounding areas.	13 green	
May decrease number of car trips as more residential developments are located close to shops, offices and community destinations.	13 green	13 red

Will increase volume of traffic onto and off of the site which will impact the entire traffic system in the area.	6 red 13 green	
Public Realm Impacts		
Will add trees along public sidewalks.	1 red 13 green	5 red 1 green
Environmental Impacts		
May promote the use of creative design solutions for all aspects of development, such as environmentally friendly urban stormwater management techniques.	8 green	6 red
Stormwater drainage improvements are a requirement of all development and can be managed through various technologies which include both above-ground and below-ground solutions.	5 green	2 red
Regulatory Impacts		
Will require development of additional regulations to manage development.	3 red 18 green	2 red
Land Use Impacts		
Will greatly increase residential density in Norman, particularly around major community destinations.	5 red 13 green	1 red
May encourage the “retrofitting of suburbia” which promotes those areas evolving to become more dense and walkable, adding value	2 red	8 red

to the land and bringing amenities to area residents.	13 green	
Stormwater Management Impacts		
May promote the use of creative design solutions for all aspects of development, such as environmentally friendly urban stormwater management techniques.	1 red 6 green	7 red
Stormwater drainage improvements are a requirement of all development and can be managed through various technologies which include both above-ground and below-ground solutions.	11 green	3 red

Station 5 Dot Democracy Survey from August 30, 2012

1. What Should Be the Maximum Building Height in Specific Locations?

Campus Corner area

Up to 2 stories	Up to 3 stories	Up to 4 stories	Up to 5 stories	Over 5 stories
	7 red 39 green	4 red 4 green	5 red 8 green	9 red 19 green

Downtown

Up to 2 stories	Up to 3 stories	Up to 4 stories	Up to 5 stories	Over 5 stories
	3 green	2 red 14 green	3 red 7 green	1 red 20 green

Porter Corridor

Up to 2 stories	Up to 3 stories	Up to 4 stories	Up to 5 stories	Over 5 stories
	2 red 2 green	3 red 8 green	2 red 2 green	3 red 9 green

Areas Outside of Central Norman (e.g. 12th & Alameda, University North Park, 24th and Main, etc.)

Up to 2 stories	Up to 3 stories	Up to 4 stories	Up to 5 stories	Over 5 stories
	1 red 16 green	3 green	1 red 6 green	1 red 12 green

2. What Should be the Maximum Density (i.e. Dwelling Units Per Acre) in Specific Locations?

Campus Corner area

Under 30	30-40	40 -50	50-60	60-70	70- 80	80-90	Over 100
2 red 8 green	3 red 6 green	3 red 18 green	1 red 2 green	1 green		2 green	1 red 14 green

Downtown

Under 30	30-40	40 -50	50-60	60-70	70- 80	80-90	Over 100
1 red 1 green	1 red 6 green	1 red 12 green	1 green	1 green	2 green	2 green	1 red 14 green

Porter Corridor

Under 30	30-40	40 -50	50-60	60-70	70- 80	80-90	Over 100
2 red 11 green	2 red 4 green	3 red 9 green	1 red 1 green	1 red	1 red 1 green	1 red 1 green	1 red 8 green

Areas Outside of Central Norman (e.g. 12th & Alameda, University North Park, 24th and Main, etc.)

Under 30	30-40	40 -50	50-60	60-70	70- 80	80-90	Over 100
1 red 1 green	1 red 6 green	1 red	3 green	1 red 6 green	2 green	1 green	8 green

3. Should Higher Density Residential Development be Required to be Mixed Use?

Yes	No	Depends on Location
7 green	1 red 4 green	6 red 25 green

4. Should On-Site Parking for Higher Density Residential Be Measured by:

Maintain Status Quo = 1.8 spaces/unit	2 Spaces per Unit	1 spaces per unit	Shared Parking Facilities OK
8 green	5 red 20 green	4 green	3 red 12 green

5. Are Design Guidelines Needed to Regulate the Appearance, Building Materials, Size and Placement of High Density Residential Development?

Yes	No	Depends on Location
5 red 41 green		5 green

6. When High Density Residential Infill Development is Proposed Across the Street from Lower Density Neighborhoods, What Conditions Should Separate the Two?

2-Lane Arterial Road	4-Lane Arterial Road	Maximum Height Limited to 12 feet Taller than Neighbors	Depends on Location
4 green	1 red 16 green	14 green	1 red 14 green

7. Can a High Density Building Be Compatibly located on the Same Block as Single Family Houses?

Yes	No	Depends on Location
1 red 11 green	11 red 36 green	1 red 4 green

8. What Should Be the Largest Parcel Size for High Density Development?

1/8 block	1/4 block	1/3 block	½ block	¾ block	whole block
1 red	1 red	3 green	2 red 8 green	1 green	2 red 14 green

Note: Average blocks in Central Norman are 400 l.f. x 300 l.f. feet.

9. How important is it for the City of Norman to provide regulations for all high density developments over 30 dwelling units per acre?

Extremely important	Very important	important	Not very important	Not important at all	Don't know
7 red 40 green	1 green	3 green			

Comment Card Transcriptions from Meetings 6 Held on August 30, 2012

SCENARIO 1

- *"I agree that many of these statements are true – the ordinances need to be changed to improve the situations. I am not agreeing with this as a good scenario."*

- *"Questions are poorly designed and system is confusing. Obviously set up to achieve desired answers rather than real feedback."*

- *"I think "status quo" should be the "default" position. I do not think zoning regulations need to move forward, but only in a way that would enhance each location, and reduce negative impact on current residents and property owners."*

- *"Status Quo would not address the need for making progressive decisions to create living space that has more options and character than the status quo offers."*

- *"The information should have been compiled into a survey to allow citizens to read and understand and ask questions.*
  The confusion of the dots/agree/disagree was confusing and the results will certainly be skewed and should not be used.
  For instance: 5 stories – are all fire departments in Norman equipped to fight fires up there?
  Also, carbon monoxide rises – parking on lower stories and apt. on top leads to disaster."

- *"NO HIGH DENSITY should be added in or adjacent to existent older neighborhoods or campus corner. To do so would destroy the charm and security of those areas. Once the charm is gone, you can't get it back."*

- *"Too many of these answers ~~questions~~ can be interpreted more than 1 way!!!"*

- *"This scenario does not support the future of Norman. We need high density to support a more sustainable future. With higher energy prices we will need to work, live, play, shop in the same area."*

- *"Status Quo is not the answer since Norman is going to keep growing. If (illegible) status quo with growth means that more sprawl will occur. More land, lawns, and low density housing that does not support public transportation. Instead, we'll need more cars, creating more traffic and gas consumption. We need to stop the "car ghetto" developments that have spread all over Norman. In time, these housing developments will become blighted and difficult to revitalize*

because no one will want to be stuck in a bad area and not be able to go anywhere w/o a car".

- *"This is the worst scenario –*
  Ineffective
  Inefficient
  Very very old-school
  Absolutely not a solution to the problem"

- *"The reason we are here is because the status quo isn't working. Projects can get bogged in the process and never know how the council will vote. Higher densities might be appropriate in some areas. But not in core Norman and not next to neighborhoods."*

- *"SET BACKS must be reasonable"*

- *"# 1 - Could be changed to encourage vertical parking options."*

- *"No change is not the answer – need to be something."*

- *"It's rather unclear whether "status quo" refers to present development patterns or to ad hoc (illegible) to them."*

Citizen distributed handout sheet attached as a comment card. Scanned in for transcription purposes:

Proposal – Core Norman Only

Residential High Density

1) Building – No more than 4 stories above ground 55 ft. height limit

2) Building – No more than 1 story below ground 13.75 ft. subterranean limit

3) Not located in the same city block of a single family home neighborhood or neighborhood where single family homes are present

4) Not across the street from a single family home neighborhood or neighborhood where single family homes are present if separated by a 2 lane street

5) Can be across the street from a single family home neighborhood or neighborhood where single family homes are present if separated by a minimum of a 4 lane street

6) Minimum lot size = 2 acres (no exceptions)

7) Maximum dwelling units per acre = 52

8) No more than 75% of land can be utilized by building and parking

9) Parking – No more than ground level of highest floor level of building; no more than 1 level below ground

10) Parking Requirements 1.8 spaces (8.5' x 19') per dwelling unit; no on-street percentage used in calculation

Additional notification requirements

1) Add notice to affected Homeowners – if 2 stories, notice becomes 600'; if 3 stories, notice becomes 1200'; if 4 stories, notice becomes 1800'

SCENARIO 2

- *"Do not endorse any of this scenario."*

- *"Do not endorse any of this scenario."*

- *"Scenario 2 is best for Norman. BUT historical areas cannot ever be brought back once impacted to such a large degree. Keep away from campus neighborhoods."*

- *"I like this scenario, but the overall size should be limited to ensure negative impacts (spillover parking, increased traffic volume) are minimized. Quality of design important. Should be on arterial (or busy) street."*

- *"These developments have the potential to answer some of the problems with Norman's issues. These developments should not encroach on neighborhoods as this will erode the quality of life that makes Norman so desirable."*

- *"No thanks. Still a bit more than I want but if we must…."*

- *"Must have required setbacks front, side and back yards"*

- *"HUD regulations for accessibility if 2 floors = 1st floor must all be accessible*
  More than 2 floors = must have elevators
  7 elements of accessibility = kitchen cabinets
  a. grab bars b. turning radius in bath c. light switches low enough
  d. wide doors e. accessible entrance f. electrical outlets higher
  g. accessibility to doors?"

- *"Insufficient setbacks, particularly to adjoining residential*
  Not enough parking"

- *"Your process for voting is terribly confusing – results in meaningless outcomes"*

- *"I'm sorry but this dot thing is too confusing and the results are incredibly meaningless. Sure hope this isn't the end of the discussions."*

- *"Should consider financial and economic impact of HD before each proposed HD."*

- *"How do we know whether there is actual demand for additional housing-apts? In Norman?"*
- *"The location of new developments impose different costs on the City. How will we evaluate that? What does it cost for the City to provide HD, mid density, low density?"*

- *"Several people voted several times for the same item on survey. (Back wall near door) results in meaningless outcomes."*

- *"The claims of "variety of housing choices" for "different stages of life" are untrue of current, very high rent proposals."*

- *"None of the scenarios depicted in the photos show high density in a single family residential area –Given the nature of Norman, it's likely some request for high density in a predominantly residential area will eventually be requested. A picture is worth a thousand words and these pictures are of areas not terribly like most of Norman."*

- *"What happened to all the public open spaces and community space that was touted by the City staff?"*

- *"Choices should be "like" or "dislike" rather than "agree" or "disagree" "*

- *"Still no mention of bicycle parking and storage! Cars are still driving dev. scenarios."*

- *"Should be like or dislike not agree, disagree. Statements are many times correct…but I don't like. For entire proves, just not this scenario. #2 OK in general."*

- *"Meaningless data. The statements have been designed to elicit positive response even when citizens dislike the concept stated."*

- *"The scenario limits what high density living is meant to do. Scenario 3 is the best scenario for Norman. This scenario still would cause people to travel by car if not close to multiple amenities; such as a grocery store. While this scenario would be next door to commercial areas; it doesn't allow for a mixed use building. Residential high density is fine, but we need to allow for mixed use buildings."*

- *"Need to increase public notice area with each new higher floor allowed."*

- *"Parking requirement inadequate."*

- *"How close are we to capacity and at what point do we evaluate that we are nearing capacity that we need to ask the question as to whether the citizens want to increase capacity for more development? ie: water treatment and supply, waste water, schools, hospital, etc."*

- *"Every scenario requires an arterial street – why was that predetermined?"*

SCENARIO 3

- *"High Density Mixed Use has no place in or adjacent or historical areas that are residential"*

- *"Does the City have water capacity for 1000 new hu [housing units] on cc [Campus Corner]?"*

- *"Don't understand 4 stories "in urban settings" (aren't they all) then in same sentence allows 6 – which is it, under what circumstances 6?"*

- *"Parking that is "shared" with others outside the building is a big problem. Residence must have shared parking spaces. 1 space per bedroom + guest area is good but difficult to accomplish."*

- *"Too much too soon. Do not do this."*

- *"et backs are essential for safety and maintenance of neighborhood integrity."*

- *"Building orientation is critical in Oklahoma. Balconies should not face west and eastern exposures are preferable always."*

- *"I don't support this scenario as location is the all important issue. I could support such a building in downtown or in outlying commercial districts, but not in the campus corner area."*

- *"All HD should comply with and integrate with city bike plan and cart service."*

- *"Any adoption of HD should be considered in light of Norman's entire long-term land use plan and should be based on objective analysis of financial and other impacts as city and residential."*

- *"Do not use any of this scenario."*

- *"All HD should incorporate provisions for greenway – plants, trees and so on that are oriented on rooftops of hd {high density] if possible."*

- *"My favorite scenario is this mixed use with mid-level density."*

- *"It is recommended that high density building be at minimal silver LEED certified."*

- *"As for storm water mitigation, it is important to utilize grey water systems. High density could also utilize rooftops as part of the green space of the building."*

- *"Your process is terribly confusing – results in meaningless outcomes."*

- *"All units need to be accessible and comply to ADA, HUD and visibility guidelines."*

- *"It's still all about cars! One basic point of HD is to decrease reliance on cars. And where is mention of improved public transportation? That's another basic point of HD . You all are missing the boat…"…*

- *"Do not endorse this scenario."*

- *"Where is the required community space"?*

- *"Not enough parking?"*

- *"There is a clear misunderstanding about how to use these red and green dots – I think your outcome may be unreliable."*

- *"The questions are worded to require positive answers even when you don't agree with what is being done."*

- *"Extremely insufficient setbacks especially on residential side."*

- *"Why do we need to increase the density of housing in Norman this drastically? It's the new in "thing" and in another decade it will be obsolete and we will be left with these aging monsters."*

- *"We need assessment of economic impacts/fiscal cost for city to provide services to new developments HD vs. edge development."*

- *"In order to reap the benefits that high density can produce, it is vital that the majority of the developments are mixed-use in the core of Norman. Walkable mixed-use (& high density) creates an upswing in tourism. Local economics, and a cleaner, healthier, environment. These results won't be seen if high density is placed on the outskirts of town or if it's not mixed use in the core."*

- *"Will HD displace sprawl or be added to the mix?"*

- *"What does it cost for the city to service HD, mid density, low density hu {housing units]?"*

- *"Statements appear to be leading us to certain answers. Some statements are contradictory within the statement! How can we design w/words? Give me pictures and specific elements to agree to."*

SCENARIO 4

- *"High Density has no place in or adjacent ot residential areas, especially in historical areas."*

- *"Do not endorse any of these scenarios."*

- *"Don't overdevelop. It destroys neighborhoods, existing rental/housing markets, and quality of life for current citizens."*

- *"Minimal design requirements equate to poor compatibility quality and aesthetics."*

- *"NO NO NO Do not do this."*

- *"Guest parking: 1 stall per unit is too much for guest parking. Would suggest 1.1 parking stalls per bedroom. Apartment owner has surveyed existing developments at all hours and found parking lots to be 65% full."*

- *"Discussion of agree or disagree and green or red – 4 questions – 1 dot"*

- *"Do not endorse this scenario. Red dots on scenario sheets indicate NO"*

- *"The difference in language to influence opinion is obvious. High density has positive words, status quo has words like "misses opportunities" negative words"*

- *"I do not agree with this scenario as it is written. In the future of Norman, it is possible such a structure would be appropriate in certain locations. However, that might be in the distant future."*

- *"Very high density housing is only appropriate in urban environments. We don't really want Norman to be turned into an urban environment. There's a reason Norman has been named among the top 100 small towns. This development will destroy the best of Norman."*

- *"15' setbacks should be enforced anytime an apartment building is adjacent to a residence!"*

- *"Please Please pay attention to setbacks and parking – both destroy neighborhoods. Safety!!"*

- *"NOT in existing neighborhoods."*

- *"August 30 meeting exercise of colored dots and columns and dozens and dozens and dozens of questions too confusing; would question validating of this exercise.*

Saw individuals "stuffing the ballot box" by putting all their stickers in one box/column."

- *"This is too dense anywhere in Norman."*

- *"Don't mix high density and single dwelling. Need to have clear demarcations or visual/spatial boundaries between single dwelling and high density. For example, single dwelling on side streets off of arterial/main streets and high density along and facing main street. Have trees and space between single dwelling and HD i.e. alley way."*

- *"Where is the discussion about the water supply? We don't have enough now?"*

- *"High density is a community option not a need. High density should not be excused from landscape or set back requirements."*

- *"Where is the community spaces you promised"?*

- *"This survey is too flowed! For example: I agree this will alter the neighborhood character – by putting a green dot does that mean I like it? No it doesn't!"*

- *"Open space requirements in #4 inadequate for high density."*

- *"Any decision to pursue HD needs to be made in the overall context of Norman's long term land use plan and must consider objective analysis of financial and other impacts on the City and residents."*

- *"Confusing scenario. People put red dots in agree to note, statement is correct But I do Not Like."*

- *"High Density – Mixed Use –Uses the phrase 'community destinations' Can builders/developers not build new community destinations? Can they only cannibalize the older neighborhoods with existing destinations?"*

- *"Failed to discuss the two major questions: do we need this density? OU is not growing rapidly. Employment in Norman has declined in the last 6 years. Fewer people work here. We do not need quantities of new housing. If you build housing units in excess of the job base and student attendance you are encouraging people that commute to other locations to work. You are creating a dense bedroom community."*

- *"The requirements for this proposal are completely inadequate – setbacks, parking, traffic, minimum requirements, design, all the things discussed as needed in the presentation."*