

CENTER CITY ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY AD HOC COMMITTEE

JUNE 3, 2019

EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM, CITY HALL

11:00 A.M.

Committee Members Present:

Councilmember Bill Hickman
Jim Adair
Cameron Brewer
Lee Hall
Keith McCabe
Richard McKown
Autumn McMahan
Byron Morris
Councilmember Holman

Mayor Lynne Miller

Committee Members Absent:

None

Staff Present:

Jane Hudson	Todd McLellan
Anais Starr	Ken Danner
Beth Muckala	Scott Sturtz
Terry Floyd	
Roné Tromble	
Tara Reynolds	

Public Present:

Jayne Crumpley	Brad Worster
Russ Kaplan	Tammy McCown
Peter Petromilli	Dustin Graham
Kamala Jolly Stewart	
Elliott Kahn	

Councilmember Hickman – We’re going to call the meeting to order. The Center City Administrative Delay Ad Hoc Committee meeting for Monday, June 3rd. Welcome everybody. Thank you much all of our citizen volunteers and Council members for continuing to serve, and to all of our great staff for their wonderful support and for lunch.

We’re going to start out item number 2 with a discussion regarding the proposed technical amendments to the Center City-Form Based Code. I’m going to let Autumn give us her comments first, because she may have to leave a little early. Then we’ll go around the room and everybody can share their comments, feedback, and I know Jane has a few things that she caught herself. We’re going to try to go through this in a systematic way and then move on to the rest of the agenda. Autumn, go ahead.

Ms. McMahan – Thank you very much. Really my question/comment was on page 23 on the signage. I just wanted to make sure that was reflecting everything we had discussed. I saw that we had increased the maximum size on the blade sign, but then I see that we changed that top sign to be called a hanging sign instead of a blade sign. That’s a very minor discrepancy, but I wanted to make sure that I was understanding that this was reflective of everything we had looked at.

Ms. Hudson – It’s my understanding it is. The reason we changed the top right one from blade sign to hanging sign, because that really wasn’t a true blade sign. We thought, just for clarification, that really we needed to put hanging on there for that one. Then it’s

my understanding that the verbiage that changed in the pink does take care of everything that was discussed, but I'm open for comments from anybody on the committee if that is not correct.

Mr. McKown – I've got some notes here about – so we're showing it 5' wide, but not more than 3' tall. That seems an awkward proportion, or a little bit small. I was wondering if you did it at least 25 sq. ft. so you can do 5x5 or 5x6, or it just seemed like we could go with 30 sq. ft. per side, either way.

Ms. Hudson – So instead of the 5' wide containing a maximum of 15 sq. ft.

Mr. McKown – It's the 15 sq. ft. – it's just limiting the height of it. I think it would be better if it was at least 25 sq. ft. per side, so you could have like a 5x5 round sign sticking out.

Ms. Hudson – Comments?

Councilmember Hickman – I'm fine with Richard's proposed change. See, Richard, I'll be easy once.

Ms. McMahan – I'm fine with that, too. I actually thought that we were going to make it proportional to the building. I don't know how we would word that. So a taller building could have a bigger sign. But I support larger signage. I think it adds to the character.

Mr. Adair – The only thing I was wanting to watch in that paragraph was the minimum height. To be honest with you, I was going to be critical of the 9', until I realized it was what was existing. It almost seems a little bit low to me. Scott can jump up and hit that if he's been drinking.

Mr. Sturtz – In my younger days.

Ms. Hudson – We could make it the same as the clear height of the ceiling for those.

Mr. McKown – I think you'll be happy with 9', especially as you get awnings and then you've got a sign hanging down below the awning. I think 9' is a good number.

Councilmember Hickman – I don't think anyone is going to intentionally put it where somebody can jump up and hit it, because those things are expensive and they're not going to want to risk the damage to it, I would think. I think you'll see people naturally putting it up higher. I'm glad we don't have a maximum so they can put it up higher on their building if they choose to. I think the market will bear it out.

I'll let somebody decide, when we get to the next items, if they want to put the signage on for a continuing topic of discussion. I think, for now, this addresses what we discussed and the one item that we have in the pipeline at Dr. Bird's office at least.

Autumn, anything else?

Ms. McMahan – That was the main thing.

Councilmember Holman – The wheeled signs not being allowed – does that mean like restaurants will sometimes put out on the sidewalk little foldable thing and they write on today's special or whatever. Is that prohibited just in this area? Is it prohibited in general, and we don't enforce it?

Ms. Hudson – Are you talking about h on page 24? Temporary sidewalk easel signs up to 36" in height are permitted within the dooryard area.

Councilmember Holman – I was looking at number 3, the prohibited signs. Portable or wheeled signs and advertising located outside any building are not allowed.

Mr. Morris – So it seems like what's mentioned in h would be a subcategory to that – so this may be a conflict. Maybe just adding language to paragraph 3 that says see paragraph h for an exception to that.

Councilmember Hickman – Except as otherwise provided for herein.

Mr. Morris – Yeah.

Councilmember Holman – So existing businesses that put the little fold-out – I don't want necessarily to end those.

Councilmember Hickman – No. Good point.

Ms. Hudson – Okay. I just have to ask a question. I understand in h it's allowing for the temporary sidewalk easel signs up to 36" in height. Then when we have that comment down there for the portable or wheeled signs and advertising located outside of any building are not allowed. If I'm understanding what that's referring to, and then we say except as otherwise provided above – are you saying that you want them to be able to have these portable or wheeled signs out in front? Those can get very large.

Councilmember Holman – Not necessarily. I'm just thinking specifically of what I see right now in front of Michaelangelo's. They just have the little sign that folds out and on each side they can, with a chalk, write today's special.

Councilmember Hickman – I think we're okay with the easels, not the big wheeled signs.

Councilmember Holman – Yeah. Wouldn't want anything that obstructs the sidewalk. I'm not sure what the legality of those is.

Mr. McCabe – I think that's where the confusion is coming from. Because Stephen likes the easel, which is still a portable sign.

Ms. Hudson – Yeah. Because it specifically says easel signs are allowed of up to 36", we're fine with that. But anything portable. Okay.

Mr. McCabe – We actually talked about that years ago. Those were those portable signs that have the flashing lights with the arrow that pointed down.

Ms. Hudson – Right. That's not what we're wanting. Okay.

Mr. Adair – I think we've been a little bit lax in sign enforcement from time to time.

Councilmember Holman – It could be a problem if every storefront had a little sign out front.

Mr. Adair – That's kind of my – if you put the big flapping flag banner every day of the week on every business, it looks horrible. If you do it one day a month on one business in the block, it attracts attention short-term. Just needs some reasonableness with it.

Ms. Hudson – I just had to make sure. Okay. Next?

Councilmember Hickman – On page 16, Jane, are we going to be able to make this picture of the regulating plan have pink on there?

Ms. Hudson – Yes. We're working on that. That will be done. Definitely.

Councilmember Hickman – On page 18 in 2.b – were we going to add in Neighborhood Middle there – pink? I thought you would add the pink there – Neighborhood Middle.

Ms. Hudson – Okay.

Ms. Hall – On the page before, on 17 – number 5, we just have pink and that probably should be Neighborhood Middle. And number 6 it just says Detached, and it probably should say Detached Frontage.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. Anybody have anything up through page 18 that we haven't discussed yet?

Ms. Hall – Well, I just wanted to make sure – we've talked about this several times, but I have noted the Regulating Plan, too, and the draft map that we've been using for pink is not what we have agreed on and we had agreed that Duffy was the north border. I just want to make sure.

Ms. Hudson – Yeah. The map is just not done yet. Lisa is working on that – it's in a different program.

Councilmember Hickman – The same thing on page 12; we need to try to add pink in there as well. That regulating plan.

Ms. Hudson – Oh, for the symbol after the key. Yeah, that will be added.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. I'm now going to go ahead to page 19, if nobody had any other comments leading up to that page.

I think, Byron, to your question about – or maybe it was one of the folks here's questions about the siting – about parcels with varied RBLs. If you see on page 19, staff has added in a sentence there on F.1 about single parcels with varied RBLs may select a single RBL and build to that designation. Does that help?

Ms. Hudson – So 19 is okay? Okay.

Councilmember Hickman – Then on page 22. Anybody have anything prior to page 22? I'm going to note that on paragraph 10, I think this is part of the language to try to clarify that if you're a corner lot the street address is what is applicable. Is that right, Jane?

Ms. Hudson – And there is a typo that we'll get fixed there.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay, now I'm over to page 27. Anybody else have anything prior to that? Yes, Lee?

Ms. Hall – On page 24, on the lighting standards. I like the addition of the design must be approved by City staff. Were we discussing having a consistent design standard for that whole area? Or just on a property by property approval?

Ms. Hudson – We talked about it at one meeting, and the concern was that we wanted to make sure that we had the consistency throughout the area. The lighting field is changing daily, so Public Works, Engineering, Traffic Division – they're the ones that typically go out – they're in the right-of-way. They're going to be installed in the right-of-way, so I want to make sure that what we get out there is uniform.

Ms. Hall – Okay, good.

Ms. Hudson – But I want to make sure that we get approval from that department, because they're the ones that are going to be going out there and working on these areas.

Ms. Hall – I just was making sure that you can have that goal with the way this is written. Okay. Great.

Ms. Hudson – I'll verify that.

Ms. Muckala – We've got to put something internal, like Jane said, but we need to address it in the language. We'll smooth that out.

Ms. Hall – But the intent is to have a unified lighting standard. Okay.

Ms. McMahon – Or to have a couple options, was my understanding.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So then on page 27, we have the insertion to clarify the mixed use and/or 3 or more dwelling units within a single structure or attached structures. I didn't see we had the definition of dwelling unit, so Jane, I think we might need to do that. I think we already have it in our zoning code.

Ms. Hudson – I'm sorry. I didn't do the definitions.

Councilmember Hickman – No, you're fine. Then on page 28, we struck the finished floor elevation shall be no less than 3 feet for residential units. I think that's something that Richard and all of us had talked about. If it's a residential unit, the 3' step-up will not be required.

Then on page 29 is where we added in the building construction standard, if you will. As a part of that conversation, we talked about residential, but having the ground floor built to the commercial standards, and staff has incorporated it in here – the ground story shall be constructed to regulations of the Building Code and references the various use and occupancy classifications that are probably the primary commercial uses, and then also addressing the entry doors, so we don't have the doors swinging out into the sidewalk. Yes, Richard?

Mr. McKown – Do we have a conflict, or do we need any clarity around the change on page 28 where we're showing required building line for at least 100% of the length. Because immediately, when I read that, I'm like, what about your door set in, like we've got multiple examples here on Main Street, where 75% of the building is out here on the build line, but then you've got this recessed door. Usually in a 2-story condition it continues up, so you would think of that building as being built to the build line, but I just don't want any confusion here.

Councilmember Hickman – Should we maybe say – at the end of that sentence, put a comma and then add except for the recessed entry doorway – something like that?

Mr. McKown – Yeah. It could also accommodate stairs. For example, if you wanted to have your finished floor – or if your finished floor just simply needed to be at a given height and you step in, walk up the stairs sideways. There's lots of reasons that you might push the front door back just a tiny bit, or the stoop, or whatever. So you're not building 100% of the way across.

Ms. Hudson – We could just say for the entry, and not put doors. Say entry – period.

Mr. McKown – Yeah.

Councilmember Hickman – But just to be clear, you're talking about a small area, though.

Mr. McKown – Small area, yeah.

Councilmember Hickman – It's still going to look like the whole building is at the build line.

Mr. McKown – In a 2-story building, you would judge it to be built at the build line, because everything above is out at that façade. This kind of hair-splitting is what gets us sitting around this table.

Mr. Adair – We've redone the sidewalks on Main Street, and redid them to meet ADA. Literally, you've got finished floor elevations that are all over the place, which makes the sidewalk real challenging to do sometimes, doesn't it, Mr. Sturtz?

Councilmember Hickman – Jane, did you get that from Richard? When we get done with all this, I'm going to ask for a motion to approve as amended, meaning as we've discussed and the comments that have been made. Just so everybody knows that's where we're heading.

Ms. Hall – I have a question on page 30. We really haven't discussed Urban Residential at all, I don't think. This just caught my attention for some reason. The Urban Residential is a peculiar block piece on University. I am a little confused because it says here it's under the Urban General building form standards, but it implies that it's residential use only. Is that correct? I mean, is that the intent? Because, if you look at page 59 on the Building Form Standards, Urban Residential is included there, but it does allow for overnight lodging. I was just unclear as to what the Urban Residential is.

Ms. Hudson – Well, it's my understanding, and I may have to ask Anais, but I'll just make this statement then I'll see if you've got additional information. It's my understanding that it was intended for residential use or boutique hotel type set-ups.

Ms. Hall – Okay. So that is an allowed use.

Ms. Hudson – Is that what you understand?

Ms. Starr – That's my understanding.

Ms. Hall – Okay. Just a point of information. I wasn't sure if the commercial was intended. Okay. Thank you.

Councilmember Hickman – Jane, my comment on page 30 would be if we could make that statement that you added be the same as the one on page 27. So just add in within a single structure or attached structures – at the no structure or set of attached structures shall contain – well, I guess you kind of already do. Never mind. You just worded it a different way. Never mind.

Ms. Hudson – We'll check for consistency.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. Going over now to page 33. Anybody have anything before page 33? Just wanted to note on this page that staff has incorporated the language from the slides that this is the same standard for dwelling units as in the orange we just talked about. This is what we talked about in several of our meetings. Then on page 34 and 35, staff has incorporated the comments that we provided. The side lot

setbacks and all structures being subject to the building and fire codes. Then on page 35 is about the street addresses. Any comments on the blue section here, pages 33, 34 and 35?

Mr. Morris – I just had a question. This may be when the regulating plan gets updated. On the live-work option there at the end of page 35, it says where live-work is designated on the regulating plan – how can you tell right now if it is designated on the regulating plan?

Ms. Hudson – Honestly, I've had to kind of piecemeal this together in my own head.

Mr. Morris – Do you have to go to the table first?

Councilmember Hickman – I think Comanche is one of those streets.

Ms. Hudson – If you look at the use category on page 59, you look at the blue and you look at – I lost a page. Does everybody go from 703 straight to definitions? Hang on. I apologize. That's what hard about this. It's in a different section, so we had to print each one separately. Underneath the regulating table, it says 704.B.1-2. Urban General, configuration, ground story residential uses, lobby ...

Mr. McCabe – It picks up after definitions.

Ms. Hudson – They're just out of order? Alright. I apologize. Okay. So we loop together is the live-work is just simply – I mean, you're residential and there's really nothing in there that outlines it specifically. But under D. Office, on page – it will be under Section 704, so after the definitions, you've got office uses are permitted within the ground story of designated live-work townhouse frontage units. So maybe we need to reference that. Is that what you're asking?

Mr. Morris – Yeah. I think that ties it together better. Sends you in the right direction from that comment on 35.

Ms. Hudson – I guess it's my understanding anywhere in the blue, if you want to do live-work, you can do live-work. So as long as you got your work on the ground floor. Somebody could do that right now in an existing building.

Mr. Morris – Okay.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. Let's go over to pages 35, 36 and 37, the new pink, and make sure that – since we're bringing this back, and I know we have some changes we wanted made to this section. Keith, do you have any comments on this area? I know that it's one that you had been looking at.

Mr. McCabe – Yes, sir. When we reintroduced going from the blue back into the pink back to the Neighborhood Middle Frontage, I had forwarded some height problems that we had. Just a reference – when we sat in the steering committee, part of the problems

we had is when we got on page 36 was the ultimate build height under the building height, which is under number 1 of 27' with a 3' stem wall. It didn't allow you to build at all. When we got to talking about that, and for what we felt at that time was going from a 3-story building that was allowed to drop it down to 27 – that's how we ended up with the blue. We, as a committee, had decided to go back to adding the pink with the side yard setbacks, dropping back to a 2-story with the attic story, which is basically your third story, which is in agreement with the existing structures. What I quickly did, just trying to make sure – because we all have our sections – and I'll let you just start to pass those down. These are 10 houses that I pulled directly off the internet right here, right now, and these are existing from Dean's Row, Asp, Jenkins, Monnett, Eddington, McCullough – the area that we're speaking about – and these are existing structures right now that fit within that definition of the pink, which is a 2-story with the existing third story that is in attic. What we're asking for is that there is the clarification that we're allowed to build exactly what was allowed before and what is allowed to be built now. On a handout that I printed off for you, just to help explain the numbers – this is the building that I'm building at 212 Eddington Street. Sometimes, when you just hear a number it's confusing, so what we physically did is I broke down the front page of my building plan to help explain where the numbers are coming from. Every house that I measured – all those houses that you're looking at right now, those measure from 34' to the very top of the ridge, up to 43' at the top of the ridge – that's what's existing. That's the reason why, when we used the number 42, because when you start looking at this set of plans, I have a smaller home here with a 3' stem wall. By the time you add your 9' wall, by the time you add your 18 or a foot and a half ceiling/floor truss, 9' wall, 18" ceiling/floor truss – now, I have an 8' ceiling in attic, but you could do 9, and the ridge of your house – so this house here, as drawn, is almost 37' off of the dirt from the ground. I hope that, by looking at that – or if any of you have driven by and looked at that, you understand that I believe that's truly in proportion with the neighborhood of what we're building. So that's the reason why I'm asking for these changes in the height definition to be put in and actually put in writing before we go to the meeting.

Councilmember Hickman – Anybody have any questions or concerns on looking at page 36, going to 42' for building height, and 18' for a sidewing, and 28' for the – I'm looking at parts 1, 2 and 3 under height.

Ms. Hudson – On page 36. It's the pink. Just look at the pink. Again, these are different sections and we had to pull it in from an old copy, so I'm sorry – you can't really look at the page numbers. You have to go to pink.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So pink, Neighborhood, under Height. You can see the pen write-in of the heights.

Mr. Adair – Keith, this is still 36" stem wall?

Mr. McCabe – Yes, sir. That's 36". Jim, what I'm hoping is to get my numbers in there first, and then that allows us to discuss the 36" stem wall height. Because these buildings – these residential setbacks – none of these encroach the sidewalk. It was part look, part privacy issue. On Eddington, where that house is sitting right now, there is a 10' setback

and what I did, because I already had the two existing houses that Richard was just looking at pre-built last year at the 25, what I did is, instead of doing a shallow porch, because of the 36, I actually built a 10' deep porch to allow me to push the house back to help keep it in line closer – but I could keep closer to the two houses that I built last year, kind of like what Lee was talking about – that frontage – trying to keep that the same. So I built that at 10 to push it back. I would like to see, whether it's in this discussion or at a later time, but I'd like to see it now, that, if we build 10' off of the residential build line, maybe we can reduce that 36" down to the 18-22. I will just tell you, and I understand we're in Biblical proportions right now in the great flood, because Noah's been parked on Eddington for the last 3 months – that trying to build a 36" stem wall with a 15mm pool liner on the inside during the great floods – we're pumping water out of that crawl space of these houses constantly. Because, typically, you back-fill them and you slab – put concrete and be done. At a 36" it was just cost-prohibitive to do that. So there was a whole lot of reasons to do it, and so maybe when we get to that point we can discuss – and I know I think that's on the part to talk about later – the stem wall height. The new product that I'm building on Park, which is right here across from Andrews – that's at 22". It's not in this at all, but it's at 22, because I want to keep that height – I want to keep that look myself. It's just that 36" has really proved to be nasty in the residential building. And that's something we don't know until you build one.

Mr. Adair – So where we struck the 36 was only in the Urban General – in the orange? Okay.

Mr. McCabe – Ms. Jane was helping me with some of the wording as far as the setback for the porch. Is that part there in this?

Ms. Hudson – It's on the next page, under building projections.

Mr. McCabe – So that's under the next page. What those heights do is I did not want this number just to scare you. I physically wanted you to see a piece of paper to see that's the heights that's already in existence and that's what allows us to build what I believe is common for that neighborhood. So I'm asking for those numbers to be put back – changed – amended – and put back in.

Councilmember Hickman – I'll just say that I'm fine with those building height numbers. The only thing that it's made me think about is if you flip back to page 34 in the blue, we had the siding shall be no higher than 15'. And pink was 15'. If we're going to go 18' in pink, I would say let's make blue 18 also.

Mr. McKown – I agree with that.

Councilmember Hickman – Technically, blue is more intense, more density, so I think that our blue numbers need to be the same or more than pink. So, Jane, did you get that?

Ms. Hudson – Yeah. Can I say something as well, please? I'm sorry, I'm going to hijack you just for one second, and I apologize. So we're back on the blue. We're going to change the siding from 15 to 18.

And, you all, don't hate me; I'm so sorry. I forgot to change something. I was just passed a note. At the meeting before last, we talked about in the blue – when Councilmember Holman pulled up those aerials – we talked about going to 100% at the required build line for a depth of at least 12' in the blue, and I am so sorry I did not put that in here.

Councilmember Hickman – Oh, yeah.

Ms. Hudson – So I will write that in here and it will be under the Siting under Façade up there where currently it says RBL for at least 65% and I will put this in there on the updated copy.

Councilmember Hickman – It will be 100% at the required build line for a depth of 12' from the build line.

Ms. Hudson – Right.

Councilmember Holman – I definitely agree with those changes, because I think that height is consistent with many of the properties and historical houses in this neighborhood.

Ms. McMahon – Which height?

Councilmember Holman – What we're changing it to. Probably my favorite house in all of Campus Corner – I wish somebody would get it and restore it. Maybe you will, Keith.

Mr. McCabe – He just wants a whole lot of money for that.

Councilmember Holman – I know the owner. I get it. But it is on a corner.

Mr. McCabe – You have to catch him in between beach trips.

Councilmember Holman – I don't know how many apartments are in there.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So, also in the pink, we have the clarification on the front yard setbacks shall be 10'. I saw that we are allowing stoops now to go 4' forward of the RBL, which I like that. That gives us a chance to make bigger porches. I think that's a great change.

Ms. Hudson – That's in the blue, also. We put that in the blue.

Councilmember Hickman – Then I see you've added here some language to clarify that pink now is single-family, single-family and garage apartment, and then a triplex for those lots of 75' or more. I would just say, instead of using the word duplex, let's do like we did on the other ones and say dwelling units – no more than 2 dwelling units in structure or attached, just so we're kind of using some consistent language.

Ms. Hudson – Okay.

Councilmember Hickman – Then maybe the same thing for triplexes for lot width of 75' or more, 3 or more dwelling units in structure or attached. Just so we're kind of using the same language, since we don't define duplex or triplex.

Ms. Hall – Well, if we're going to go there, then we probably should change garage apartment to ADU.

Councilmember Hickman – That's probably true.

Ms. Hall – Or accessory unit is what we call it.

Councilmember Hickman – Accessory dwelling unit.

Ms. Hall – Accessory unit is the definition in the back. We don't have a definition for a garage apartment.

Councilmember Hickman – Good catch. Okay, anything else? I think I heard Keith say he wanted to have a conversation about the stem wall – 3'. Can we table that for the time being and get through this, maybe a) come back around to it, or b) put it on the list of topics for further discussion?

Mr. McCabe – I just wanted to make sure that, knowing what we're trying to achieve, that was brought forth that either we speak about it later or table it like you said and come back to it. But that needs to be addressed.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay.

Ms. McCown – Tammi McCown. Unless we lower it, right now the one we're doing is 43', and I think 44' was allowed before. So if you lower the stem, then your 42 works. If you don't, it doesn't. 44 was allowed before.

Councilmember Hickman – I will say, anything that's built now would be grandfathered in at the height that it's at.

Ms. McCown – Right.

Councilmember Holman – I know it's going to be something we debate about, but I've been clear that I like it and I want to keep it. If we do keep it, though, I would prefer it not even count against the height, because we're asking them to do it – the 3'. Whatever we need to do to make it possible is what I would support, because I walked to Lion's Park last night for Summer Breeze, and walking through the neighborhoods, every time we see a house that the front porch is level with the ground, it just doesn't look like it belongs in the neighborhood. It doesn't have the same feel. I keep thinking I would not buy that house. I'll buy the house next to it that has the front porch that's raised off the ground. That's just how I feel about it. So whatever we've got to do, in my opinion, to make that feasible ...

Councilmember Hickman – You would rather raise the 42 to, let's say, 45 and keep the 3'?

Councilmember Holman – Or just say it doesn't count against the height of the – that part, because it's a requirement we have. We're requiring you to do 3', so maybe that 3' should not count against the height limit at all.

Ms. McMahon – But Keith is saying that he needs to lower it to 22 instead of 36. I want to make sure I understand what you're saying.

Mr. McCabe – Yes, ma'am. What I would like to do, if I'm understanding you correctly, is, because we're not going to discuss the 36" height at this time, I would like to amend that number from 42 to 45. That way it allows for the 3' stem wall in place exactly the way we have it. Then if we do go back at a later time – a different committee – and drop the height of the stem wall, then we could relook at the height issue at that time. But if we maintain the 3' stem wall, we need the 45 then.

Councilmember Hickman – I think I've been pretty clear, I do tend to agree with Stephen on this particular issue. I know that there are others that may disagree. I understand your point and your point. I, personally, would rather do like what Stephen is proposing and change both blue and pink, because I think the blue height should be at least the same as pink – change them both to 45 as total height, and leave the 3' in place, with the understanding that it may be put on the future agenda for discussion and those numbers tweaked again.

Mr. McCabe – Yes, sir. Let me say, I love the look of 212. I think the house is beautiful and I love the way it's coming. It has just been hard. It's okay. Nothing easy is worth having. I know that, and I believe that in my life.

Councilmember Holman – Are there other reasons why the 3' thing is a problem? I just don't want height limit to be one of the reasons why.

Mr. Adair – Can we refer to finished floor elevation that would be at the top of the stem wall? Would it be simpler if we just referred to a height above the finished floor elevation? Then if we come back and change it later, we're changing fewer things.

Ms. McMahon – That's a really good point.

Councilmember Hickman – I'm fine with that, and leave it at 42. You just say above the finished floor.

Ms. Hudson – 42' from finished floor?

Councilmember Hickman – Make that same change, Jane, in blue.

Ms. Hudson – So that's what was my question was going to be. Okay, so we're going to say 42' from finished floor in the pink.

Councilmember Hickman – And 44' from the finished floor in blue.

Ms. Hudson – 44. Okay.

Councilmember Hickman – 44 is already what's in blue, so no reason to change it. Okay. So then let's move on to page 37, the yellow. Then we have some on page 38 – you see the red addition of the front yard setback, and we had some clean up language there, Lee. Do you want to explain to us?

Ms. Hall – I just wanted to clarify. Stephen was gracious enough to spend time walking University yesterday with me and I asked Jane before the meeting – I thought the way we left it was – the vote was to change to the 25' setback. I know, just from visually walking it without a tape measure, there are some differences from the west to the east side of the street in the setbacks. I guess what I would be more comfortable with is staying consistent with what the current setback lines are, whatever they are on either side of the street. Because what I'm hoping to maintain is that visual consistency of setback, even though it's different on either side of the street. And they may not even be 25'.

Ms. McMahon – That was my question, because sometimes it was 20'.

Councilmember Holman – That's why I voted against that, because there's inconsistency on each block and Jane and I talked about that.

Ms. Hudson – And that's my fault. I apologize. I didn't have the minutes when I was doing some of this, so I continued the discussion with Councilmember Holman after the meeting and, I apologize, I thought that we had kind of coming to bringing the ones on University forward, but on the side streets keeping those at 25. So you guys tell me what you want to do there. So that really is my bad.

Councilmember Hickman – Sounds to me like, in the yellow ...

Ms. Hall – Just on University.

Councilmember Hickman – Just on University.

Ms. Hall – Just like we've got an exception here right now to keep the current front building line in place if there's redevelopment going forward. So that protects the way the street looks – the form and the way the street looks, and also accomplishing a goal, I hope, of encouraging people to keep these structures that are in place – these historic homes – and if there's future redevelopment, instead of pulling them forward to 10' and having that break up the view from the street as you're walking down the street. Does that make sense?

Councilmember Hickman – So are you saying that you would be comfortable with the structures all staying at the build line that they're at currently, and any new structures being at that same build line?

Ms. Hall – Yes. On University.

Councilmember Hickman – So why don't we just say that, instead of any specific footage?

Ms. Hall – That's what I would like to do. Because it's inconsistent now.

Councilmember Hickman – But the front yard setbacks shall be as currently – shall be the current setbacks.

Mr. Adair – In the case of a total reconstruction, we have sufficient information to determine where that was?

Mr. McKown – Or it matches the adjacent structure.

Ms. Hall – Yeah. Because the setbacks are inconsistent on either side of the street, but they're not inconsistent with the west side and the east side.

Councilmember Hickman – Shall be the current build line, or matches the adjacent structure or the location of the current structure. Something like that?

Ms. Hudson – And that's just on University, then the remainder stays at 25.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, are we sure that they're all 25, though, is my concern?

Ms. Hudson – The side streets might be mixed, but it was my understanding from the meeting, and the vote, actually, was that it goes to 25'.

Mr. McKown – My interpretation of us choosing that 25' was that's what Norman's R-1 setback is, which may not have been the case way back when those houses got built. I think we would be better served to just say they just remain as they are. Because you wouldn't want all of a sudden to have houses start creeping back and go what happened here?

Ms. Hall – That works.

Councilmember Hickman – I agree.

Ms. Hall – That's my intent. That's what I'd like.

Councilmember Hickman – I think we don't put any specific number in there.

Ms. Hudson – The entire yellow is what you want to do, keep it status quo.

Councilmember Hickman – Right, Richard? You’re saying the entire yellow.

Mr. McKown – Yeah.

Councilmember Hickman – I’m agreeing with you.

Mr. McKown – The 25’ setback in Norman is 5’ deeper than other cities, and it actually causes parking problems, because it encourages people to double stack their cars on driveways and block the sidewalk. We should amend that to 20’.

Councilmember Holman – Why is it like that in Norman?

Mr. McKown – I don’t know the history on that. I could just assume.

Councilmember Holman – But it’s usually 20’ outside Norman?

Mr. McKown – Yeah.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So, Jane, tell us what you are going to say on this front yard setback in the yellow.

Ms. Hudson – For the entire yellow area, for the Detached Frontage, redevelopment may – and we’ll get the verbiage correct – but may construct at the existing setback for the previous structure. Now, that’s just the front. So I want to make sure that we’re going to get the side yard setbacks met, because some of them, I’m sure, are probably not at 5’. I just want to make sure that we’re going to. Okay.

Ms. Hall – I think that accomplishes the goal of keeping it a transition.

Mr. Brewer – If we have any new builds on vacant lots or existing parking lots, is that – do we need additional language to cover that as well?

Ms. Hudson – We can. We can just say that they’ll go in line with what’s adjacent.

Councilmember Holman – On that block or on adjacent properties.

Mr. Brewer – Well, like a specific site, where the First Christian Church – there’s just parking lot along there. There’s no adjacent properties.

Mr. McKown – There’s several parking lots like that.

Mr. Brewer – This is the parking lot across from McFarlin. That’s a little further down toward Campus Corner.

Ms. McMahan – With McFarlin, you have an adjacent property.

Councilmember Hickman – So adjacent structures or structures on the same street.

Mr. Brewer – I just want to make sure we're consistent – I mean, if you just pick your structure on the street.

Ms. Hudson – We could say the nearest block with existing structures. We simply jump a street, but we would go to the nearest block – in the yellow.

Councilmember Hickman – In the yellow.

Ms. Hudson – Or nearest block. Okay. We'll get some ...

Ms. McMahon – And all of this is going to have to get approved anyway.

Mr. Adair – I'd say it's not just possible, but it's aspirational that some of the church parking lots redevelop.

Councilmember Hickman – A lot of hard work to get those church parking lots back in the day. Right, Jim?

Mr. Adair – My family has a lot of history in church parking lots, and I certainly haven't ran any numbers but, with the drastically inflated property values that we've seen because of the redevelopment in there, structure parking is as economical or probably even better than surface parking these days. Historically it was a function of land cost. You could buy a house for \$50,000 and tear it down and surface the lot. Now that number is \$250,000. Those numbers are really different. I've visited with friends for years that First Baptist and First Christian could share a parking structure there literally across the street from both of them. I think that's probably not the only situation. If the church wasn't big enough to do it themselves – and it may get to a point where they may not be looking for that kind of redevelopment, but if their land has this kind of value, they build a parking structure and draw cash.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay, let's move on. At this point, I am prepared to jump over to page 53 about parking and loading standards. Anybody have anything prior to that?

Mr. McCabe – I do. In your table for committee later, building a new property under the redevelopment I was required to rebuild an existing alleyway and brought it up to City standard. It originally came up that I had to do the entire alley from my house 250' – that was my responsibility. They came back and said it is my responsibility now just to do the 50' behind the property. Something to think about, if we're looking at these TIFs and the sewer line is running down that alley – I'm fixing to spend \$8,000 on an alley that you're going to bulldoze to put a brand new sewer line in. Maybe we want to look at maybe allowing me to bond, maybe allowing me to pay money into a deal – I think Jim told me – Jim, what's the name of it?

Mr. Adair – Deferment.

Mr. McCabe – Something like that. It makes sense to me. But for me to spend \$8,000 to watch you bulldoze it – I get it. I'm committed. I've got it. But that might be something for us to consider. Since I'm in the center of the block, the engineers and the surveyors are out there scratching their head about how we'll do this little piece here and how everybody else to the east and west of me are supposed to tie into me. Because it's not one continuous run. I get it; I'm in it. But that might be something we want to discuss, maybe allowing that paying in a certain amount of money and just say here's my portion and when we fix it, let's fix it right. I just wanted to bring that up, since we're going past that.

Councilmember Holman – I think that's a big issue and I think that's why, with streets, we prefer to do recoupment, so that we can do it all at once, instead of just having every property owner widen their section of the street. I do think that, as far as the TIF goes, the alleyways should probably be one of the priorities, since we're requiring parking in the back and a lot of these areas, putting more traffic on these alleyways – to me, that's probably a top, critical infrastructure piece for the TIF is the alleyways.

Mr. Adair – I absolutely disagreed with the burden that redevelopment of one 50' lot should have to bear the burden of repaving an entire alley. I think that's just excessive. The other side of it is, doing these piecemeal, 50' at a time, hit and miss going down this alley. Scott, you and Kenny feel free to weigh in here. You don't want 50' of an alley paved, do you?

Mr. Sturtz – The problem with that is how do you want to safely gain access from a lot of these situations when you have gravel alleys back behind there? That's where the decision was. The other thing that we're facing, a repetitive situation throughout this whole area is, in many places, we're driving a majority of our stormwater to the alleyway. The alleyway is unimproved – we have just moved the problem to the alleyway. Now the alleyway is going to fail. Now we're trying to park everybody on an alleyway that's failing because it's gravel because we can't get it fixed because no one is repairing it because we don't have the TIF money, and it goes on and on and on and on. So what we're creating is a situation that is going to fail. It's when and how – it's not if – it's when. And that's why we were talking about could we do the whole thing? Now, we had a situation on Castro where, because they were going to use that as their drainage – that's not in this area – I'm just showing you another situation. We told them if they were going to take all their drainage to the back, they would have to take it to the public street. They changed their direction on that and came to the frontage. But you're describing the exact dilemma that we're facing every day. So, in your case, it's the 3rd or 4th house in and you guys are going to be going down there. We already have a "death alley" sign put up by someone down in this area. We're creating that, but we're magnifying it because we're taking all the stormwater and all the cars there. I don't have the solution. And we're not going to have the money in the TIF for a long time to go back there and start rebuilding every one of these alleys.

Mr. Adair – I was just going to say, Scott, I don't want problems, I want solutions. Stephen and I can tell you literally the very first time – the first time around on this Center City, when

they said we're taking out all the driveways, we're going to move all the vehicular traffic to the alley – and it was go get Shawn O'Leary, we've got to figure out how we're going to repave these alleys. And right now.

Mr. Sturtz – We have been concerned about that from day one ourselves. We're in the same place you are.

Mr. McCabe – Part of the reason why I'm bringing it up is I understand why we want to do the whole alley. I understand why we want somebody to do the 50'. But there's no language in here at all that says a developer is required to do an alleyway – a public street. Going through the design review, it was brought to me and I agreed. I'm good. We're going to figure it out. But there's no language requiring a developer to do that – to build a City acceptable street or alley. So that would be something I would like to see – if we're going to require somebody to do it, it needs to be in here.

Mr. Brewer – Something I'll mention to the comments here. I do believe there is the bonding capacity in the TIF right now to go through and do most, if not all, the alleyways. That's based on analysis I had done based on future projections of development. But if you're looking at existing development that has already occurred, in addition to what expected increases in taxable value from the County Assessor's office is, I know that's a step that the City just needs to take and talking to bond attorneys and figuring out what bonding capacity is there. But with all the discussion here, I think alleyways should absolutely be a priority and everything underneath those alleyways, so that way we're not going in and tearing out the work that's already been done.

Using Project 180 in Oklahoma City as an example, that's a very unique situation and Devon Tower basically being the primary driver behind the TIF to do Project 180, where they redeveloped all the streets. However, there were parts of it early in the process that they did do a streetscape and then they went in and tore that street up to then work underneath the street. That's something that we can't afford to do, literally, from a financial perspective. But I definitely think it's possible to do that the right way and do it early. So it's setting up redevelopment in a way that makes sense for what we're talking about in the code with parking standards.

Councilmember Hickman – Basically what we need to do is we need to get the money in the bank through the bonding capacity, and then as projects come forward, do like we would normally on a TIF and do development agreements, where maybe the developer puts in some money. The TIF money is then authorized to redo that alleyway and there is some potential for when the other lots are developed, they kick in some money as well, and then we do the whole alleyway with all the infrastructure in that alleyway with the funds that are then in the bank from the TIF.

Mr. Adair – Is the development and the prioritizing of project plans for the TIF – does that come from Council? Does that come from statutory committee?

Councilmember Hickman – Well, that's part of what I was going to say is a continuing topic would be the TIF for this committee. Make some recommendations.

Mr. Brewer – Part of what we started to recommend is to have an urban design plan with a phasing plan. I think that includes – does it make sense to do alleyways and everything underneath? Does it make sense in certain areas, that are more prime for redevelopment? Those types of questions. Are there streetscapes that are more important than others? That, I think, is a key next step in making this done the right way, with reducing the questions from development side, but also putting forward some public infrastructure that matches what we're trying to do with the code.

Mayor Miller – Maybe Cameron is really kind of speaking to that right now because, for everybody in the room to remember that the amount that the TIF is expected to generate – there was a plan that was done – a block-by-block plan done about what needed to be done in every different block in that whole area. There's enough money to do what's in that plan. So, based on the discussion, it sounds like the alleys are a priority. I just wonder what else in the plan – probably not enough money to do everything. So that's a really important discussion. Somebody needs to go back and look at the plan.

Councilmember Hickman – That's why I think it needs to be part of our continuing topic I'll suggest for this group, because we will need to kind of break down here are the different things – water, stormwater, sewer water, alleys, streetscapes, etc. The Johnson plan does have those all broken out by those groups. Then figure out, okay, we maybe have \$8, 10, 12 million of bonding capacity now. How do we want to invest that money, knowing that the rest of it is going to be kind of pay as you go, if you will, or we have to build up some value to then do the rest of it. So if we put all of our upfront \$8, 10, 12 million into alleys, we don't have money for streetscapes or whatever. That's just what I think we need to really dig into at the next level of detail to make some recommendations and to get, maybe, a consultant on board.

Mr. McKown – I heard Keith say that there isn't anything in here that says he has to build the alley. How did we get there, to where we're even having the discussion of him paving an alley and/or putting up deferral money? What tool are we using to try and make that happen?

Ms. Hudson – That was a discussion that came up at the DRT for his Certificate of Compliance. That was determined by Public Works for development.

Mr. Adair – But he's on a platted lot with all public improvements in place.

Ms. Hudson – Correct.

Mr. Adair – And we're having him redo public improvements.

Mr. McKown – We need a consistent methodology. I've been in that situation before. I'm the last guy in and had to buy a \$400,000 signal light, and everyone on all the other corners got a free ride. We don't really want to go down that path. It's not fair. We managed to rewrite Oklahoma City's rules around that, where everybody just chips in a little bit. If you wanted to come up with some kind of a supplementary thing for contributing to like a deferral category, you could come up with just an amount of money

based on traffic generated by the bedroom count, or something, to say here's how much goes in the pocket to match the available bonding capacity and the increased value that's already there. I think we should be giving you incentive to come down, rather than adding in the additional burden, personally. But it would make more sense to write a check than to go build something that no one gets any benefit out of.

Mr. McCabe – Let me clearly state. I agreed. Okay. I signed off on it. I agreed to do it. So I'm good with my deal. Now that we're going to the engineers and now I'm going to the surveyors trying to figure out how I drain in the middle of the block to set this up, now I see the problem coming. Because it's not a continuous run. There's a couple of properties east of me, toward the railroad track, that are fixing to be developed. So here's this piece going to be done now. They're a year from now later than that. So you're going to have this patchwork. Since stormwater is such a priority here, they've determined that the west side of the railroad track, I think Scott – the west side of the railroad track there is where we're trying to drain to. Because once we get it to the west side of the railroad track and then that follows to the creek. So that's our point that we're shooting for. But it's going to be patchwork, and I think that's going to cause a problem. When they told me they were going to look at redoing the alleys and the sewer and I just kind of chuckled and went well, there goes that brand new concrete job pour. Maybe to pay in or something. But it looks like we need to address that later.

Councilmember Hickman – I'm hesitant to start adding or making changes as this group in this new section when we're down to our last 45 minutes of this meeting. We've not gotten staff input on some of those issues, although I understand and I do think it's a concern, so I would either propose that we either a) put it on the continuing topic of discussion, and I think that the idea of a shared cost is one way about it, or it's clearly something Autumn, as the community representative and representative, I guess you could say, from this committee as well, on the DRT, and something that staff, as a part of the DRT – the Design Review Team – could also begin to implement some kinds of processes, sort of like we do with our sidewalk program, where there can be deferred payments or I call it a cost sharing. But what was the right term? I've gone blank.

Councilmember Holman – It's that 50/50 cost share.

Mr. Sturtz – We do a 50/50 for sidewalk. A new sidewalk is on the burden of the developer for each one. The sidewalk deferral comes in when you're doing a whole platting development.

Councilmember Hickman – What's the program where, when we're building a road, we will ...

Mayor Miller – Recoupment.

Councilmember Hickman – Recoupment. That's the word. Thank you, Mayor. Recoupment. Like a recoupment type program, where if you put in your share, then the other lots that are going to benefit, like you were saying, Richard, down the road, we could recoup from them later a proportionate cost for their share. Those are just some

ideas to chew on that we can flesh out later if it's still an open issue come August when we reconvene.

Okay, so let's jump ahead then to page 53 on parking. I just wanted to point out that on page 53, it looks like this is where staff had inserted if more than 3 bedrooms per unit development must provide 1 parking space per bedroom. I think maybe we should insert per dwelling unit, since we're going to define dwelling unit. I think we need to add a definition for bedrooms, and the bedroom definition, I think, comes from the CNZOD.

Then on page 54, there's the additional add of a minimum of ¼ parking space per residential unit shall be provided as shared parking. Is that a new add? I don't know if I remember that conversation, but I don't want to ...

Mr. McKown – I'm not sure I understand what it means.

Ms. Hudson – It's not a new add. I highlighted it because, if you look at it, that's under D, which is the Urban Storefront and Urban Residential frontages. Under that section, for residential, it says a minimum of ¼ parking per residential unit shall be provided as shared parking, and I was only trying to highlight that to make sure everybody was clear that's in there and that's in the orange where we're talking about allowing residential on the ground floor, so we could have an entire building of residential in the orange, so for the shared parking, are you okay with leaving that in there?

Mr. McKown – I'm trying to draw through this in my head. What does it say? What picture does this generate?

Ms. Hudson – So within the Urban General – let's just talk about that. That's the orange. And you have shared parking and the shared parking table is over on ...

Councilmember Hickman – Time out real quick. Autumn is going to bail on us. Do you have any future topics that you would like to put on the table before you leave?

Ms. McMahon – Nothing that we haven't already discussed. But I think we need, obviously, some clarity on quite a few issues.

Councilmember Hickman – Are you willing to serve in the continued capacity if this committee is reconvened?

Ms. McMahon – Yes.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So, Richard and Jane, did you all figure this out?

Ms. Hudson – If you turn to page 55. 604.B. They've got this outlined for any time or hour of the day restrictions for shared parking. It's gray. That's why I wanted to highlight it and make sure, since we're talking about more than 3 bedrooms per dwelling unit, the development must provide 1 parking space per bedroom.

Mr. Adair – Jane, is Gray Street currently C-3?

Councilmember Hickman – No.

Mr. Adair – C-2.

Ms. Hudson – It's mixed.

Mr. Adair – There is some C-3?

Ms. Hudson – I believe so.

Mr. Adair – Because I think we did – and I don't think we distinguished between use, because, previously I don't think we thought residential. There's an exclusion in here of all parking requirements on previous C-3. The logic there was we have an existing building covering 100% of the lot, and now all of a sudden you want me to have a parking requirement. That doesn't really fit.

Ms. Hudson – Yeah. It's under A under 603, Minimum Parking Requirements. It talks about C-3 at the time of adoption, exempt from the minimum parking requirements, and so on and so forth. But if we're talking about some of these areas coming in and we're having 3 or 4 stories of straight residential, and I understand it was C-3 or C-2 prior to the Form-Based Code coming in, but then you flip the coin over and we're talking about requiring a parking space per bedroom if over 3 – it contradicts itself.

Mr. Adair – I'm not sure we've got enough parking language in those areas.

Mr. McCabe – Was the 3 – or the parking spot per bedroom – was it intended for the orange residential urban?

Ms. Hudson – We put it all residential.

Mr. McCabe – Yes, I understand. But my question is, since we're trying to – do you see where I'm going with that, Stephen? Is that where we want to go? Is that what we meant to do in the orange?

Mr. Brewer – In my mind, it was not for orange and red.

Mr. McCabe – Not for orange. It was just in the blue?

Mr. Brewer – Yeah.

Councilmember Hickman – The blue and the pink.

Mr. McCabe – Okay. So for the blue and the pink. Okay.

Councilmember Holman – I mean, yeah, that would be what I believe the intent was. I would be specific, to me, on Gray Street and Main Street, there should be no parking requirement. Because I do not want any new buildings built and then building parking

lots on Gray Street or Main Street at all. So, to me, any new buildings built on Gray and Main Street, their parking is the overall downtown parking, wherever it may be. If they have to park at the County parking garage at nighttime – wherever it is. But I do not want parking lots built downtown because we required parking for new residential structures. Unless they want to build a parking garage.

Councilmember Hickman – On page 53, under Minimum Parking Requirements, number C, the addition – if we amended that to say excluding the red and the orange, if more than 3 bedrooms per dwelling unit, the development must provide 1 parking space per bedroom – are we okay with that? I'm okay with that. Okay. Jane?

Ms. Hudson – Okay. Then, adding to that, over on page 56, where it talks about Off-Site Parking ...

Councilmember Hickman – Hold on. Before you go there, on page 55 about the maximums, we may need to add in some language that caveats what we just did on page 53 about the 1 spot if there's more than 3 bedrooms. Do you see what I'm saying? Because your maximum parking will be different.

Ms. Hudson – So for 604. Maximum Parking Standards, under A – are you talking about the table there?

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So that's only Urban ones, so that's not going to be the blue and the pink. Yeah.

Ms. Hudson – Right.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. Never mind.

Ms. Hudson – Okay. So on page 56, under Off-Site Parking, historically, we've had the allowance under number 2, off-site parking, shared or reserved, must be located within a distance of 1,000' from the site it is serving. So within the blue and the pink, if someone has the ability to have off-site parking and they have the requirement of providing 1 parking space per bedroom, are we going to allow them to do that within 1,000' of their development?

Councilmember Hickman – No. That's an important clarification, and it's not on this either. At least my understanding, on page 53, this is supposed to be 1 parking space per bedroom on-site.

Ms. Hudson – Okay. That's what I wanted to know.

Councilmember Hickman – It's got to be on-site there with the structure. Otherwise, we're just pushing more cars out into the street or everywhere else. That's what we're trying to avoid.

Ms. Hudson – So in that case ...

Councilmember Hickman – For the blue and the pink.

Ms. Hudson – For the blue and the pink. So then would I delete number 2 under Off-Site Parking? Is that what I want to do?

Councilmember Hickman – Well, could off-site parking still apply in the orange?

Mr. Brewer – It shouldn't be – there's no parking requirement in orange.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, there is in some orange. Orange may not be all residential. I mean, this off-site parking is not all just for residential.

Ms. Hudson – All orange is not C-2 and C-3, so there will be some orange that will – so then we would want to leave that, then.

Councilmember Hickman – I think so. I did want to point out, Jane, at the bottom of page 55 and top of page 56, under C, Maximum Surface Parking, number 2, Townhouse/Small Apartment – we probably need to add in the pink – and Detached frontages, the total surface parking, shared and reserved, shall not exceed – we probably need to add in a caveat language here that says something about the number of bedrooms – except for dwelling units with more than 3 bedrooms, maximum parking shall be 1 parking spot on-site for each bedroom.

Councilmember Holman – How can this tie in to what Richard brought up about angled parking in the right-of-way on these east/west streets where there's a lot of room, and even on Gray Street, too. I don't want people to build a parking lot, but if somebody builds a new building on Gray Street, having them put in the angled parking between the street and the sidewalk, like the rest of Main Street and Gray Street look like would probably be appropriate and I would prefer that type of parking over making them all go in the alleyway or off-site somewhere else. Most of these streets have very wide rights-of-way and the plan calls for it to all be trees, which is great, and there's trees there now in many of the places, but I'm talking about planting them. A detailed plan where you plan around the trees that are already there, but using that space as angled on-street parking, which takes the cars off the street, actually, and because it's angled back-out parking, people will probably drive slower through those streets. It cuts down on having to build parking lots. If Richard is right, 1,000-something spaces – that cuts down the need of a \$25 million parking garage. If there's really 1,000 spaces that could be created just by using the rights-of-way in this area. I think that's something we really should consider. I don't know how to work it into this plan as a requirement.

Councilmember Hickman – I agree with you, Stephen. I guess what I heard when Cameron did the motion last time, on the master design – urban design plan and a phasing plan, that would be a part of – I think he talked about even a survey – would be a part of what the consultant would do. They could go out and actually look at this in 2 or 3 degrees more detail than the Johnson study, to see what could work and help – and then work with our staff to begin to sketch out and design these streets in this area.

Because right now we have sort of general templates. I think the right-of-way varies along each of these streets. So each street might look a little bit different. But I don't think we have the information right now – the detail – to know. So that's kind of where I think we're at on that topic. Jane?

Ms. Hudson – So are we clear that – and I just had to ask – I want to make sure – that these two designs that are calling for the parallel parking, those do not apply to Main and Gray.

Councilmember Holman – I think those are for the north/south streets, because the right-of-way is smaller on the north/south streets for whatever reason.

Councilmember Hickman – So, Cameron, would that be your thought as well, that to get to a discussion about the angled parking or the street parking – whatever you want to call it – that we need more detailed information from the consultant? Is that kind of what you were getting at with your motion on that topic?

Mr. Brewer – Yes, absolutely. I do think that there are ideas we could pass along to a consultant on the committee side, just based on what we already know, or even what we're aspiring for. But, yes.

Councilmember Hickman – We need to get Council to engage a contractor – a vendor.

Councilmember Holman – Be clear that we don't want any trees that are existing to be taken out to create the parking.

Councilmember Hickman – And then we provide that contractor with some important key points. That's how I envision this. So this committee has made a recommendation that's going to be in this initial report to engage that contractor.

Okay, before we move on through this, then if we get on down – I'm flipping pages here. I've given a few definitions to you, Jane. Bedrooms, dwelling units.

I'm now on page 63. This is the special use addition. I think everybody has seen this language.

Then on pages 1 and 2 – the next pages – are the Part 9. Site Development Requirements. This is the work from Scott and the Public Works folks – Carrie.

Mr. Adair – Bill, on page 63, on H.1 – I thought we were going to have language that dealt with existing properties and rezoning. I wasn't seeing that.

Councilmember Hickman – Or an addition/alteration to existing construction. What are you saying, Jim? I guess I missed that.

Mr. Adair – Yeah, for existing.

Councilmember Hickman – You wanted that in there, or no?

Mr. McKown – I thought we had talked about ...

Mr. Adair – I thought we ended up there last time.

Mr. Kaplan – It's under 2.d.

Councilmember Hickman – In 2.d the word "special" is misspelled. Does that cover your concern?

Mr. Adair – It does.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay.

Mr. McKown – On that page on item 3. We've got in here that tandem parking can't be more than 2 spaces deep. Is there any reason we want to have that restriction on 2 deep? One idea, living that close to campus, is it's a park once idea and you just stack them in there 3 or 4 deep and everybody just rides their scooter or walks – walking is good for you.

Councilmember Holman – The drawing you showed the other day that tandem parking took up less space, less concrete. I'm not opposed to it being more than 2. I don't really have a strong feeling about that.

Councilmember Hickman – I'm agreeable to striking that paragraph 3, if everybody else is. I understand the purpose of it. I may have asked for it early on, but I'm a kinder, gentler Bill now, so I'm willing to strike it. I'm a giving person, Richard.

Ms. Hall – Who are you?

Councilmember Hickman – So we strike number 3?

Mr. Petromilli – I was wondering, I forget what page, maybe 57, it also talked about tandem parking. I was wondering – it talks about the maximum being 75%. I was wondering if, in residential areas, could that go to 100 – you know, if your building is 100% residential, could that be 100%? That way, if you had, say, 3 units, each unit could have ...

Councilmember Hickman – It's like the mouse and the cookie book – give the mouse an inch and they'll take a mile.

Councilmember Holman – I think people living there move in understanding that's what the situation was. Right? You're stacked in 3 deep.

Councilmember Hickman – I understand what you're saying. I guess what I would say is that's what is in here currentl. I'll use Keith's logic on some of the other conversations. It's not something that we've had comments on. I do think parking will be a continuing topic. What I would say is let's put parking on as a continuing topic and I hate to tinker with something that we've not had an issue with and we've not talked about over all

these meetings. That's something that's come from the current regulation. So let's just put that on as a continuing topic of discussion – parking. Yes, Jim?

Mr. Adair – 901.B. I'm going to consider this as a draft document. You're stating in it that Imhoff and Bishop Creek are at capacity and have streambank stabilization and flood issues. Bill, does the lawyer in you really want to put that in an official municipal document?

Councilmember Hickman – I'm not the City's lawyer.

Mr. Adair – I think acknowledging that is just asking to get sued.

Ms. Muckala – I will make some comment on that. These portions came in right before the last meeting, and we've been drafting ever since then. Jane and I spoke about it. These are things that are going to have to be legally vetted. At this conversation, we are at the recommendatory stage. So I'm glad you made that comment. This is moreso a draft than a lot of the rest that we've discussed. So your comments are well-taken.

Mr. Adair – We've had a lot of discussion that there's issues, that there's problems ...

Councilmember Hickman – Well, see, I may not always be on Council, so I may want to take that as a lawsuit.

Mr. Adair – I have gotten to sit in this room a couple of times and the conversation has started with this is at capacity, and the word that follows it is moratorium.

Councilmember Hickman – I understand your point. Anybody else have any other comments on the technical changes in the document? Say it now or forever hold your peace, as they say.

Mr. Adair – I've been kind of quiet to this point. 903.C. We've still got the pre-development language in there. I'm really concerned about this. I want in the minutes – I want Scott and his staff to get to do their job as engineers. I do not want – I have over and over and over expressed concerns about density here. I do not want us putting excess pressure on engineering to pull density down. I'm not tickled with this language. But we struck it once and it's come back.

Mr. Sturtz – We've been asked to look at that. We have been. We just haven't – we've only had about 2 working days.

Mr. Adair – Forgive me. I want the density problems to be Jane's, not yours.

Ms. Hudson – I will say, for clarification, as everyone has said, and as Scott just said, you know, we had the meeting, we did have comments on this document for part 9. At 5:00 I was still editing and getting everything printed, and I did not get a chance to talk to Public Works/Engineering on those. So they will continue to work on this.

Mr. Adair – Bill, one last thing and I'll quit. 905.B. One, I'm not tickled to death about us referencing some other city's ordinances. If we're going to do it, I think we need say the City of Wichita's storm manual as of a specific date, because these tend to be living documents, and next month they may change their stormwater manual to something we don't agree with.

Councilmember Hickman – And I think the City has, by resolution, already ...

Mr. Sturtz – We've already adopted this manual as part of our water quality protection zone. Really all we've adopted is Section 3, which is just the technical data of how you can use that to apply to the selection and design of. So we have not adopted Chapters 1 and 2 – their stormwater background. We've only adopted Chapter 3, which is the technical design manual for LID. It's actually pretty well-written. What I'm hoping is Tulsa comes on line and we may try to incorporate theirs, too. It could then be some things that are newer and more innovative. They're not on-line yet.

Councilmember Hickman – The part that we've adopted is the part that we would be referring to here? So we're going to add in the City of Wichita/Sedgwick County Stormwater Manual, as adopted by the City of Norman.

Mr. Adair – When Keith comes in to do something, he needs to be able to go on-line to the City of Norman and pull down everything he needs to do to do his job, and not have to hunt around and figure out what version from Wichita he needs.

Mr. Brewer – This was already discussed, but on page 30, one of the small things that's been bothering me the whole time. In the uses shall be limited to residential. I think to match the use table, it should include and overnight lodging.

Councilmember Hickman – Are you talking about Urban Residential?

Mr. Brewer – Yeah. There's Lee's comment earlier in the meeting. Just the addition of and overnight lodging, just to be clear.

Ms. Hall – Where it says lobbies, leasing offices.

Ms. Hudson – In the box? Is that what you're talking about, Cameron?

Councilmember Hickman – Yes. The box on page 30.

Ms. Hall – I just have an edit – 905.A. There's an extra "the" after 65% -- the first one needs to be deleted.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So I'll entertain a motion to approve the – what did we call this on our agenda? Approve the proposed technical amendments to the Center City Form-Based Code, as amended and discussed by the committee. Anybody make that motion?

Ms. Hall – So moved.

Councilmember Hickman – Do I have a second?

Mr. McCabe – Second.

Councilmember Hickman – Second, Keith. All those in favor, show your right hand. Richard? Okay. Any opposed, same sign.

YAYS:	Adair, Brewer, Hall, McCabe, McKown, Morris, Holman, Hickman
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	McMahon

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. It passes unanimously. Love you guys. Thank you very much.

We're going to move quickly on to item number 3, discussion and recommendation regarding a proposed architectural design review committee for the Center City Form-Based Code. I'll entertain a motion that this committee recommends that architectural design review committee for the Center City Form-Based Code area.

Ms. Hall – So moved.

Councilmember Hickman – Is there a second? We can have discussion if you guys want. We don't have to do a motion first. I assumed everybody would probably want to have an architectural design review committee.

Councilmember Holman – I'll second it so we can talk about it.

Ms. Hudson – I just want to ask a question before we vote on that. The architectural design review committee – so Keith has an application that he's going to bring in. Okay? He submits to the architectural design review committee prior to bringing his application to the Planning Department for the Certificate of Compliance, and then we go through DRT? What step is that? Or am I jumping ahead too far?

Councilmember Hickman – Stephen? I don't know the answer to that question.

Councilmember Holman – We did talk about this a lot in the first Center City committee. Our consultants from Berkeley – I think they said it would be something like a 12-18 month process to create the design review committee and the criteria and the process and everything, and that's partly why we didn't do it. They showed us several examples of well-intended design review committees in historic cities that had some real terrible outcomes with new development trying to apply some sort of standard. There was a lot of discussion about what is good design? Who is on that committee? I like some of the buildings being built in Center City right now, and some people hate every single building that's being built. There's some of them I don't like very much. So what is good design? Who determines what that is? How do we determine what that is? Were some of the

things we went back and forth on and why we didn't go forward with a committee the first time. Maybe Mary Madden – you might be able to get in contact with her and get some of those examples -- unless staff has them somewhere – examples she showed us of some of the bad results that design review committees – I think in Alexandria, Virginia or Charleston – one of those real historic cities they have a design review committee and I think it was a Toys-R-Us – they built a new Toys-R-Us and they tried to apply this design review to it and it was absolutely terrible.

Mr. Adair – It was supposed to be in Athens.

Councilmember Holman – Athens, Georgia or something like that. Anyway, she just cautioned us about – be careful, because it's not as simple as it sounds. I think it's something we need – just how to get there.

Councilmember Hickman – I want to say, I suspect that this would be a topic that we, as a committee, could further discuss. So whether or not it's a separate motion as a recommendation to Council at this point in time, or a topic for the committee to continue to discuss – I defer to you guys. I know, from the public meetings that we've had on this, plus emails that I've received, that there are people that would like to have the conversation about having a design review committee.

Councilmember Holman – Yeah, there is.

Ms. Hall – I think from the community standpoint and all of the feedback that we've had from the beginning of this whole process, that the architectural design review is something that the community at large that I'm in contact with, is at least wanting to get this fully fleshed out, whatever path it takes. I don't think it's simple at all. I think it takes time, and I think it takes intention and thought. I just want to make sure that we keep this on either the list for the committee or something that just doesn't get lost, because it's been on every single agenda as an agenda item. We were all feeling the pressure of time to get as far as we've gotten today, which I think we've made a lot of progress. I want to keep this alive as a conversation in some form, to see what's possible.

Councilmember Hickman – Cameron, what are your thoughts?

Mr. Brewer – I agree. I would recommend that it's a topic for the committee to continue to be discussed. I'm not comfortable with a recommendation to City Council right now.

Councilmember Hickman – Alright. So let's do this. Lee, would you withdraw your motion?

Ms. Hall – Yes.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So let's skip on down then to number 4, and let's start making a list of future topics and items for consideration.

Ms. Hall – I'd like to add architectural design review.

Councilmember Holman – Affordable housing incentives.

Councilmember Hickman – Affordable housing and incentives.

Councilmember Holman – How to incentivize affordable housing in the Center City area.

Mr. Brewer – What are the topics we already have?

Councilmember Hickman – Here's what I have so far. I have four – I have the TIF/shared costs or – what was the word we used?

Ms. Hudson – Recoupment.

Councilmember Hickman – Recoupment. Yes. Mayor's word for the day – recoupment. And then number 2, parking.

Ms. Hudson – Tandem.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, I think it could be broader than just tandem, but I'll just say parking. Number 3, architectural design review committee. Number 4, affordable housing and incentives.

Ms. Hudson – That's what I've got.

Councilmember Hickman – I would add number 5, accessible housing and incentives, for my friend Dave Boeck – let the record reflect.

Ms. Hall – Green space.

Mr. McKown – I was giving you a thumbs up on accessible.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay.

Councilmember Holman – Can TIF funds buy a park or buy land to develop a park in this area?

Councilmember Hickman – I think that might go under TIF. Green space. Or would we want to have it as a separate topic? So let's just put down green space as a separate topic.

Councilmember Holman – The City should look at purchasing land for a park.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah, I agree. I would love for us to have Unity Park in the Center City Form-Based Code, and there is a great corner lot at the end of the old DeBarr Street on Duffy. I don't know who owns it, but maybe, Keith, you can buy it and donate it to the City. Okay, so we've got 6 things on the list so far.

Mr. Adair – Several times Cameron has made a suggestion of getting us a consultant that would move us toward project plans. Is that part of your TIF discussion?

Councilmember Hickman – I think we've already sent that on as a recommendation. Right, Cameron? Is that how you see that?

Mr. Brewer – Yes, I do think that we need to be moving in tandem as a committee to get ahead of that process.

Councilmember Hickman – I agree. But, to your point, Jim, I think this committee has recommended to Council to engage a consultant to do a master design and a phasing plan. So, in my mind, when Council takes action in July, we probably won't be passing a contract, but then at least Council can hopefully figure out the TIF, get the dollars secured, engage the consultant in the fall, let's say, and this committee, I think my proposal would be that we reconvene in August, after the Council meetings in July that we would take action on all of this. We start reconvening in August, and part of what we start working on is getting out in front of, like what Cameron is saying, these TIF discussions, so that when the consultant is doing their work, we can kind of mesh our work together on the priorities within the TIF, changes potentially to the project plan, like to buy a park, so that we can then mesh all that together. That's going to probably be, I'm going guess, going to go until about a year – about to this time next year. If we get this consultant hired in the fall, by the time they go through their process, I see that being something that maybe Council has a product or take action on about a year from now.

Mr. Adair – That was my number 1.

Councilmember Hickman – Just knowing how the wheels of justice work. That way, if we get that product, then we can start the process of implementing phasing in these things and putting in place the recoupment plan – the shared cost plan – maybe the green space, amending the project plan. Because right now the project plan would not allow for buying land for a park.

Mr. Brewer – I think if we had discussions and design review felt like that was something we wanted to incorporate, that could be part of the amendment of the project plan as well.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah, exactly. I agree 100%.

Mr. McCabe – I believe, from the original charrette, the only green space they even had was Brad's customer's business.

Councilmember Hickman – I think what I heard some people say is, like, this design review committee might be one that, if you go through it, you have TIF funds available to you. If you don't go through it, you don't have TIF funds available to you. I'm not saying that – I'm sure some people want everybody to go through the design review committee, but I have heard as an option that it be optional, but if you want TIF funds you have to go

through it. So may be a discussion, but I think there's a lot of different ways the TIF and architectural design committee could inter-relate as well.

Councilmember Holman – That's what the downtown OKC thing – if you want TIF funding, you have to meet their review.

Councilmember Hickman – So I have 6 topics, as we're running out of time here. We've got 3 minutes. Byron?

Mr. Morris – I don't know if you read it off already, but it was mentioned earlier about signage.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah. Do we want to put signage on here? I'm fine with signage. Byron, did we solve the two issues you told me about – the corner lot issue and ...

Mr. Morris – I can't remember if I brought it up in the email or not. But it will fall under the discussion about parking – about the possibility of having residential developments on-street parking being assigned to that residence.

Councilmember Hickman – Yes. So that would be a part of the TIF discussion. I have 7 topics now. Jane, do you have 7?

Ms. Hudson – Um-hmm.

Mr. McCabe – Okay. So can I just piggy-back real quick on that? So that I'm understanding, if you did off-street parking, you can't designate it toward your – right now you can't say it belongs to this house.

Mr. Morris – Correct.

Mr. McCabe – But you're saying that maybe count it toward the parking requirement to that house, you just can't dedicate it to that house?

Mr. Morris – Well, looking at being able to dedicate it.

Mr. McCabe – Okay. Looking at being able to dedicate it.

Councilmember Hickman – What I hear on that is sort of two-fold – one would be under the TIF process, but then one would be under the committee's parking process discussion, and we could look to create, I'll say as kind of a pilot project in the City, on-street permit parking, which I know has been talked about a lot. I have had conversations with our County representatives. The Mayor had made me and Brea representatives of the Council to the County and the City had done a joint parking plan study. Part of those conversations were about permitted street parking, like you had to get a permit to park on the street. That's where this idea of sort of designating on-street parking – it wouldn't necessarily be per se designated, but it would be by permit. You get so many permitted

spots – but that’s going to take some work to create something like that. But that’s something that this committee, I guess, could be a resource to do that and provide assistance to the staff and to the Council in this particular area, which is why I kind of call it sort of a pilot project site. It would be something that would be consistent with what some of the conversations with the County have been. Does that make sense, Byron? Okay. Anybody have anything else? Any miscellaneous comments from the audience?

Ms. Jolly Stewart – Related to the parking comments and questions, on-site tandem – if this goes through and is adopted by Council, and then we have a closer look at parking and it’s recommended that we do negotiate all of that differently, could that section – just the parking section – be changed – like just that section be amended to fit with the recommendations and – because all of that.

Ms. Hudson – It could be amended independently, as long as it didn’t ...

Councilmember Hickman – The answer to that question is absolutely. The part that I love about this is that we’re looking right here in July 2017. Here we are, not even 2 years later, and we got a great committee together that is making great recommendations. We told people – I know I told people this is a living document. As we learn from it, we’re going to make changes, and that’s exactly what we’re doing. If through this process over the next year of this continuing work, and with the consultant, we realize we made that change but we want to change this now or do the street permit parking, then, yes.

Ms. Jolly Stewart – My specific thought related to that is the tandem parking and off-site parking, and parking requirements when a structure is built. The way the off-site parking is written, it says they have to be designated, permitted spaces for that place. So if it’s that specific, it seems like it would reduce how many parking spaces we try to fit tandem or whatever on the site where it’s needed. So I just – for the sake of attractive design, I think that’s something that really needs to be considered.

Councilmember Hickman – Jane, you would agree, that’s something that we can consider, right, down the road or as continuing discussion?

Okay. The last question I have for the committee, so the record can reflect this, and Jane can put it in the report. How do I ask this question? Is everyone on this committee willing to continue to serve on this committee, if the decision is made by Council to continue this committee in a more formal capacity, or informal capacity – I don’t know, I haven’t talked to Brea yet about it. But if you’re willing to continue to serve, just raise your right hand. Okay. So everybody is willing to continue to serve on this committee. Is everybody comfortable with basically we would not be reconvened until August, let’s say, after Council takes action?

Mr. Adair – I want to compliment this committee. I think the details that we probably spent 80% of our time on – the first time around, if we started to get close to anything like that, we were kind of told we were getting off in the weeds. Prior to Jane, staff would figure out how to administer the details in this, and this document needed more work than that.

Councilmember Hickman – I want to thank all of you guys on this committee. I know all of you put in a ton of time, a ton of hours, a lot of thought. I know we didn't all always agree, but I think we've come to some great solutions and compromises and agreements. I appreciate all of you being willing to continue to serve and to work on this. Like I said, I have told people as I've talked to them about this Form-Based Code area, that – and I mean this – all other things set aside, but for the future for the City of Norman, for kids and the grandkids that are on their way, what we are doing, I think, people will look back on in 5, 10, 15, 20 years in this part of town and say those guys got it right, this is awesome. I love this part of Norman. And people that only come every 5 or 10 years for football games are going to be just floored. Or they're going to look at it and say those guys really screwed that up. Why did they let this happen? It's destroyed downtown or this whole area. So I really feel like, just for the future of our community, this is the potential biggest change of our town. I really appreciate all of you all's hard work and time, because I know you all are vested and bring your own unique expertise, and it has really made this a great success. I want to really thank staff as well. They have all put in numerous amount of time and effort in getting this done. So thank you guys.

Ms. Hudson – I just want to go over a couple things before you guys run out of here. June 6th, the legal will be in The Transcript, and public notice mail-outs and so on will be taken care of. Then, in addition to that, June 20th, which is a Thursday, is going to be the Pre-Development meeting.

Councilmember Hickman – And that's at?

Ms. Hudson – 6:30, Council Chambers. Roné got that reserved for us today. I would like for you guys to be here, if you can, please. If you can't, I completely understand. Then we have June 27th, which will be exactly one week later, it will be the Special Meeting for Planning Commission.

Mr. Adair – 6:30?

Ms. Hudson – 6:30. Tara will send out reminders to everybody and make sure everybody is still on the same page. But since you're here, I want to talk about it. Then July 9th will be first reading at City Council, and July 23rd – seems odd – is that right? Yep, that's right – July 9th and July 23rd – so the 23rd will be the actual vote at City Council, and it will be an emergency ordinance to go in effect to beat the 29th deadline.

I want to get all the amendments done and I hope to have – the public had asked about getting this on the website. So now that you guys have seen what we've worked on and everything, we'll get the amendments done, get that posted so that people can look at it prior to the Pre-Development meeting and Planning Commission, and I'll get – did everybody get a copy of it today? Is that what you emailed out, or did you just send the agenda? But you guys got it. You were able to open it. Kris compressed it for us so we were able to email it. We'll get that done and get that back out to you guys. I want to send it in an email this time, if that's okay, instead of printing copies. I can't think of anything else right now.

Councilmember Hickman – Alright. Then we will be adjourned. Thank you guys very much. Everybody have a great day.

Adjourned 1:06 p.m.