

# NormanCenterCityVision

Center City Vision Steering Committee Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, May 12, 2016 8:00 am – 10:00 am  
Municipal Building Study Session

## **Members in Attendance:**

Jim Adair  
Rebecca Bean  
Susan Connors  
Jonathan Fowler  
Judy Hatfield  
Councilmember Greg Jungman  
Richard McKown  
Becky Patten  
Daniel Pullin  
Cynthia Rogers  
Mayor Cindy Rosenthal

## **Members Missing:**

Councilmember Stephan Tyler Holman  
Barrett Williamson  
Heather Woods-O'Connell

## **City Staff in Attendance:**

Jeff Bryant  
Leah Messner  
Jane Hudson  
Anaïs Starr  
Jolana McCart

The meeting began at 8:00 am.

Susan Connors began the meeting explaining that the underlined sentence of Appendix A, Process, *“The exclusion of the commercial area of Campus Corner may be reevaluated by City Council, with input from Campus Corner property owners and stakeholders, at such time that an adequately-sized parking structure that is open to the public is completed or an appropriate funding mechanism is approved”* was re-written in response to the changes requested at the April meeting.

- Using “may” instead of “shall”;
- Parking structure of significant or adequate capacity;
- Speak to funding generally instead of a TIF specifically and
- “with support of the Campus Corner property owners”

A discussion was held on the Campus Corner area addressed in the above statement. (West side of University, White, Asp, Boyd on the south, DeBarr and Jenkins.) It was suggested that this

black lined area be stretched to include further north of White along Buchanan and Asp to the alley between Apache and Linn. (This was discussed in more depth later in the meeting.)

A discussion was held on the height issue.

- To be financially feasible, with mixed use on the bottom floor, at least 3 stories above this would be needed?
- Parking garage height can vary greatly – define by feet? 4 stories = 58 feet? Or define by “stories”? No more than 3 stories or 44 feet? FBC currently allows 12 feet per story in a commercial area. Height restrictions directed only to a parking garage?

S Connors will consult with the parking study people. 3 stories with top parking? Richard McKown stated that he thought they should work with the median height of the building, which is determined from ground to the parapet wall. Daniel Pullin said that the Elm Ave parking garage is 4 levels, with the 5<sup>th</sup> covered, is 45 feet, from the ground to the top of the structure. Jonathan Fowler said that he thought there was going to be 2 sets of language: a) the west side of University is capped at 3 stories total for any type of structure except with a parking garage, then b) 3 inside with 4th on top provided that it meets all the necessary amenities that were desired within the charrette process.

A discussion was held on the restrictions of property owners and what they are getting back. What and how large, are the trade-offs? Is the FBC an actual “taking”? It was agreed that these items are seen differently and will continue to be seen differently by committee members.

Richard McKown stated that if 20% of the property owners protested the proposed rezoning, it would take a super majority vote of City Council to approve the request. He felt it would be hard to get this approved as mandatory. He also said that other people in the R-3 area would protest, thus raising the percentage. He said that the campus area and downtown were trying to be stitched together for a sense of place.

J Fowler said that he felt the process was designed to protect the core and enhance the area between downtown and campus. He felt that others were for projects that were not in the best interest of the neighborhoods. He said that large well-known groups lobby for the walkability and place-making that FBC provides. He felt that this is what the neighborhoods want and that downtown should be included. Not everyone can or will be happy. He said he didn't know what else could be done when others only want to make as much money as possible. He felt that a tremendous amount of compromise had been found so far.

Cindy Rogers said that she can understand people thinking that they will not be able to do what they could before. She said that may be true, but by working together and having a coordinated plan and vision, it's going to change what is going to be more profitable. The mixed use is the way to go.

Questions were asked about the City Council/supermajority/approval/neighborhood protests.

J Fowler said that the only way to move forward is with compromise. And that would require the Steering Committee stepping up and lobbying for FBC positively. FBC allows for a lot of growth.

C Rogers said that something needs to be done to make other things more profitable than student housing.

A discussion was held on moving the black line exclusion area further north as previously suggested. The group agreed to this expansion.

S Connors said that one of the greatest concerns that began this discussion was the tear-downs and duplexes being built. Finding a happy medium with the new developments and making sure they are reasonable within the context of the area is the goal.

Mayor Rosenthal said that she feels that the group had come to a very important compromise. The Campus Corner area has been excluded until a parking garage is constructed. Then it will be up to the City Council to decide the height guidelines.

S Connors said that C-3 does not have parking or height restrictions anywhere in the FBC. (Appendix A - 2.) The Mayor said that FBC emphasizes and cares about streetscapes.

The Committee agreed with the Appendix A wording as presented.

S Connors said that the Committee needed to decide if the incentives are a percentage of the fees or a total amount. R McKown asked if City staff could come up with the maximum amount of reduction possible. Mayor agreed. C Rogers said that the impact on the City budget is also important.

Rebecca Bean asked if any other disincentives had been considered. J Fowler said that to go outside the FBC would require a CC PUD which would require public input. J Hatfield said that it was also more expensive. A 350 foot notification would also go into effect, which is the normal process.

Adding a posting notice and a neighborhood person to the DRC will be added to Chapter 2.

S Connors pointed out the clarification on Page 2 of Section 520 addressing 3C, shortened and meaning clarified:

*(c) Parking and off-street loading. All uses established within a PUD shall comply with the off-street parking and loading requirements as established in Part 6. Parking and Loading Standards of the CC FBC. Properties currently zoned C-3 in the Center City area as of (date) shall have no parking requirements.*

and 3G, 3 stories or (couldn't understand) :

*(g) Building Height. The height of structures on the west side of University Boulevard extending from Boyd Street to the alley north of Apache Street shall be a maximum of three stories. Properties currently zoned C-3 in the Center City area as of (date) shall have no height requirements.*

Page 4, right before 5, this sentence has been removed: *Additionally, the applicant shall submit a schedule of construction for the project, or for each phase within the project, indicating the sequence of development according to residential type and other non-residential construction within the project.*

- Beta Testing – Test Case 1 – BFS Urban General

Open space design requirements? Integral to the building. Balconies, open roof space can be considered open space. This creates open space for people using these structures. Councilmember Jungman said that this example is a great example for a “given”.

- Test Case 2 – BFS Urban Storefront and Urban General Frontages

Parking layout looks like it comes from the alley? FBC allows for alley access. Where will the alley maintenance money come from? Tree upkeep will up to the property owner. A TIF could pay for parking, green infrastructure, etc.

- Test Case 3 – BFS Townhouse/Small Apartment

Public parking is in the back. 2 spaces to a unit are provided.

R McKown said that the Committee needs to pull in people who are doing R-3 redevelopment and have a conversation with them about this level of detail. There is conversation of maximizing profit, but if a project doesn't make money, no one will finance a deal. He asked if a small group could be brought in and work through the plan examples. Rebecca Bean asked if the projects currently being built are more financially feasible than the proposed. J Fowler said that the examples given could make money, just not as much money.

S Connors asked R McKown who would he would suggest be in the conversation. He volunteered, as did J Fowler. Tammy McCown, Keith McCabe, John Lungren and Brent Swift were names suggested. The Mayor said that she wanted both sides represented, not just all positive for the FBC or negative.

The Mayor thanked staff for designing a couple of examples but that it wasn't their role to design each property. She asked the legal department to check into the arguments that rent- by- the- bed can be prevented because it discriminates against families.

R Bean asked if the market could be the driving factor instead of parking? Minimum parking for residential is: up to 600 sq feet is .5: 650 sq feet 1 per unit; 1,000 sq feet is 1.25 spaces per unit. Parking can be provided off-site within a certain distance from the lot. R-1 requires 2 off-street per unit. Parking permits is also a possible solution.

S Connors stated that the next meeting will be very important for all Committee members to attend. This meeting should be within the next week or so and could be the final meeting before moving forward to the public hearing process. The Mayor thanked those who changed their schedules to attend this meeting, but flexibility will be necessary for all to attend.

Meeting adjourned at 9:48 am