

# NormanCenterCityVision

Center City Vision Steering Committee Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday, September 24, 2015 1:30 PM  
Municipal Building Study Session

## **Members in Attendance:**

Susan Connors  
Jonathan Fowler  
Judy Hatfield  
Stephen Tyler Holman  
Councilmember Greg Jungman  
Richard McKown (1:45)  
Heather Wood O'Connell  
Becky Patten  
Mayor Cindy Rosenthal

## **City Staff in Attendance:**

Jane Hudson  
Anaïs Starr  
Jolana McCart

The meeting began at 1:45 pm.

Susan Connors went over the Options for Center City Form Based Code handout. (See attached) Comments on each process proposal:

### **A. PROCESS**

*Approve the Center City Form Based Code as a strongly preferred by non-mandatory Overlay District. (The option to make the Form Based Code mandatory shall be reevaluated after a five-year trial period.).*

1. *The property owner can decide to use the current zoning or the Form Based Code (FBC) but cannot mix and match.*
  1. No comments
2. *If the current zoning district is used, the property owner is required to come to the City Council for a public hearing to secure a demolition permit and site plan approval. The public hearing process will require notice and provide property owners within 350 feet the opportunity to object. The property owner bears the burden of proof to show why the FBC is not appropriate, compatible or financially feasible.*
  1. Should the notification area be increased? The standard is 300 feet by State law, so the City has already expanded the notification area by 50 feet. Meetings are posted on the web.
  2. If the FBC is not utilized, City Council has to approve the site plan.

3. The term “financially feasible” will be removed. (See discussion under #4)
3. *If the FBC Overlay District is used, it will be administrative process for site plan review, demolition permit and preliminary plat through the Development Committee after staff review. Final Plan would need to be approved by City Council.*
    1. Final Plats typically appear on the Concert Docket.
  4. *If an applicant chooses to rezone the property to another zoning category rather than the FBC, then it must be rezoned to PUD (a new definition of a Center City PUD would be developed). The primary goal of the new CCPUD category is to provide flexibility when a property owner seeks to comply with the intent and goals of the FBC but seeks relief regarding specific requirements of the FBC. The property owner bears the burden of proof to show why the FBC requirements are not feasible.*
    1. Discussion on 3/4 stories vs. 6 story structures in the Urban General designation.
      - Apprehension in the neighborhoods over 6 story structures. 3 acceptable, with 4 being the limit.
      - Financial feasibility of building only 3/4 stories vs. 6.
      - Economic feasibility not as much of a priority as much as protecting the neighborhood.
      - Old apartments currently there will deteriorate – redevelopment will be nonexistent with 3/4 stories.
      - Massive exception for feasibility is provided, and then the standing rule does not need to be for feasibility, but for neighborhoods.
      - Does the community prefer what is there right now or something brand new? Change or exactly as is?
      - Can revisit in 5 years and change if redevelopment is being hindered.
      - 3/4 over 6: personal preference, more eyes watching, visual over tree canopies, mass, no gradual ascetics.
      - 3/4 stories have always been stressed as a comfort level.
      - The process that has been outlined provides the right balance between putting it on the owner as to why not comply?
      - Property owner can always ask for an exception.
      - Not the City’s obligation to see if the owner can make the most profit.
      - Is there a loop hole being created that will allow some strange hybrid code use?
      - RO restrictions, such as height, parking and landscaping, may make lots in this area unfeasible for 6 stories.
      - 5 stories with step-backs – see cover photo – more acceptable.
      - 6 stories acceptable downtown with the CCPUD allowing more.
      - Concern for major push-back on 6 stories.
    2. Show of hand vote: 5 committee members for 5 stories on Campus Corner; 4 committee members for 6 stories.

B. INCENTIVES for Developers using the Form Based Code (These incentives would be in place for a period of five years and then reevaluated.

- Unknown on percentage of fee reduction at this time. Fees based on construction cost. Too much of a reduction impacts the City; too small, not a true incentive.
- Not shifting development but shaping. Encouraging.
- 5 year re-visit to see if it has been a big enough enticement.
- Do not exempt water meters. Susan will do research on other fees.
- If the new project does not increase capacity or incur additional cost, it should be given back to them.
- Only fast tracking will be offered to those following the FBC.

C. PLANNING UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) REQUIREMENTS.

- Parking requirements in the FBC cannot be deviated from.
- Street space? Presentation from the street. No set-back.
- Re-development percentage has not been determined.

Miscellaneous Discussions:

1. Is there some kind of market analysis to show that perhaps student housing is over saturated? CDBG has already had a market analysis done as part of the Consolidated Plan. It can be used in development planning.
2. Limiting the bedroom/bath ratio. Does this cross the fair housing code? 3 bedroom/2 bath the normal single family home being built. Need to try to make a statement against 4 bedroom+ units.
3. Moratorium possible? Monitored review process? Public review process? How can you tell someone they cannot follow the current zoning? Speeding up the process would be more acceptable.
4. A return visit by Mary needs to be planned and scheduled. Perhaps to bring the Planning Commission and City Council up-to-speed.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 pm.

