

**CENTER CITY ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY AD HOC COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

FEBRUARY 24, 2022

The Center City Administrative Delay Ad Hoc Committee of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in the Executive Conference Room of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 24th day of February, 2022.

Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <https://www.normanok.gov/your-government/public-information/agendas-and-minutes> 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilmember Lee Hall
Councilmember Steven Tyler Holman
Councilmember Matthew Peacock
Keith McCabe
Richard McKown
Autumn McMahon

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jim Adair

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Director of Planning & Community Development
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Logan Hubble, Planner I
Colton Wayman, Planner I
Anais Starr, Planner II
Rone' Tromble, Admin. Tech. IV
Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer
Sara Kaplan, Retail Marketing Coordinator
Scott Sturtz, City Engineer

Councilmember Hall called the meeting to order at 11:32 a.m.

1. WELCOME

Councilmember Hall – Just want to remind you all that just to keep things moving and make sure we're not interrupting one another, I'll recognize you; just stick your hand out. Thank you all for coming today.

2. DISCUSSION OF DUMPSTER/POLY CART PROVISION AND PLACEMENT REQUIREMENTS

Ms. Hudson – I think this will be a very brief discussion. I have done a lot of checking with City staff – I don't see anybody here – but I've got a couple emails back and forth from them. Anybody that has driven down the alleys in this area understands that there is an issue with the amount of polycarts/recycle polycarts that are back there. There are some that are definitely kept organized and taken care of, but there are some that are not. City staff from Utilities has done some research and gotten back to me. For what we're considering multi-family units – these are not single-family dwellings – that recycling is not provided for multi-family. Because we are having such an issue in that area, there's only a few left that actually still have the recycle polycarts, and I believe that those will be going away. In addition to that, historically on the applications when we would review them at DRT and get the permits, the applicants would show an area where they were going to line up their polycarts. With this current amendment, we want to be a little more restrictive, have some additional requirements in place that they will show on the site plan where the polycarts are going to be located. In addition to that, we need some sort of screening, and it can be just the 4' stockade type fence that's just the depth of the polycarts, so it's that actual designated area. Repeatedly they show that this is where they're going to put the polycarts; it becomes a parking space and the polycarts stay out in the alley area. We want to add that requirement that they actually have to show us where it's going to be, so that they have an area to bring them back into that location. If they get rid of the recycle bins – 4 polycarts, maybe – maybe 5. Depends on how many units they might have. Ideally, dumpsters would be perfect in this area, but we don't have enough room to do that at this point, even if it was just one on an alley, and you're the 5th developer that comes in there and you're the one that has to put a dumpster in, and that's not what we want to do either. That's what we are proposing to do on the polycart locations.

Councilmember Hall – You don't happen to have any pictures, do you? I think you've showed those before in other settings.

Ms. Hudson – I don't have them today.

Councilmember Hall – The polycarts and the trash bins are an issue that has been identified for a long time. What I hear you saying is we really have the ability to just say you don't have to do that anymore.

Ms. Hudson – For the recycle?

Councilmember Hall – Yeah.

Ms. Hudson – Right.

Councilmember Hall – So we've literally been providing that service when we didn't need to.

Ms. Hudson – Initially, there were some when the first dwellings were constructed they had set the carts.

Councilmember Hall – Personally, I think it's a big improvement, because if you take a ride down those alleys any day, any time, it is an issue. It can be a safety issue as well, just because there is not good placement, which is understandable for lots of different reasons. Lots of different people probably handling those. I know there's also the issue with the polycarts that we've known for quite some time that the contamination factor with that many residents and residents that are moving in and out frequently that just literally may not understand what the guidelines are for recyclable materials. So that's an issue, too.

Ms. Hudson – The majority that go in the blue bins are trash bags; they're not recycling.

Councilmember Hall – I guess my question is how soon can we actually implement the recycling polycart thing, or does that have to be part of this?

Ms. Hudson – I don't think it has to be part of this. They're actually still doing the research. They – being Utilities – is doing the research to find out which units still do have the recycle carts, and I don't have those numbers back. We'll get that and follow up on that part.

Councilmember Hall – I also really see requiring it on the site plan and providing screening as a benefit, too.

Mr. McCabe – With the polycarts, I absolutely agree with you. They're used for trash cans. I talk to the people in Sanitation weekly. It is cross-contaminated. I have all the recycle carts removed from my single-family homes voluntarily. I still pay the monthly fee, even though I don't have the service. So when you speak to City Utilities, they say that's not an option. I can give up the cart, but I still pay the fees. So I do. But that's there. Driving today down the alleys, looking at this, case in point, a house at 701 Jenkins – 10 carts in the back; 5 recycle carts. So when you add the cost of a \$14 cart plus \$7 per additional cart, it's cheaper for me to have 10 carts than it is to have one small dumpster. So that's why it's being done. If there's room for 10 polycarts, I would kind of argue there might be room for 1 small dumpster. I like the idea, but I know that the City does have those very small dumpsters. But the majority of the landlords or homeowners don't set their polycarts out to make it easier for Sanitation, and if you look at the Sanitation workers physically having to get out to physically move each individual cart because the only thing that would worry me about the fence, which I like, the way that our cart system is set up they have these grapples that come around – they need a wide berth so sticking them in an enclosure, which I like the idea, will impede that process. So if we're trying to make it easier, at least for Sanitation, that might be something to consider.

Ms. Hudson – The enclosure is supposed to be off of the alley, so when you pull them back to provide services for your tenants – the enclosure isn't out on the alley. So you'll still be able to line them up out on the alley for pick-up. This is just trying to get them back off of the alley and have a designated area on the site plan.

Mr. McCabe – Again, driving there every day, landlords and homeowners don't move those polycarts. Wherever they sit is where they sit. So are we thinking about making it

some type of mandatory that they physically have to move it – penalty if they don't? Because, if not, they're going to sit where they sit whether we designate something or not. Again, at 701, that was the house right there on the corner and they physically built a stockade fence on the back property line, because they had planned on putting up gates to help hide how many cars there were. So these polycarts actually sit in the alley – physically in the alley. There is no up into the yard. So it's physically in the alley.

Ms. Hudson – I can check. It's my understanding, and I could word this wrong, that it is in the ordinance that it states that you're supposed to bring your polycarts back from the alley, or the pickup area – I don't know the exact verbiage. I would wager that there could be a citation – a fine – that could be implemented through the Utility/Sanitation staff, but I need to double check that and see.

Councilmember Hall – I also have a question about Mr. McCabe's point on the fee. If it's not required for a multi-family unit to have a recycling polycart, why would they still be charged the fee?

Ms. Hudson – I need to ask that. I've got that note here.

Ms. Hoggatt – I don't think that duplexes count as multi-family.

Ms. Starr – Even though they're being used as that, they're not counted.

Ms. Hudson – The duplexes, correct – but these that have 3 and 4 and 5 units – those are what they're looking at as multi-family per my discussion with the Utilities individuals.

Councilmember Hall – I'm glad you raised that issue, because that was another thing I was thinking about with how we're defining a duplex. So would that be something that maybe would be more included in the amendment package, to treat that as a multi-family unit within Center City?

Ms. Hudson – I will find out. May I ask a question? Keith, do you have some of your older ones before the Center City was adopted that are true duplexes?

Mr. McCabe – Yes.

Ms. Hudson – Do you have recycle bins on those?

Mr. McCabe – Yes.

Ms. Hudson – And you still do?

Mr. McCabe – No. I mean, I had them, I removed them, but I still pay for them; they're still on my bill.

Mr. McKown – This feels more like a design problem to be drawn through. I'm trying to think about how big those polycarts are. If on trash day, you've got them all rolled out

into a 20' wide alley on both sides and they're sitting on the pavement, assuming it's 20' wide – then it really starts to choke that whole situation down, and it almost feels like we need a drawing of what is the solution to also sort of address this grabbing thing. In my mind, I'm imaging a little 2.5' pad – little concrete pad that's on the edge of the alley where these things live, and then they can be grabbed and then just are where they are. Otherwise, I feel like we have a design problem here, that words are really not good at solving. I'm starting to try and draw it up, but I just don't know the dimensions.

Ms. Hudson – When they put them for pickup – the tenants, the owners – they line them up along the alley.

Mr. McKown – On the pavement or adjacent, sitting in some kind of a grass area adjacent to the pavement?

Ms. Hudson – I've seen them behind some of the cars – so the cars are parked there, so they line them up behind the cars. Some of them pull them out a little bit further into the alley. I've seen both ways. But then, once they're picked up, they just need to bring them back this way as opposed to leaving them out there. It's just been loose the way it was written before.

Ms. Muckala – Just weighing in on what if they don't bring them down, where should they be placed. I do think that drawings are a good idea for what we're talking about as a designated area, with separate requirements to bring them out. Any residence does this, so I can't cite our ordinances. We can get that information. I'm feeling that the result would be if they don't bring them down, they don't get picked up. It sounds like maybe there are situations where they're not really placed where they should be, and our City crews or our contractors are doing extra work to reach them that probably shouldn't be being done. The consequence for a residence is you don't take it out/it doesn't get picked up. That's probably more of what would happen. But I can verify that.

Councilmember Holman – I think if carts are going to be placed in the alleyway, they should be part of a design of the property, to where they're on their property, not in the alleyway. There should be a designated space. But, ideally, we could find a way to have one dumpster at each end, or two in the middle of the block. I don't know how to do that, or how to look at each block as a whole – who would pay for it? Or do you assess all of the property owners on that side of the block – they pay for that dumpster on that side and the other property owners on the other side all have to pay for the one on the other? That seems like, if we could find a way to design it in, having one dumpster at each end of the alleyway would be the best way to do this, I would think. But it is pretty constrained. If we're going to have polycarts, then it should have to be part of how they design their property where these are going to go. It could be difficult to get the tenants to move them, because they're going to say it's not my trash can, it's the whole building's trash can. Why should I have to do this every week, and nobody else in the whole building will do it, and I'm tired of doing it. Unless it's the property owner going out every week and doing it themselves, like Keith might do.

Mr. McCabe – I do.

Ms. McMahon – Several of our owners do. Several of them go out and move – and the bigger issue is not that people don't put them there in the alley to get picked up. It's that they don't pull them back. So they're just there the whole time. So finding a 2.5' slab that could fit 10 polycarts – that becomes the issue. I agree with Councilmember Holman that dumpsters, to me, seem like an obvious solution.

Councilmember Hall – Can you speak to that, Ms. Hudson, because I know you've already investigated. Logically, I think we all would assume that dumpsters are the issue, but there are issues with that that you've already investigated.

Ms. Hudson – We were talking to a couple of the builders and we were trying to figure out a way to get a dumpster for one of the sites, because the way it has been developed, there was almost no place for the polycarts to go. So we were looking at this alley, trying to figure out where it could go. What it does is it takes 3 parking spaces to accommodate a dumpster location. If you're serving 6 lots, or even 12 because you've got the houses on both sides that could utilize it, is losing 3 parking spaces a bad thing, necessarily? I'm going to say no, for me, but for the developer that's losing 3 parking spaces that's an issue for them. So we didn't get an agreement. There's also the telephone poles/light poles sometimes that are a problem because that was one of the other things to put it where it would work there was a pole. We've been working on it.

Mr. McCabe – The very large dumpsters, correct. But the City has smaller dumpsters that it actually takes up less than 1 spot. There's 3 of them behind me that the man and woman who owns a lot of the DeBarr properties – or Deans Row property – they have those. Now, what they'll have to do is they might have to pay for an additional pickup, because it's just not that large of a cart. But it's not taking up 3 spots.

Ms. Hudson – They're required to put an enclosure on it now. Those that you're talking about don't have enclosures.

Mr. McCabe – So we're still talking the difference of what you're considering multi-family, which is 4, 5, 6 units, as opposed to a duplex, single-family, 1, 2 unit.

Ms. Hudson – Now here's the thing, if you want to write in here that this area – the Center City area – you don't have to have an enclosure, you could do that. I, personally, would not like to see them without enclosures. Maybe if it is the smaller units, that they have more frequent pickup. I can check into that, too, and see what the enclosure would be for the smaller units. But with the typical units that are set, it does take 3 spaces, and it's also because of the angle it has to come in and then back out because of the lines, get to a position in the alley where they can dump it and not hit the lines, and they have to come back in and put it back in and come back.

Mr. McCabe – So you're basically looking at those as commercial structures, which then you get into the commercial setup, which is the enclosure, the right-of-way, all of that. So, yeah, there's a big difference.

Ms. Hudson – I'll get some of this information and have it as the first item on the next agenda.

Mr. McKown – I'm happy to do some drawing here as a volunteer. But I definitely feel like there's a lot here on the table, and some of the variables are going to be what are all the different dumpster options? We have a situation not unlike this in Oklahoma City where polycarts and recycle bins started to get delivered to the 6 townhouses, but the whole property of 32 units has a commercial dumpster solution. We just found the whole thing really bizarre, the way it was just unrolling, and having to do with 2 different property types – single-family attached versus multi-family. Oklahoma City does not provide sanitation to anything multi-family – you have to go a commercial route, and once you go that route, you can have dumpsters on wheels that are 2 yard dumpsters. You can have 3 yard dumpsters. Then you can have the big, heavy ones that can't be moved around. There are just so many different ways to solve this. But here, what are our range of options with Norman? I would also say that once you get over a certain number of polycarts, you could also just make it a requirement. You have to get a dumpster. It probably is ending up to being more expensive. It might save you a lot of labor. I feel like we need measured drawings to be able to make a good decision here on what ought to be the solution.

Ms. Hudson – I just don't want a dumpster on every lot, even a smaller one. I would rather just have one on the block, instead of trying to do ...

Mr. McKown – So often the problem with a dumpster is it attracts the random neighbor that's like, oh, let's go empty out our dorm room at the dumpster. There is no easy answer to this.

Councilmember Hall – Well, we're up to the task to try to find a good one.

Mr. McKown – Where could I get some ...

Ms. Hudson – I'll get with Bret, who I've been working with in Sanitation, and ask him what sizes there are, what type of enclosure – I'll find out.

Mr. McKown – I'll be happy to make some drawings and just email them out for people to see.

Councilmember Hall – That sounds good.

Mr. McCabe – Just so you're aware, the typical lot that we're dealing with, the alley is either 8' to 12' wide. It's not 20'. Then part of our problem, which I hope we address also, are the alleys are two-way existing now. So what happens, you pull the polycarts out, as two cars try to pass each other, they physically have to go into your yard, so they actually move your carts. Well, now your cart is no longer on the alley and it doesn't get picked up. So it's one of those deals that – Lee and I have spoken about it before, even something as maybe making the alleys one-directional. That way the cars aren't passing

each other. After physically driving into somebody's backyard to pass. Sounds silly, but it isn't easy.

Councilmember Hall – I'm aware of some very peculiar situations in Core Norman where one-way alleys have been a really good solution. Every time we think we have simple, low-hanging fruit that's not going to take very long, here we go. I think this is really a significant discussion, because it's an issue. It's an issue on multiple levels, and I am a visual learner myself, so having it in a site plan and physically represented as a drawing in the code – I like all of that as well. I just want to make sure we're also going to pursue the fee, and how that might impact all of this. Because if we're going to eliminate, by policy, having a recycling polycart, then we need to also address not continuing to charge a fee for that.

Ms. Hudson – I'll find out.

Councilmember Holman – The alleyways on either side of Main Street are one-way. I don't particularly like one-way streets, but I think it makes sense for alleyways that are much narrower and have a lot of functions going on on them for loading, unloading, and trash pickup. So I think it would make sense that in the Center City area that the alleyways all be one-way, whichever way it is. I think that's something we should do.

Mr. McKown – When we make Main Street two-way, we can recycle all those one-way signs.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. Does that give you enough direction to refine this? This is actually one of the items that I've really been looking forward to talking about, just because it's just an eyesore, number one. It's a safety issue, number two. And I'm glad we've got the clarification that we do, and then we'll see what you can come back with later.

3. DISCUSSION OF DEFINITION OF "BEDROOM"

Ms. Hudson – This is really just to get this out in front of you. Definitions is something that we know we need to continue to look at within the Center City area. As we know, we've talked about many times, the 3-bedroom units with 2 common living areas are sometimes turned into 4-bedroom units. This definition of bedroom is something that we're looking at bringing forward with the update. We want to include the definition of habitable space. This definition of the general living space, which would address some of the questions about the second den or second livingroom area. And then this definition of the dwelling unit. We've been working on this for a little bit, and I think that it meets the direction that we're looking to go. But we can definitely get this out to you and let you look at it, and then we can put it as one of the top items on the next agenda. Like I said, I know that you really need to think through this and think about it. We can definitely get that out to you.

Councilmember Hall – So you're going to send this out. Does anyone have any comment generally about this issue that might help everybody else think about it? Okay. We'll take a look at that. This is something that I've mentioned at a previous meeting already.

I think this is a really important piece of how we're moving forward, because we continue to see the unintended consequences of not having a grip on this, and it actually is connected in very significant ways to agenda item 4, discussion of reformulation of parking requirements, because this is what we're seeing. Now having a definition that we can work with within the Center City boundary, when we don't have this secured, it definitely affects parking requirements. So what we are currently seeing is not just 3-bedroom units adding a 4th bedroom, it's other types of units that are adding more than 1 bedroom. We're aware of that, too. So from the very beginning, because we have no way to confirm what the bedroom count is after it's completed, but anecdotally we're very aware that there's not proper parking provided for what the end result is going to be.

4. DISCUSSION OF REFORMULATION OF PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Hubble – We discussed these last time, these three tenants that we really see as hopefully working together to create more units in the CCFBC area with fewer bedrooms per unit. We really want to revisit the parking minimums discussion we had last time. There wasn't really a consensus. It seemed that there might be an interest in creating a one space per bedroom minimum if we allowed for on-street inset parking to count toward the parking minimums, so we just wanted to revisit that and see what everyone's thoughts were.

Councilmember Holman – I feel that way. I don't want more surface parking. I don't want these properties being taken up half by parking lots. That means less people, and I want more people. Parking spaces don't spend money and they don't support the economy like people do, and I just don't want more surface parking lots around here. Having more of the on-street parking and letting that be counted toward the overall totality of parking in the area is what makes the most sense to me. That also means the City is not having to pay to put the inset parking in the street, either. So it seems like a good way to address that. Many of the streets, as Richard has shown in his drawings, there's still room to do that, some of the streets with parallel, some of the streets with angled parking, and still have room for green space and street trees and things like that. That's the way I would prefer, before we start requiring more parking lots and more on-site parking, if possible.

Ms. Muckala – I just wanted to add one little note I remembered from the last meeting, and a clarification for my purposes. At the last meeting, there was some limited discussion about a revocable right-of-way permit, but pretty quickly it was established in the discussion that we want this offset parking, but you don't expect it to be reserved for your tenants. I just want to make it clear we are not talking about a platform that would involve actual reserving of these spots. They're simply available to be counted toward the count.

Councilmember Hall – I think that's the understanding. Is everybody clear about that?

Ms. Muckala – I only clarify because that definitely has a lot more legal consequences and would open a big can of worms.

Councilmember Holman – That, and better and more aggressive parking enforcement. If you park on the grass, you're going to get a ticket. And you do it again, you're going to get towed. And that be how it is. If you don't like it, then don't live in that area. That's simple to me. There's plenty of other student housing all over the place. If you don't like the settings that exist in this area, then if your truck doesn't fit then you might have to look at somewhere else in town.

Councilmember Hall – Clearly, that would be a key part of making whatever adjustments we make successful. I totally understand your point, but we have several examples right now of it has come in as a 3-bedroom unit, but we know it's going to be 4, and there has already been parking secured on other lots. We also have an example of parking lots where you would prefer to have density. So that's part of the problem. I really understand where you're coming from, but I think the reality of the park once environment and a walkable neighborhood – the key phrase there is you are parking once. Even if you're not getting in your car again for 3 weeks, you still have to have a place to park your car. I guess, number one, the question is are we satisfied with the way it's set up right now? I think the reason we're talking about it is the answer is no to that for all the things we discussed last week. Are we creative enough to balance all of these different needs to improve this? Because even if they don't need to have the required parking places, we already have multiple examples of then we're just going to other pieces of property and instead of building a multi-family unit, we have surface parking. So that's an issue, too. Would love to hear your thoughts.

Councilmember Holman – I would love to see, again, the street parking – the drawings that we've seen that Richard has made. If every block had the on-street parking, we're talking about hundreds of parking spaces for the totality of the area that would exist and provide more room for buildings. That is what I would prefer that we do, is try to develop out all of each block with angled parking, parallel parking, wherever it fits all throughout this area. To me, it seems like it would add enough parking spaces to satisfy the whole need, perhaps.

Ms. Hudson – So everyone is clear, at the next meeting – March 3 – we're going to have staff here to discuss the proposal that Richard had forwarded to me last time. I forwarded that on to the Public Works Director, so we're going to have staff here that can go over that and the possibilities of what will, what won't work. That would give you a better idea of how it could be five years from now or something like that. I just wanted you to know that's going to be here next time.

Mr. McCabe – I absolutely agree. If dedicating the off-street parking to the house becomes a greater, bigger issue, then I'm good with just creating that off-street parking, but I think allowing it to count toward your total count, even though with general parking, I think that's a great solution.

Mr. Petromilli – Seeing Scott here today, and you talking about dumpsters, one of the things the Development Committee needs to get into an issue with is that all of these – and this happened on the entire code that was originally written, and I fell into that trap when I started working in Norman – is that there are a number of City staff members that

aren't involved in making the decisions that actually happen here in reality, and then the development community comes in and we have, for example, a dumpster enclosure and they say, hey, look at how this little dumpster enclosure fit on my lot in this drawing, and then we go out and we showed that on our site and the City regulations don't actually meet what is in this, and so Public Works has these standards that are set up for the City, and so does Planning, and so does Plan Review and development, and all these other ones. But they don't actually match what's in this form-based code. So it's just like your conversation here – it's the same conversation that happens every single time from the very first. Maybe we can do this, and we can fit this, and I see Richard working on this. But is that the standard that Scott has in his room, because they're not going to let me build it if it doesn't meet that standard. So it's the same thing. We have inset parking spaces that we're talking about right now. The form-based code has a very specific size, and they actually decreased the width of the street. I don't know if anybody has done a stack of drawings, but there's these street standards. They've decreased the width of the streets, which is a way to help control the speed of vehicles, but it doesn't meet the City of Norman standards, and the parking spaces inset don't meet the City standards. I don't know if the rest of the development community continues to go there. There's a huge disconnect. So you are making these decisions in a vacuum, even with staff here. It's not being relayed. I'm just saying you went through and made a whole dumpster thing, but I'm going to be the person that goes to put a dumpster on there and they have very specific sizes, and it's not what you are envisioning. That's not addressed. It's not addressed until we get the buy-off from the people that actually make the decisions once you go to Council. And that's across the board, because the two items you're working on right now, dumpster and parking, they don't match – they're not even close. So how do we come to a resolution here that actually works?

Councilmember Hall – Appreciate that feedback. That really is part of this entire process. I think that's literally why we keep coming back and revisiting this, because it was intended to be a living, breathing document from the beginning. Obviously, the Planning Department has encountered multiple challenges, not only with the lane that they're in, but just to your point, how does this all come together and work, because it's a completely different zoning overlay. I think that's part of the discussion. I know that the last time we worked really carefully with the rest of the City staff, but to your point, that's what we really need to understand is what are the impacts of these changes going to mean and how do we coordinate that with what the current expectation is? There's going to be some things that, we found out last time, we just can't do, period.

Councilmember Holman – I think that's a great point. For me, the Center City area, we've always known, is different than the rest of the City. So, to me, whatever standards we put in place in this area should override anything else that is a standard in the rest of the City. If we say the lanes are 10' wide in this area, then that overrides what the standard is everywhere else in the City, in my view – or should be. And that should be made clear to all the departments that are reviewing plans, is that if we say this is how the dumpsters are going to be and this is the dimensions, it may be different than the rest of the City, but it's overriding because it's in this area. That's how I think we should address that going forward – is find out what works with the spacing and all that type of stuff. That

shouldn't be an issue, though, if we're making decisions about how this area works. It shouldn't be up-ended because of a standard that exists on 36th and Robinson.

Councilmember Hall – I totally agree with that. Depending on what it is, obviously, there's going to be some things that may not be as flexible as other things. But I think all of that needs to be part of what this looks like at the end. Just to use another example, we have historic districts in Norman that are governed by City ordinances, and those are the most restrictive zoning overlays in the City of Norman. So things that you can do everywhere else in Norman, you cannot do in an historic district. I think that same idea applies to this, if it's going to be successful and meet the vision of what the community expects.

Councilmember Peacock – I was just going to add to that. It's typically what I've seen in other cities is that the overlay district is the overriding zoning, and that's why they have design review boards for each one of those districts, is because they're specifically trained to look at that particular zoning for that particular overlay. I know that was a big point of contention early on, but I think it's a missing component of Center City is we don't have any kind of design review process.

Councilmember Hall – It's on the list.

Councilmember Peacock – Don't want to put the cart before the horse, but I thought I'd put that out there. That seems to work really well in other cities, in my experience.

Councilmember Hall – Any other feedback about parking, in particular, or do you want to move on to the next one?

5. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE CONSOLIDATION IN NUMBER OF FRONTAGES

Mr. Hubble – I will talk about the height limits again in a little bit. This is regarding the consolidation of the number of frontages.

Councilmember Hall – Can I interrupt you just a second and make sure that, just for the record, what we're talking about is changing to the Urban Residential Building Form Standard, so that's what this is in regard to.

Mr. Hubble – Yes. In the first meeting, we had talked about combining the Urban Townhouse/Small Apartment, the Neighborhood Middle, and the Urban Residential all into one frontage type that, essentially, acts as an offshoot of the orange Urban General Frontage type. That's because what we're getting in pink is low density for where it is, right next to campus. Pink is the Neighborhood Middle Frontage. What we're getting in the blue, Urban Townhouse/Small Apartment, is almost identical to what we're getting in the orange Urban General. So we thought if we combined those districts, we can essentially solve all the problems at once regarding form. What we came up with was this box – these would be the distinctions in this Urban Residential area – the distinctions from Urban General. This is what changes from Urban General to Urban Residential. The first one is it lowers the finished floor elevation, from the 3' that it is in the blue area right now, to 18". That makes it so the ramps don't have to be nearly as long for the accessible units. Now it would be 18" to 8', so that would allow for a bit more variation along the

streetscape. Number two allows private open area to be anywhere behind the RBL. Right now it's only behind the parking setback line, but we want to allow courtyards in this area, so this would allow courtyards to be used as part of that private open area. Number three is the allowance for courtyards. You can either build to the RBL for 100% - and that's ignoring possibly having up to 3' setbacks. So that's ignoring that. But 100% would be the general requirement. If you wanted to have a courtyard, you could build 50% to the RBL. So a 50' lot, that would be 12.5' building, 25' courtyard, 12.5' building. The courtyard could be smaller than that, but that would be the maximum that you would be allowed as far as courtyard size. Then the last one, number four – and this one is pretty minor. Right now, in orange, a street wall has to be between 5' and 12' tall, and in blue it is 4' to 8' tall. So we just changed from the 5' to 12' to 4' to 8' for this area, because that matches what we're already getting in blue. That's all I have for this one right now.

Mr. McKown – 18" – I would like to propose none, and no one is going to want to do that – we could maybe say 14", because stairs are 7" each maximum height. So if you had 2 steps to get in, as opposed to having to do 3 6" steps – I think that would be something worth considering. I mean, if I was 14" taller, I probably would have played high school basketball. It's still a lot difference.

Mr. Hubble – At the first meeting, I don't remember who it was, someone talked about that if we lower it too much, because of the height of the alleys versus the street, that it might mess things up in some way – it might make the backs of the unit lower than the ground. That was why we did 18" instead of none.

Mr. McKown – They will just naturally end up being above the sidewalk. Your finished floor in most of this area will end up higher than the sidewalk and create that differential where you don't have the sensation that someone is looking down into your dwelling space as they're walking by. But that all said, as you're looking at your drainage, having just one more constraint – like must be 18" above – just makes it difficult. I'd rather just let it be what it's going to be.

Mr. Hubble – You'd rather it be at zero?

Mr. McKown – That it just not be a requirement for finished floor height. We just are silent on the issue, and then it will work its way out.

Councilmember Holman – I've been thinking about it a lot, and I've definitely been willing to compromise my position on this issue. I was kind of thinking 2, but 18" is half of 3'.

Councilmember Hall – 2 stairs?

Councilmember Holman – I was thinking reducing it from 3 to 2, but reducing it by half is a good compromise, too. But I would also like to add one caveat, if you were doing fully accessible residential on the first floor – cabinets and everything was all fully ADA accessible – that you wouldn't have to do the minimum at all. That's where you would get the zero, if you're doing accessible units, you don't have to do the floor height at all

– or whatever the minimum is to build a slab, I guess – or the alleyway issue. I like the 3', but I also want ADA accessibility, and I don't necessarily want to have a giant ramp all the way down to the back of the alleyway, so I'm definitely willing to compromise.

Councilmember Hall – We've had that discussion, too, in the past, about to make it accessible the only way you can enter is from the alley being maybe not ideal, either.

Councilmember Holman – And that being because all the parking is in the back.

Mr. McCabe – Just add on to what you're saying, every time we do a lot, each individual lot is so individual. When we do set up forms, when we do build pads – City inspector comes out. He's looking at the elevation from the alley. He's looking at the elevation from the street, to the side, to the side, how we're going to affect the neighbors. He's making sure we're high enough that there won't be a problem from the alley. So he would always come out – and I know he's not doing it as much, but he would come out and say here's your minimum of what you have to do based upon what he saw the elevation and drainage needs to be. So even in the other parts of town that I build in that aren't with the 36", I'm still up at 18-22" just for drainage to appease everybody involved. So maybe the fact that we don't necessarily set a minimum, because each individual lot is going to direct you to exactly what you have to do anyway.

Councilmember Hall – Because of building inspection requirements.

Mr. McCabe – Well, you don't want to build it that any kind of water is going to come into it anyway. So you're going to do what you have to do.

Ms. McMahan – I 100% agree. I would love to do away with this requirement altogether. I think it streamlines it for the builder. I 100% agree that people aren't going to build something that's so low it's going to get flooded. That doesn't behoove anybody.

Councilmember Peacock – Wasn't the entire reason for having this requirement was because it was recommended by the consultants? They didn't give us a number; they just said to separate the pedestrian traffic from the actual residential traffic you wanted to have a little height there. I definitely understand where everybody is coming from. I'd hate to get rid of it altogether for that reason, just because it was recommended. But I do think compromise is fair and I think 14" would be fair, especially if you're able to say 14" from the highest point already. So you basically say the alley or the sidewalk is going to be where you measure your 14" from, whichever one is higher, that's where you go.

Mr. McKown – No. I think it's got to be from the sidewalk. I'm sorry to interrupt. But I think your alley, in many cases, is already going to be 2' above the sidewalk. So if you started and went up 14", now you're back almost over 3' above the sidewalk. The thing that this discussion has definitely brought to light is the alleyway – if you lived here and you were rolling to campus and the only way to get there was out the back door through this nightmarish alley condition ...

Councilmember Hall – With all the polycarts.

Mr. McKown – We're doing a complete injustice to anybody that can't use the front sidewalk system or can't get to it. We really need to spend some time trying to design the alleys, but I don't think that's a good solution for the alleys to be our ADA route.

Councilmember Peacock – The reason I wanted that to be the baseline was because, again, that's where the parking is. So if that's your access, that's where your access is. Until we change that, it's what it is. I just want to make sure we have some sort of grade separation at the front porch and sidewalk. Whether that's 14" – I think 3' is excessive, obviously, but it was recommended for a reason and I think we should at least try to honor that. Definitely understand the concerns, though.

Councilmember Holman – Now, if we're going to be doing more on-street parking in front, that changes that accessibility. A lot of the properties that were redeveloped in this area right before Center City built flat level with the ground. I would like to believe that they'll build whatever, but based on what I've seen built in the area, before Center City, they're flat and level with the ground. It looks like suburbia out there for some of those. With those, they're set 25' from the street because they conform to the old zoning, so it's not as really big of a deal, I guess. But that's why I wouldn't want to eliminate it completely because, in my experience, I haven't seen builders willingly do that look, and it's been just flat with the ground, level with the sidewalk. I do like the idea of a compromise, but with there being a way to do zero if you're willing to do accessible units. That, to me, also gives an incentive to do accessible units. Hey, you're not going to have to build 14" or 18" or 3' if you do accessible units. I think that's a good compromise, anyway. I like 18" better, but I'm not a builder. If 14" works better for math or geometry, that would be fine.

Councilmember Hall – I agree. I really like the idea of the incentive to go to ground if you're doing an accessible unit, because that is something that we would like to see. I guess the only other comment I'm going to make about that, because I think these are all really good feedback, is this area is designed specifically not to look like the rest of Norman. We just need to keep that front and center.

Ms. Hudson – I just want to throw this out there, and I can visit with staff and have this back for you again at the next meeting. But Richard or Councilmember Peacock may know this. So if we do the 14" and if they do make it fully accessible, then they wouldn't have to. But because these are coming further forward on the lot, we're going to have to put a special accommodation or release in the document to allow for the ramps. If we're coming in the front door and we're 8' from the front property line, and we're at 14", if that's what we settle on, what kind of ramp are we going to need to get in the front door?

Councilmember Peacock – 14'.

Ms. Hudson – But it will come out in the right-of-way.

Councilmember Peacock – You could do it sideways.

Mr. McKown – I'm drawing it on here. 4' wide and it would 23.33' long at 1:20 at 14", so that's going to get you around to the middle of the lot. I was actually wanting to try to draw through the rest of this and see what the implications of it were. So what is the required build-to line? Are we building to the property line?

Mr. Hubble – It's shown on the regulating plan.

Mr. McKown – I'm sorry. I don't have the regulating plan in front of me.

Ms. Hudson – We were not going to change any of the build-to lines on these current designations.

Mr. McKown – These other changes we're making, what does it generate in terms of an image that we can make some decisions around? Is the build-to line the property line?

Mr. Hubble – In some cases it is; in some cases it's not. We haven't changed any of that so it is the same as it is currently.

Mr. McKown – So, basically, these changes are just for dragging those requirements from Urban Residential to the other ...

Mr. Hubble – From Urban General to Urban Residential.

Mr. McKown – So we're not changing any of the requirements as they are, this is just what they are.

Mr. Hubble – This is adding just a few things. Right now in Urban General there is no required finished floor elevation, or it might say that it has to be equal with the sidewalk – I don't remember. The private open area has to be behind the parking setback line, which means that basically it has to be behind the building. It has to be built 100% to the RBL, so there's no allowance for courtyards. And then the street wall has to be between 5' and 12' high. That's the only changes from Urban Residential versus Urban General.

Mr. McKown – In this area, what is the required build line? Do we know, or it changes as we go down the street.

Mr. Hubble – Yeah, it changes. In many cases, it is the property line, but sometimes it's a little bit further back. I wasn't here when this was created, so I don't know what went into deciding where the RBL is. But it does vary throughout the area.

Ms. Hudson – I wasn't involved in the very beginning, either, so I don't know where the setbacks came from. But in orange, he's correct, it is zero. The blue is typically 5-6' ish. The pink is going to get a little bit further back, maybe 10'. And then the yellow, which is the single family, gets you 25 or you can follow the existing line that's there on the street.

Mr. McCabe – That would be the question we're going to have to look at, because each of the residential build lines were setback were dedicated by the color. Blue was 10'. The pink is 13'. Orange is 3'-5'. So if we're going to combine them, we need to look at those residential build lines. Because, like I said, in the pink right now we're 13' off of the street. That's where I'm required to build at. And blue is 10'. So if we're going to combine them, we're going to want to look at making a uniform RBL.

Mr. McKown – We should go with the shorter.

Councilmember Peacock – I agree.

Councilmember Holman – Just to Jane's point about the ramp in the front, my intent is if it's an ADA accessible built unit, there wouldn't have to be a ramp at all. The pad would be even with the sidewalk. But in that instance, we would waive your having to be elevated if you were deciding to build accessible units on the first floor, you wouldn't have a minimum height.

Councilmember Peacock – Zero entry.

Councilmember Holman – Yes. You would have zero entry.

Councilmember Hall – Yeah. That's what I thought we were talking about, too.

Councilmember Holman – And then, hopefully, that would maybe incentivize some folks to say, yeah, I'll do that instead of doing the elevated.

Mr. McKown – It's been too many years. You can build to the property line, or you build to the required build line and not further forward?

Ms. Hudson – Build to the required build line for the front – no further forward – and then you have to be property line to property line on the sides.

Mr. McKown – Okay. Talk me through, on number 3a, at least 100% for at least ...

Mr. Hubble – That just means that you can't have – your building can't have a weird thing that juts out that goes all the way to the property line. But only for 3' back. So that means that from the RBL you have to be built property line to property line for at least 12' in depth. So going back from the RBL 12' has to be entirely building, property line to property line.

Mr. McKown – For at least 50% of at least 12' in depth of the RBL, excluding applicable side yard requirements. Tell me how to draw b on 3.

Mr. Hubble – The intent here, and we probably need to add a little bit to it, is for courtyards. So that's saying they have to built to the RBL still, but instead of being built along 100% of the RBL, you only have to be built along 50% of it, and that would create courtyards.

Councilmember Peacock – If the other 50% is a courtyard.

Mr. Hubble – We need to work with it a little bit more, but yes.

Mr. McKown – This is a 50' wide lot, 140' deep. I'm 10' back, and that's 12' wide and that's running the whole length. So 50' lot, 140' deep and that's 12' wide and required building line strip. And what we're saying is half of that you don't have to – this half isn't required if you wanted to do ...

Mr. Hubble – If you wanted to do a courtyard, you could do a cut-out of it of 50%.

Mr. McKown – Where is that coming from in terms of ...

Councilmember Hall – Allowing for a courtyard?

Mr. McKown – Is it a request that we've had?

Ms. Hudson – Multiple.

Councilmember Hall – And we're actually doing one currently.

Mr. McKown – And we want more of that? We're pleased with what it looks like?

Councilmember Hall – Well, we haven't seen it yet.

Mr. McKown – We haven't seen the plans?

Councilmember Hall – No, we've seen the plans, but is it under construction yet?

Mr. Hubble – No, not yet.

Councilmember Holman -- It's the Ryan Broyles project. But it's got two units that come out to the street, but then it's got a courtyard.

Mr. McKown – Oh, in the center?

Councilmember Holman – There was an issue with that where the doors – we don't allow the doors to face the courtyard, which is something we need to address, too. The doors have to face the street; they can't face the inner courtyard, so that was a twist that came out of that one. But that's the first one that we've had come forward.

Councilmember Hall – And it was a 75' lot.

Councilmember Holman – They came forward because of the delay, and they had to come.

Councilmember Hall – We just need to make sure that would actually work on a different size lot.

Councilmember Peacock – I think that's the key right there. The bigger lot definitely helped.

Councilmember Hall – There aren't very many of those.

Councilmember Peacock – Right. We don't want to create a condition where you've got a bunch of missing teeth all along the streetscape. I think that's what you're going to end up – it sound like on a 75' lot it made sense there. I'm wary.

Ms. Hudson – So are you thinking less than the 50%, so you're thinking like 20% allowance that could have the narrow courtyard area, as opposed to the 50%?

Councilmember Peacock – I don't even know if we want to give it a number. Almost give you an administrative review ability.

Ms. Hudson – Of how it fits on the lot.

Councilmember Peacock – Yeah, just say case-by-case basis.

Ms. Hudson – We've been asked multiple times that they want to do this. Like Councilmember Holman said, the other issue is that they would want to do the courtyard, but then the front door had to be on the frontage and it just – because you had a door inside here and then you had a door here. So it just was not working. But I like the idea if we just did less, because they have to show us how it's going to fit on the lot, and when it goes to DRT.

Mr. McKown – We're going to get a lot of this sort of L-shaped thing, and the reason that you would want that is because the window requirement for a bedroom – your second means of egress. Any time we're able to do it like that, we're making it easier to do the 4-bedroom duplex, rent by the bedroom kind of thing. So if we require it to be built across the whole thing, with the exception of maybe these wider lots. We have these cool examples. In fact, we even have pictures of what we're talking about with the courtyard and the doors all face. We have an example right here in town that's been here forever over on University. So we don't want to make that illegal, but we don't want to inadvertently make it easier to build the 6-bedroom stacked duplex.

Councilmember Hall – That's why you're here.

Ms. Hudson – So you think that they'll end up doing that to kind of go around the ...

Mr. McKown – Totally. Building a continuous street wall basically forces you into central stairway, apartments on each side and stack it up 3 stories tall and build six 2-bedroom apartments, which you really don't have enough parking to accommodate that. We're

trying to require a kind of urban form, and if we do something like this, we're very much make it easy to go back to the thing we've been trying to get away from.

Councilmember Hall – That's why we're walking through this.

Councilmember Holman – I was going to bring up the Las Donas Apartments on University. They're really the best example. It's property line to property line on the side and then the courtyard is in the middle. Now, it's the width of 2 lots, is the main difference there.

Councilmember Hall – So would that be 100'?

Councilmember Holman – It has no parking, either – no dedicated parking. But I've known a bunch of people that have lived there. I think they're all 1-bedroom apartments. That was one way, I guess, where it's required on both sides – you can't have an open side. It's got to be side-to-side, but you can have the middle be open as a courtyard. But for them, it's not just open; they have a wall with a gate – the gate is always open, but it gives the look as though it's not just a missing tooth there.

Mr. Hubble – The way it is written here, the private open area would front the RBL and is enclosed on all other sides by a structure. What Richard drew wouldn't be allowed. It would have to be truly a courtyard that's in the middle, like what we have at Las Donas.

Mr. Petromilli – Then you'd have two 12' slivers on each side and a 24' open area? This is a form-based code – that's the form we want? Two 12' slivers down the side and a 25'. If you get 50% open, then you've got 25', 12'6" on each side and that's the form you're getting. I think that's an extreme deviation from the form-based code. I'm just putting it out there. The only other thing I saw was somebody was talking about unifying the setback, and I don't know if that's actually on the table or not, but when this was originally set up in the form-based code, the red and the orange had very specific zero lot line setbacks because of the streets that they were on and the active urban frontage, and blue stepped back further because of the type of housing, and the pink set back even further. If we unify that, you're going to have retail that set 13' back, if that's what you decide. Again, extreme deviations from the original intent in 3 years. There was a lot that was put into this, so this is really amending the things that are issues for Public Works and for Planning and those things, which was the intent – there is a plan to work on. But if we're redefining this form-based code, six months is not enough.

Ms. Hudson – The commercial area wasn't included. The red that you're talking about would still be at the build line.

Mr. Petromilli – But like orange on Boyd or orange on James Gardner.

Councilmember Hall – This is Urban Residential. This is the two blocks on University.

Mr. McKown – Is this what you're describing? 12' arms that come out.

Ms. McMahon – I think what he was saying is that runs the whole width. There's just a chunk in the middle where there's nothing but courtyard. Right? You've literally got like a U and then the courtyard in the middle.

Councilmember Peacock – So just take out your middle chunk.

Councilmember Holman – On the Las Donas Apartments, each side is about 30' – each of the dwelling units – the side is 30', the courtyard is 15', and then 30'.

Councilmember Hall – And it's a U-shape.

Councilmember Holman – So the total frontage of those apartments, roughly – I'm using Google Earth here and the measuring stick is 75' is the face of those apartments – 30', 15', 30' is how they've done it. Then the lot is ...

Councilmember Hall – It was on a 100' lot.

Councilmember Holman – It's on 100' lot, 75' wide.

Mr. McCabe – Is this also the same time we would talk about 100% RBL that we're running into the issue of, if you don't own the lot beside you and they don't want you on their property, you can't do it? Is this where we would also look at – if you owned 5 continuous lots, I think you should be able to roll the whole 100%, except for that last lot. And then I think that we might want to look at wording that last lot – sorry, you don't own the one beside it, you've got to stop 5' short.

Councilmember Hall – That's had some unintended consequences, too.

Ms. Hudson – We talked about that at the very first meeting, I think, and we were – Councilmember Holman, if you want to – we were saying that we would still keep that, even though you may not own the adjacent property.

Councilmember Holman – That's what I thought we'd agreed to. Yes.

Ms. Hudson – Right. The very first meeting. So we can talk about it, definitely. It's not on the agenda, so I want to be careful how we ...

Councilmember Hall – All of this at this point is obviously under review. It's not going to be too long before we're going to have to come back in and tighten that up. That's kind of where we left it at that point. As we discuss the rest of these things, that may become something that we'd want to come back to. Nothing has really been set in stone at this point.

Mr. McKown – Pete makes a really good point here. If some version of that is allowed with the words we have up here, we're going to get that. We just need to be clear about whether or not that's what we want to get. Any time you can extend that surface, you can get more windows in. More windows equals more bedrooms. So we're being asked

for something here as an end-around to get to the 6-bedroom duplex. Because that's the most profitable thing you could build.

Councilmember Peacock – He's absolutely right. That's why I was originally in favor of not even giving a number – letting it be a case-by-case review. If you can make the argument that you deserve that 50%, or whatever percentage it ends up being, we can evaluate that. But I think just including it in the ordinance is – it's going to create a lot of heartache going down the road. Richard is exactly right. The more side space you give them on a building, the more opportunity there is for windows, which is more bedrooms. I think that's the whole goal of this process is to kind of put a pin in that.

Ms. Muckala – I just want to weigh in a little bit on the format of what kind of regulations we're talking about. We're talking about zoning. Zoning really does need to have some specificity to it. So I do shrink away a little bit from a case-by-case analysis. If we're going to consider that, we really want to work in some specific guideposts for how that's going to be administered, because otherwise we're really liable to have an arbitrary ordinance.

Mr. Hubble – If we had a requirement like this, and maybe change the percentage, and made it to where it was only allowed on lots that are 75' or wider, would that be more amenable?

Councilmember Holman – That's what Las Donas looks like, by the way.

Ms. Hudson – What if we took it down to 30%? What is that going to look like, Richard?

Mr. McKown – That's one of the best pieces of urbanism in Norman. We need to figure out how to make that legal.

Councilmember Peacock – You say that's 100' wide lot?

Councilmember Holman – Well deep, yes. 100' deep, 75' wide.

Councilmember Peacock – So it's 30, 30, 15?

Councilmember Holman – Yes.

Councilmember Peacock – That's 20%.

Mr. McKown – It's less than 50%.

Councilmember Holman – And there's 3 buildings. The back part is 2 stories.

Mr. McKown – The gap. What would you guess the percentage of the ...

Councilmember Peacock – You said the gap was 15' wide?

Mr. McCabe – The sides – because that's not completely to the build line. So that's probably adding another 10' to your total. Because if you're at 15, probably got another 5 there and another 5 there.

Mr. McKown – My instinct wants to go 25%.

Councilmember Peacock – It's that fine line of being able to give them too much, where they're actually able to use it in a nefarious way, and low enough it would actually accomplish what we want it to do.

Councilmember Hall – Stay one step ahead.

Ms. Hudson – So just a quick question. If we took it down to 20 or 25%, but also put a maximum depth of the courtyard? So it would still give the 50' wide lots the opportunity to have that common area, but it couldn't be, as Richard drew, and have it go so far back. If it was at 20 or 25%, whatever you ended up falling on, that would help get the courtyard area, but not have the 12' wide.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. It seems like we probably need a little more breathing time on this, as well. We have one more item, but we're out of time, so we'll have to move that to the top of the list the next time around.

6. DISCUSSION OF QUALITY STRUCTURES AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS

7. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Councilmember Hall – Let's make sure, because we've thrown out a lot of different dates. Our next meeting date is next week, March 3rd. Do you have what we agreed upon – but that might have been before two snow storms.

Ms. Hudson – For this item, discussion of quality structures and architectural requirements, I think, which everything that we're going to pull from the top of this agenda and come back and report on – we've got the Part 9 discussion, which Scott Sturtz and his staff will be here to do a presentation on next week. There's also going to be the discussion about the information that Richard had sent in for the on-street parking. So there'll be those two items for sure on the agenda. Then pulling the couple items that I need to come back and report on the polycarts – I think that's going to be a full agenda. So that would pull discussion of quality structures to the next meeting, which we had originally said we would be the 3rd, the 15th, and the 31st of March.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. So we could be back on track.

Mr. McKown – We are meeting next week?

Ms. Hudson – The 3rd.

Councilmember Hall – Right now – that's where I wasn't sure. The 3rd, the 17th, the 31st.

Ms. McMahon – And a reminder that the 17th falls within Spring Break.

Councilmember Hall – Is that going to be a problem?

Ms. McMahon – We will be gone. I can Zoom in to see what's happening.

Councilmember Hall – I don't think we can do that.

Ms. McMahon – I know I can't vote. I can't even watch it?

Councilmember Hall – No. Is that correct?

Ms. Muckala – I don't think there's any issue with us making a feed available for someone to observe, but you couldn't participate as an actual member of the body. Logistics-wise, I don't know.

Ms. Hudson – That's fine with me, if you've got the ability and you can make your notes and then when you come back ...

Councilmember Hall – Are you willing to do that?

Ms. McMahon – Yes. I think we'll be in the car.

Councilmember Hall – I know the last time, we just did it – set up our phones so she could listen. If we can make those arrangements.

Mr. Petromilli – Can that be made available to the citizens? I know there are plenty that would love to attend.

Ms. Muckala – I would recommend that, if we're going to do that – would be attending as a general citizen. Ms. McMahon would not be attending as a member of the board. We can only do it if we can ...

Councilmember Hall – Do it for everybody.

Ms. McMahon – If that further complicates it, I can call Lee and get filled in.

Councilmember Hall – Do we have a precedent for that?

Ms. Muckala – Not really. It's not something we've done. The law is for meetings that are subject to the Open Meetings Act, which this one is, the person would have to not only be announced as attending by Zoom, but where they are would have to be open to the public, which is why if she wanted to watch it, she just couldn't be a member.

Ms. McMahon – You guys are welcome to join us in the car.

Ms. Muckala – It's very specific.

Ms. Hudson – Here's my concern. If we do it for the 17th but then didn't do it for the 31st or any other subsequent meetings, I would have a lot of heartburn with not doing it the next time. I'm sorry. We never did it before.

Councilmember Hall – So how did we do it when she participated by phone.

Ms. McMahon – Illegally. That's why we had to stop.

Councilmember Hall – Here's my next question. Is this just being audio recorded? Okay. So you could go back and listen to the audio. And how soon is that available.

Ms. Tromble – Immediately.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. So there you go. Does that work?

Ms. McMahon – Yeah. I'll plan on it.

Councilmember Hall – Other public comment?

Ms. Hudson – We can give you the audio. We can get Bryce to put that out there on the Planning website.

Councilmember Hall – We're a very transparent and accountable entity.

Councilmember Holman – Keith had a good point. Just to be clear as a committee, we are moving forward with the revision of the colors and combining.

Councilmember Hall – That's what we're talking about right now.

Councilmember Holman – Okay. So none of the issues that we're trying to address are specific to pink or blue or orange at this point.

Councilmember Hall – Right.

Councilmember Holman – Because, if we're changing it, it would be ...

Councilmember Hall – The concept – and maybe you can speak to it a little bit better, either Ms. Hudson or Mr. Hubble – This was a suggestion from Planning Department before these meetings started. Obviously, they live this every single day, and those of you that develop in the area, I'm sure it's probably about every single day, too. But it was an attempt – and that's why I think we're trying to build this out until we get to where we really have to make some hard decisions – but it's an attempt – remember we want to simplify for the developer, for the Planning Department, and we had that very unique building form standard that we didn't have to make up something else. It was like, well, can we do this? So that's what we're trying to do. So far everybody seems to be onboard with exploring the idea.

Ms. Hudson – As Logan pointed out, we're not getting anything different in the blue and the orange.

Councilmember Hall – Right. We're getting a single housing type, no matter what color it is, right now. Any other comments?

So, just to reiterate, we are meeting on March 3rd, March 17th, March 31st. And if you cannot be here – I know anybody on the staff or myself are happy to catch you up, but you can literally go back and listen to the entire content, and we have the best minute writer of all time right here.

Ms. Hudson – Can I just throw this out there? So we've got the 3 meetings in March. Technically, we will have the opportunity to meet the 7th, the 14th, and the 21st of April, but the 21st would be our last ...

Councilmember Hall – That's our drop dead date?

Ms. Hudson – So keep it in your pocket that maybe we might want to meet the 7th, the 14th, and the 21st.

Councilmember Hall – I think we should just assume that right now, because there might be an extra meeting or two in there, but mostly we're just compressing it up to the front because we have to stay on our timeline to be done by the 14th of June.

8. MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Councilmember Hall – Any other final comments? Final public comment? Staff, anything you want to throw out there? Again, thank you all. I think this has been a very productive hour and a half. Really appreciate all the different lenses to see this through. That's the important part of all of this. I really think we're making progress. So thank you for your time and sharing your time and your expertise.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:03 p.m.