

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

MARCH 3, 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 3rd day of March, 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
Keith McCabe
Jim Adair
Richard McKown
Autumn McMahon

MEMBERS ABSENT

Councilmember Steven Tyler Holman
Councilmember Matthew Peacock

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Director of Planning &
Community Development
Logan Hubble, Planner I
Anais Starr, Planner II
Rone' Tromble, Admin. Tech. IV
Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney
Sara Kaplan, Retail Marketing Coordinator
Scott Sturtz, City Engineer
David Riesland, Transportation Engineer

GUESTS

Peter Petromilli
Bill Woods
Tom and Elizabeth Bevel

Councilmember Hall called the meeting to order at 11:33 a.m.

1. WELCOME

Councilmember Hall – We're starting almost on time. Welcome to our committee members, and staff who is joining us today, and our visitors who are also with us.

2. PART 9 – SITE DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS – IMPERVIOUS LOT COVERAGE, ALLOWED FOR DESIGN & REGULATIONS

Mr. Sturtz – Good morning. We're making some minor adjustments and Jane helped me out with copies of it. There's been a lot of concern about the stormwater drainage, and this is the section that helps address that section for us a lot. The last time we did this Ad Hoc Committee, we kind of got to the end and realized that the increase in impervious surface was really starting to have a negative affect on our stormwater and our drainage systems within the Center City Form-Based Code, so Carrie and I put our heads together at the last minute and came up with this Part 9 to go in here, to try to help address that. I've got to say I think that what we have done has been pretty successful so far. We've seen some really good, innovative work. I think that all of the developers that we've worked with have done a good job and they've responded well. Overall, I'm going to give it a solid A. There have been some concerns if we need to revisit it, and since we're having this Ad Hoc Committee reformed, it's a good time to look at it again. It gave me a chance to go back through it. I've got to say that my initial response when I started rereading it was, Dang, we did a pretty good job! So I was pretty impressed with what we had in the end. I thought that we had more holes, until I actually got into it. There were some things that I think as a staff that we weren't initially managing very correctly, but we've made some adjustments in-house; we're starting to do this a little bit different. So I thought I'd just take a minute and just explain to you some of the changes that we're proposing to make, with your concurrence.

The first item is we wanted to add this first section in red here, which is marked B, but should really be A. I can't format this in this program, so I'm having trouble formatting; we'll get it fixed. One problem that we've seen, and it's been pretty consistent throughout the area, as the development is extending into the right-of-way and into the alleyways, that's public area, and another item that we're having is sidewalks are being removed or blocked throughout the entirety of the construction of the property. That's really not allowable. It's causing us problems. We're getting ADA complaints. We're having people in wheelchairs say I can't get where I need to go. We have reached out to several of the developers – in fact, Pete's one of them – and said, hey, you closed the sidewalk we need to get up detour signs, and he's done a good job of doing that. But the reality is we need to be confining this work within the property. So we added this section to try to help do that. I had one of those ah-ha moments as I was shampooing my hair in the shower this morning, and went don't we have a mechanism where we're supposed to be charging for usage of the sidewalk? In fact, we do. It's in our Engineering Design Criteria has an entire section, particularly encroachment for construction or demolition purposes that allows for us to charge – and I'm going to be honest, it's a whopping amount and you're going to be shocked by this – but if you're going to take out the sidewalk across a 50' lot it's going to be \$1 a day for fee. I think what the problem is is no one is saying you must go get this permit.

Mr. McKown – Did you say \$1 a day per foot?

Mr. Sturtz – A dollar a day. We going to make bank off of this. We're going to pay my salary in 128 years. But we do feel like we need to get back to that. I'm going to tell you that this is not a problem that I only have within Center City Form-Based Code. I've got other development areas where sidewalks are removed and we need to get this back in place. It also puts it back on our radar. So I'm going to make another minor adjustment here to refer back to getting the temporary encroachment permit per section blank of

the Engineering Design Criteria, so that it's in here and we're all clear. The other thing I did add in here to this section, that if you are going to do work in the right-of-way, you have to have a right-of-way permit. At that time, it also triggers that temporary encroachment permit. So as part of that, they say we'll have it closed for 30 days. We do the calculation and it's a \$30 minimum. If you're going to be closed for 30 days, that's your minimum. You're good to go. But if you go over and you have to reapply, it doubles, and it doubles every time you reapply. So if you think it's going to be 90 days, you say 90 days. But that also invokes the need to put in pedestrian signage for the sidewalk closure with a properly accounted for plan that David will have to approve. I think this is a big change. I think it will help here. But it's something that, as a staff, we're going to be looking into across Norman, not a penalty here. It's just something that I think we need to improve on to make it better.

Pretty much as you go through a lot of the things didn't really change here until you get back to 903.C. It's a very minor change there, where we're talking about you can use the engineered controls and where to go for those. The one change I'm making is I'm putting "or the current adopted City of Norman green infrastructure manual" because we're currently working on our Engineering Design Criteria update, and as a part of that there's going to be a new section that is going to be our new stormwater greenwater infrastructure section, and we will no longer use that Sedgwick County document, but we're adopting more of that in. So I wanted to have that in so that the day we do that we didn't have to come back and change this document again, so it's just an administrative deal, really.

After some discussion with staff and Planning, it was recommended that we take the maximum coverage from 85% to 75% on these properties for impervious area. That's open for discussion, but that's something that we think would help with the stormwater a lot, and we can discuss that and go with the will of the committee.

Then on section 4, we already required an operations and maintenance manual for the LID systems, because they really need to be maintained. This is something that is actually in the Wichita also. We have done it and I caught it late and we've actually had the last few people who applied have submitted one, which I think is great, but it just gives that property owner a way of knowing what they need to do. You can't just put these systems in and leave them. They've got to be maintained. They've got to be working properly or we're not getting the benefit anymore. What we added in is it needs to be filed so it's part of that record for that property, so if it gets sold a new property owner is aware of it. That's something else that I've picked up from Wichita – the way they did theirs. Also that a copy gets given to us so that we know what's there.

Then we added section 5. These systems need to be monitored. They need to be inspected. We don't really have the staff to go out and do that right now in our Stormwater Group. I think everybody knows the plights of stormwater here in Norman. So we're just asking that they go out there and do an inspection and submit it back to us so that we can at least have a record that it's being monitored and watched.

Then I made some minor changes on the last section. It looks like it just shows it as a deletion, the way that it's shown here. We had a lot of stuff in there that the manual would discuss how many square foot of impervious area would be offset by this design or that design. At the time we wrote this, we really thought that we'd be getting a very different implementation manual for green infrastructure, and that would be something that was being done. It doesn't look like that's really the direction it's going right now. I

still think we could add that in and it wouldn't affect this document, but I just didn't want it in there that people would go, oh, you didn't tell us that so many feet of infiltration trench would get us X number of feet of impervious area. So I just didn't want that in here so it wasn't a confusion factor, so I just took that out. Really the work that the engineers are providing to us right now are giving us that in some rough numbers anyway. I do want to work toward that goal, but I just don't have it and I don't know when we're going to be able to obtain it completely, so I thought it was easier just to take that out. Then if we do it, and incorporate that into the manual, it's already in the manual; it doesn't necessarily need to be stated a second time here. I did add storage tanks on number 8 on the very bottom of this document – rain barrels/storage tanks. We've had a lot of discussion about the necessity to at least put up screening around those, and as we move forward, we'll be working with Planning on where that screening requirement will be discussed, so I just have that highlighted – section blank, because we're not sure where we're going to put that yet, but we do feel that screening would be necessary on those storage tanks.

I'm happy to answer any questions, comments, adjustments, or things that you guys have dealt with that you think needs to be improved. Again, we have an opportunity now to make things better and taking it would be a good idea.

Councilmember Hall – I'm going to just start backwards and start with storage tanks. Explain why we are okay with above-ground storage tanks.

Mr. Sturtz – Certainly. I guess, from my point of view, I'm more why aren't we okay with them? I've got the other viewpoint. We're all about rain barrels, and we work with everybody to do rain barrels. A storage tank is just a bigger rain barrel to me. In my world, it's an incredible way – what they did here – this is 207 Apache. I get lucky. Sometimes I remember an address that's not my own. What they did on this site is they actually came through and they're using those as detention ponds, which is a great idea. Their engineering report accounted for how much storage they were required to have. Now these tanks are maybe 3 times the size of what was necessary for the detention component of the drainage. But then what they proposed is that they wanted to use the stored water for irrigation on-site at later dates. They actually went to the point where they actually showed that the monthly usage for a site of this size and how much water they would need and this was to help offset that. For me, it's very difficult, as a stormwater person, to say we don't want you to store that water and use it in a better way than just letting it run down the road and wind up in the storm sewers. So these are maybe a little larger than what they had to be, but they designed it with the specific purpose for that landscape use. I know there are people that think this is awful. I look at it, and I'm like what a cool use of an easy resource to make a huge difference on the stormwater. So I understand I may be in the minority here.

Mr. McKown – I think it's cool, too.

Mr. Sturtz – To me, if that was screened appropriately, I think there would be a different feel to it. The reason for above-ground versus below-ground – when you go below-ground you've got, of course, the expense of installation, but then you also now have to have a pump system to do anything with that water, whereas in this case they have a 2"

exit with a valve on it. They can hook the hoses up to it. They can water straight out of it. It's gravity flow. This is just a rain barrel. Like I said, we participate with the whole Oklahoma City area doing a rain barrel event every year, and we give out hundreds of rain barrels – or I think they sell them now – they used to give them away. Now they sell them. It's just a size difference to me. But this, to me, is a very appropriate stormwater tool here that has a very positive play on the stormwater in this area. Now, this is the only one that has proposed this. I can think of one other application, and it was years ago for a home that wanted to do a 3,000 gallon – if I remember right – it's been a long time – but 3,000 is the number that sticks in my head. They wanted it at the side of the house. It was going to be a cistern, which is just another word for storage tank. They were going to collect all their runoff from that side of the house and use it for irrigation. That one didn't go forward, but I can't remember why. It's just been too long and I can't put anything more than just that vague response to it. But I certainly understand that there are people that the aesthetics here is not what they want. It sure didn't seem to affect them in renting the property. But it's hard for me to say that this is not an appropriate stormwater solution.

Councilmember Hall – Well, that's why I'm asking. Because if this is just a super giant rain barrel. So that's the other thing that I'm curious about, because I'm not a lot of things, and one of the things I'm not is an engineer. So why do you have to have 2?

Mr. Sturtz – That was their choice. That was just their choice for the storage volume that they wanted. Could you have had one giant one? Sure.

Councilmember Hall – So it would be even bigger if you had one.

Mr. Sturtz – Potentially. Depending on the amount of volume that they wanted to store irrigation water. That's really what drove the size of the tanks here.

Councilmember Hall – That's why we're having these conversations. Because just to me personally, aesthetically – and you know I am a huge proponent of best practices when it comes to managing stormwater in our fair city. So if this is something that we need to understand better and educate our neighbors and residents about, okay, fine. But aesthetically I just keep imagining if we have an entire block and this is the preferred detention choice, and we're already struggling with parking and we're already struggling with having enough parking on-site to accommodate the number of bedrooms that are there, it just doesn't really promote any kind of outside living, to me. But that's just me. So that's why I'm asking.

Mr. Sturtz – That is the downside of it, certainly. I can agree with that.

Councilmember Hall – So your suggestion about screening – what do we think that would look like?

Mr. Sturtz – So, in this case, an 8' stockade fence. You could word it where it was an opaque fence that was within so many feet of the top of the tank, or however you wanted to word – it would be easy to word. In this case, that tank is just a little less than

8' tall, so if you put up an 8' stockade fence around it, that would certainly screen it. I think we'd probably word it in a way that it would be from view from public areas, or something like that, so it would be screened. We do trash enclosures right now. If you have a dumpster, it has to be within an enclosure that's opaque within a certain height and we have restrictions on that. It would be easy to do something like that here. I think there are some neighborhood associations that probably make you screen rain barrels. They make you screen your trash cans. So it's not something that would be unusual, and it would be easy for us to incorporate. It would just be a matter of where we came up with to put that into this document and had it refer back appropriately.

Councilmember Hall – You were an important part of this conversation 2 years ago, too, when we had the other ad hoc committee in 2019. I think one of the things that you seemed to reinforce today is that we felt like we had made some positive improvements on best practices for managing stormwater and detention and all that. Of all the things that we have here as choices that can be used, how does this rank as a choice? Is underground detention preferred in any way? Or is it equal to? I'm just trying to get a sense of if this is really something that you see as a positive solution for our stormwater issues. How does this rank? Because, like I said, aesthetically, for me, it's just like whoa.

Mr. Sturtz – That's really tough, because you've got to consider your site characteristics of each site independently. One of the solutions that's become very popular is basically an infiltration trench. It's a reverse French drain. Instead of collecting water, you're depositing water. Then they're putting a pop-up on the end to where if it fills it can pop up – because it's usually connected to the downspouts. When it was first presented, I thought it was really unique and interesting, and it's probably become one of the most preferred methods. I would rank this above pervious pavement – in fact, way above pervious pavement, which is just another in-ground detention to me. If you go to an in-ground detention system, the issue that you have is you have to be able to discharge that, and you're going to have to pump it out. Our storm sewers aren't deep enough that you're going to be able to discharge it by gravity. So now you have a pump system. So now you've got to be checking those pumps and maintaining those pumps. If the pump goes out, now you don't have detention because it's full and it's overflowing. I prefer this above in-ground detention for that reason. But if somebody wanted to take on that and maintain that, that's great – I'd totally support it. No one has really approached it. I think rain gardens are an interesting opportunity. Bio-engineered soils or infiltration trenches, bioswales – I think those require a lot of different kind of maintenance. This is a very low maintenance – very easy to install. You can see if there's a problem. But to say 1, 2, 3, 4 – that's a tough thing. I would say this is a very easy, obtainable solution.

Councilmember Hall – Is this the least expensive route?

Mr. Sturtz – Potentially. I haven't actually compared cost of the infiltration trench. I haven't actually done any kind of a cost analysis on this. They actually had called out this – I don't know if they bought these from Tractor Supply or Atwoods or Lowe's – I don't know. These tanks are relatively inexpensive.

Councilmember Hall – My final comment, and then I'll definitely want to hear what you all have to say. It just seems so out of proportion, I guess, for a very limited back yard that is full of parking places and a tiny little strip of green. It just seems to dominate the back yard. So if it's contributing to a higher purpose, okay, but ...

Mr. Sturtz – One thing we've discussed, and we haven't really done the background on this particular case yet, but the footprint that that is occupying needs to be counted as impervious area toward the site. I have not gone back and done the research to determine if that was done on this one or not. But that is something that we need to make sure that we do as we look at this. If you're going to do it in this manner, that is an impervious area and it counts toward your percentage. It's a balancing act there. You put in an extra 20 square feet, how does that affect you? Are you better off with a tank that's half that size? That's just something that the engineer and the developer will have to work together to determine what that trade-off would be best for them.

Councilmember Hall – So that's how this was calculated? As impervious surface?

Mr. Sturtz – I'd have to verify that. I'm not sure how it was done on this one. I just didn't get to that point in my research.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. Thoughts?

Mr. McCabe – I'm a lot in agreement with Scott here, because there's multiple options to use for stormwater. Obviously, it sounds like the only hang-up we're really having is aesthetics. It's not the functionality. It's not the workability. If we talked about the fact that we were using that water to water the lawn, as opposed to City water, we would be all for that. We would be excited about that. So if it's a system that works, if it is a system that falls legally into our boundary, and we just might not like the aesthetics, let's look at that. I would suggest we look at how we can clean that up, as opposed to taking this away. Because it's obviously a workable system. So if it's the aesthetics – like the 47 trash cans – let's just figure out how to make it prettier. But if it works, I think it works.

Mr. Adair – This may be the dumbest question ever. Are we dealing with too much inflow at one time if you did it in-ground to deal with some sort of lateral system? You're talking about rainwater here, not wastewater.

Mr. Sturtz – You could probably try – that would be the same as what they're doing now where they're taking it from the downspout into a perforated pipe and then into a gravel packed area – like I said, reverse French drain. You've got to calculate what that space is. You have to have an understanding of what your infiltration rate would be into the soils. Yes. Could it be done? Absolutely. If somebody wanted to propose that, that would definitely be something we'd consider.

Mr. Adair – I have no idea how that would compare to a pump system. A pump system sounds like money and maintenance.

Mr. Sturtz – In this case, to use it for irrigation – if you have an underground tank that was 5' deep, you're now down below your watering zone with your laterals.

Mr. Adair – Do we have requirements on the placement of them? If you were going to do them above ground like this.

Mr. Sturtz – Not at this time.

Mr. Adair – I'm assuming this is a rear elevation we're looking at.

Mr. Sturtz – It is.

Mr. Adair – If you were doing Section 8 and you didn't care who your tenants were and they didn't have much choice, you could do that in the front yard?

Mr. McKown – No, I don't – surely we don't have ...

Mr. Adair – I've learned not to say surely.

Ms. Hudson – For this area, I don't think that you could fit those in the front yard.

Mr. McCabe – I would probably say no because we have a residential build line that we're dealing with. Once we get to that line, you can't go in front of that line. And this, being a permanent ...

Mr. Adair – Does that violate your build line? Is that part of your structure?

Mr. McCabe – I would say it would.

Mr. Adair – Again, we're going to have people defining terms for Jane, if we're not careful.

Mr. Sturtz – For me, I think I would say it's a structure. You could build this out of concrete, if you thought that would be cost effective.

Mr. Adair – Scott, I'm listening to you. I just want to point out you're an engineer. I'm very much leaning with Lee on the aesthetic side of this. I just see this as one more thing that somebody in Ward 4 that wants to throw rocks is going to drive down the alley and go, oh, my God! I think a screening requirement is probably not unreasonable. Again, I'm not saying take it away as an engineering solution.

Ms. McMahon – I would just add I think this is a good solution. I would way rather look at something like this than look at a yard that's been washed away by mud and excess water and flooded streets, and then you have mud in the streets and all that. But I agree with Keith that it's an aesthetic issue. I think with Lee and Jim that we do need to address that piece, but I don't think you would walk away from a solution that could be really beneficial for that reason alone. I think we just look at how we make it more attractive.

Mr. McKown – There's a reference in here to the section ??? on what the screening is supposed to be. Surely it's not just like a 6' stockade fence, because I don't know that we've made aesthetic progress if that's what we're putting up around it. Because there is something kind of nice about that being what it is. It's like – huh, giant tanks. What are they there for? Beer, of course! Because, you know, like that's who lives here. It gives us an opportunity to tell a story about what's going on there in terms of stormwater. Solar panels – they're awesome. Love seeing them pop up in my neighborhood. Some people don't like them. I don't care if you don't like them; you're on the wrong side of that. We've got to see the solar panels pop up. So this is like a good thing. So if we just put up a stockade fence, one, it isn't lovely and, two, it's more resources and maintenance and more difficulty taking care of this and getting to it to use it for its intended purposes for irrigation. So what are our screening ...

Councilmember Hall – So are you saying no screening, or more creative screening?

Mr. McKown – I would be more in favor of vegetative screening of some sort. This is not a lovely photo. If you started editing the photo, the first thing you'd want to remove is the polycarts.

Councilmember Hall – But this is our reality. Including the polycarts.

Mr. McKown – I know. There's certainly a way to work with those tanks and have them be a legitimate part of the structure. They do look a little bit like an afterthought. It would have been nice to have seen them designed in from the beginning.

Councilmember Hall – Were they designed in from the beginning?

Mr. Sturtz – It's actually in their plans. It's shown on their engineering plans from the beginning. I will say, if I was going to screen these, it would look like a tiki hut, thatched roof top and it would have leaves around it and it would look like a tiki hut and I'd have more fun with it than I could do.

Councilmember Hall – And that's why we will respect your strength as an engineer.

Mr. McCabe – Just to follow up on that, because on some of my projects we have submitted the permeable blocks and the paving. What comes with that, as Scott has brought up, there comes an annual maintenance that has to be done, and if you don't do it that really does no good. So why the City is starting to allow to see that, he is correct that we need to show some type of maintenance to keep it, because that's the only way it keeps working. But, to me, that's the beauty of this idea, is that it keeps working and I don't have to maintain it monthly, yearly. It's going to work. It's gravity fed. That's how most of our water systems that we receive our water from are gravity fed tanks above ground. So there's a simplistic beauty to that.

Councilmember Hall – Richard, what would you offer as far as a design or ...

Mr. McKown – I don't know where I would – I'm sitting here drawing site plans and I don't really know where I would want to put this on the building. It's going to take some thought. Do these just bleed off? They fill up during a rain and then they bleed off like a detention pond? Or do they have a valve?

Mr. Sturtz – It's interesting that you say that, because they actually calculated it as if it was open valve like a detention pond, but they're keeping the valve closed and saying we can store that amount, and then they're storing above that and they have a valve that they can open for irrigation.

Mr. McKown – And they probably could, if they wanted it to bleed, they could let it bleed off in different sizes, to get storage back. From a landscaping/screening standpoint, I might have planted bamboo around the thing and then it would totally screen it. I'd still make it to where you could get to it. Then I would have had this thing just bleeding off growing my bamboo.

Councilmember Hall – It's invasive.

Mr. McKown – Yeah. It was also native to Oklahoma. So there's lots of different species you can get. But it is highly invasive. It's a little bit like Scott's tiki hut. It's beautiful; we grow it downtown in very contained areas.

Councilmember Hall – But that's another maintenance issue over time, too.

Mr. McKown – Anything like that that is green infrastructure is going to be providing other ecosystem services. So that's a good thing. I think if we're talking about screening it through some sort of vegetative screening, or evergreen type plants – that wouldn't be a bad thing. The stockade fence wouldn't be a good thing. That's all. Jane, what are our screening options in the section ???

Ms. Hudson – Well, that's just it; we don't have them at this point. We have to figure out what we want.

Mr. McKown – Oh, we'd have to create them. Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't hear your answer.

Mr. Sturtz – That's why I said – was asked what could be used – I was giving the easiest, quickest 8' stockade fence. You can add whatever you want. And you've got the question is it from view from public areas? So you don't have to – like Richard said – when Jane and I first talked about the screening I said, yeah, but if you boxed that in, now how do you get to the valves? You're going to have to have a gate – a way to access it. So do you make it viewable from public areas, so that the back, and in this case, so you couldn't see it from Santa Fe? Those are decisions that need to be made. That's why it's question marks in here – because that's something that we feel would need to be added if we continue to allow this.

Councilmember Hall – Well, clearly, we don't have consensus about this, and we have several people that are missing today. So I would say, at this point, that at the minimum,

if we accepted that this is a legit option. Clearly, remember our goal is to make this simpler, not more complex. But, my concerns, in a nutshell, would be I think the aesthetics are something to consider, especially if, now that one developer has chosen this method and it's a less expensive path to solve the problem, then I can only assume we're going to see more of these. So how would it need to fit in a site plan? You said that these were larger than they needed to be, but performing another function, maybe there's a way to consider size – maximum size per lot, unit, whatever. I just can't get past seeing every single back yard in Center City Form-Based Code with this with nothing that goes along with it.

Mr. McCabe – I don't know what the intent was here. But as Scott had made mention that these are oversized, we currently allow cross-boundary parking. Maybe the fact, if a developer does something like this, and he is blessed to own the piece of property next door, he's able to handle two properties with this one, so that maybe he can groom that through and help with that. Obviously, that's going to be a calculation number, but we're already allowing vehicles to park on different lots, and we keep talking about how we want continuous whole block development, that maybe they can tie in and we don't have as many. Idea.

Ms. Hudson – My only question – I was asking Scott – if you did that, these are tied into the downspouts. So how is that water going to get from the adjacent property?

Mr. McCabe – If we're allowing 100% residential build line, I'm right there against it in reality. If you're building building-to-building with no space in between it, especially with the new stuff that we're looking at – 100% RBL – easement-to-easement – it's going to be right there just as close as the existing building that you have.

Ms. Hudson – This one has got that setback on it, too.

Mr. McKown – I've been trying to draw what we're talking about. This building footprint represents the 75% coverage, if that's all parking, dumpster pad. This building footprint is about 52' deep, and so you could have – if that was – are those 8'? They look like they might be. The diameter?

Mr. Sturtz – Roughly. They're like 90" diameter by 95 – something in that range.

Mr. McKown – Well, I drew these circles at 8', which is also assuming that's still within this 52' to get your overall 75% impervious surface. So at least they could be tucked into the structure and they would kind of quasi-disappear if you did something like that, and make that outdoor patio, greenspace, yard a little bit more usable. Just an idea.

Mr. McCabe – The last thing, before we get away from it, I have a little concern about reducing the permeable from 85 back to 75, not that there's this number. But if we're seriously talking about adding height to buildings, concrete parking, or concrete pads for dumpsters, and then here we go reducing again. So I think, before we just agree to arbitrarily go from 85 to 75 – I understand that solution – but I also understand everything

else we're talking about adding to – I hate for us to already cut it before we've even started what we want to build. So I just want to bring that up, and not let that slide by.

Councilmember Hall – I'm glad you did. That's a good segue, because, like I said, we have some ideas here. So can these be painted?

Mr. McKown – Are they plastic or fiberglass?

Mr. Sturtz – I think these are plastic.

Mr. McKown – Paint would peel off within the year.

Councilmember Hall – So you can't graffiti that?

Mr. McKown – Oh, you could graffiti it. I thought you meant paint it to try and make it disappear.

Councilmember Hall – Well, I've got several options there.

Mr. McKown – You'd probably be more successful removing paint from it than getting paint to stick.

Councilmember Hall – So it couldn't be an art project, either.

Mr. McKown – It could. That's akin to the tiki hut. I'm all about it. I'm for all art. I'm against censorship on every level.

Councilmember Hall – So that's what I'm asking. If that was intentional, could you apply paint and it would hold up?

Mr. McKown – Probably not. Paint doesn't like sticking to plastic.

Ms. McMahon – Well, but on this one – we're just using this one example. You could get a metal one. Right?

Mr. McKown – Well, if it were fiberglass – I mean the ducks that are all over, those are played on and those are fiberglass, so it really does depend on the material. But if it's plastic – plastic is really hostile to most paints.

Councilmember Hall – Or another route would be – I'm just thinking of screening options beyond a stockade fence. So could you paint it – in your tucked-in model, could you paint it to fade into the structure? The color of the structure.

Mr. McKown – You could. I would almost argue that if those were notched in something like that, that they would look like they were meant to be there, that they were always part of the original concept, and if that was how it was done, you'd look at it and go, how cool is that that they're collecting their stormwater. Right? And you want it to be

seen for what it is. It's like a rain barrel in front of somebody's house. Your neighbor may go I don't like that rain barrel. Well, saving the planet one drop of water at a time. Sorry you don't like it.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. I think we probably need to bring this back when, hopefully, we'll have everybody here, in another week or two, and maybe just explore – like I said, the ultimate goal is to make this simpler for everybody, not harder – but are there things that could address the aesthetic concerns and have it be proportional to what is actually needed on the parcel, and see where we can come up with something better to recognize that stormwater is a significant issue in this part of town – in and outside the boundary.

Mr. McKown – I think one thing we could definitely put on the table for everyone to think about, that would generally be positive for multiple reasons, would be vegetative screening of some sort. Because you're getting all kinds of good benefits. You're getting more evapo-transpiration just by having something there beside Bermuda grass. I don't know – I bet I could grow Boston ivy on that thing, because it kind of is amazing and sticks to just about anything. You might not enjoy it, but it would probably ...

Councilmember Hall – I can supply it for you. I know we have a recommended tree list. Is that included in here, too – in the form-based code?

Ms. Hudson – It is.

Councilmember Hall – So it would be possible and consistent with what we already have in here if we wanted to recommend – or you had to use from this list, for example.

Ms. Hudson – If we wanted to add it to it. Right. The screening measures.

Mr. Adair – When you're ready, I want to follow up on Keith's comment on coverage.

Councilmember Hall – My fault, I started at the bottom. So let's just run through here. The section 902 on the site grading plan – does anybody have any comments about that?

Mr. McKown – I actually was a little confused. It looks like what was deleted is exactly the same as what was put back.

Mr. Sturtz – Because I initially wasn't doing this using Track Changes, so to make it whole, I had to delete it, put it in – so it is doubled.

Mr. McKown – I was reading it trying to find the one word that had changed.

Councilmember Hall – So what was actually deleted is not reflected here.

Mr. Sturtz – It's just because I didn't hit Track Changes before I started typing. That is the exact same language, and it's just duplicated in this case.

Mr. McKown – So you're not really making a change.

Mr. Sturtz – I'm adding this section in whole. This 902 what's labeled as B, but will be A – that is all new. That is added. Nothing was deleted.

Councilmember Hall – Is everybody good? We all on the same page?

Mr. Sturtz – I guess I should have started over with the whole document.

Mr. McKown – So that's the \$1 a day permit that you've got to go get?

Mr. Sturtz – We will put that language in here, along with this, where it says you must get a right-of-way permit, we'll put that language in here, also, at that point.

Councilmember Hall – I appreciate you catching that and adding this, because that has been a significant number of complaints that I've been aware of just as receiving complaints as a Councilmember when construction is going on and we've had some severe accessibility issues. Some of it is just the condition of the sidewalk that's not up to – it's not anybody's fault. But when we do have proactive measures that we can take that disrupt that continuous ability for anybody to get up and down the street, but particularly for those who have accessibility issues, then I think let's use the tools that we have in our toolkit. I think that's just an education process. I think perhaps those who are building within Center City might be very surprised at how many people in this part of town are wheelchair bound, or they use a little scooter type of thing, or they have visibility issues, or mobility issues. So there is a significant population that is impacted by this.

Ms. McMahon – Even kiddos riding bikes, moms who are pushing strollers.

Mr. Sturtz – This isn't just Center City Form-Based Code concern. This is something that I'm going to be working with our inspectors and people who are out there making sure we're spotting these when we don't see them. This is going to be an effort I'm going to be making Citywide. We just have an opportunity to put it here.

Councilmember Hall – Well, I really appreciate it. And, of course, because there is more construction going down here in the Core than other places, we just hear about it more often.

So on the 903.3, was that really deleted?

Mr. Sturtz – It's a page break.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. Just a page break – that's it.

So then 903.C is just looking to the future and allowing us to be able to reference.

Then 905.4 and that is pertaining to having a manual on file. That makes a lot of sense, so you can file that with Cleveland County, but also would be filed with the City of Norman. Am I understanding you correctly?

Mr. Sturtz – Yes, ma'am.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. I'm sorry. So 905 in the impervious coverage incentive, proposing reducing from 85 to 75. Who would like to go first?

Mr. McKown – I drew this, just so we'd have a quick reference. And, Keith, I don't know if this is what's getting built; I tried to get as much parking on as possible, and then balance the square footage, and then also tried to get a dumpster. There's 11 parking spaces here, and then that's 66' by 50', and that gets you 85% coverage, including the ramp and sidewalk going in. If we go down to 75, that reduces this down to 52'. And I think, from the square footage standpoint, the bottom one is 3300 sq. ft. and the top one is 2600 sq. ft. So just for reference, if that's helpful. I don't have a view on it, other than I just wanted to see what it looked like.

Councilmember Hall – I'm going to ask Ms. Hudson to weigh in on why Planning is recommending this.

Ms. Hudson – Well, it's the entire area as a whole – the whole Center City area that's being developed rather densely, so the concern is – not just tomorrow, but 10 years from now – and, granted, we might have gone through another review for amendments for this area between now and then. So the concern is we just want to make sure that we are taking care of the area and not negatively impacting adjacent property owners or the area around it. That's our main goal.

Councilmember Hall – I know this was a topic of robust discussion last time around, too.

Ms. Hudson – That's how we got 9 put in, because of the discussion last time.

Mr. Adair – Significant portion of this, we're going from 2 stories to 3 stories. We're definitely heading for increasing parking requirements, which in and of itself is going to substantially cut down density. Now we're looking at pulling impervious surface back from 85 to 75 and, again, you're going to cut back density and I don't think that we're calculating the two together. If I'm reading this correctly, the standard is 65% impervious and then if you use light impact, best practices, green solutions you can exceed that. I don't necessarily want this to be my example, but if we're doing something like this that accounts for the stormwater in excess of 65, why is 85 a problem? You're accounting for the excess stormwater. We're presenting an engineering solution that takes it out of the equation. It's not having a negative impact on the area.

Mr. McKown – That makes a lot of sense, that if we're calculating and we're not increasing the stormwater runoff because we're doing on-site detention, then ...

Mr. Adair – Then why are we choking it back? Jane, what percentage of – off the top of your head, are we always going to 85%? I see your partner shaking her head.

Ms. Starr – Whatever number you set, that's what they're going to go up to, just to be honest. You were talking about density, but it's not density. If you had 3 units that had 2 bedrooms each, you don't need 12 parking spaces because you have a young couple

living there, or something. So the assumption that you've got to have 12 parking spaces, but you don't necessarily need 12 parking spaces if you're doing 3 units and you're doing 2 bedroom.

Mr. Adair – And we haven't got into a unit count discussion yet. Stephen is not here. He always speaks for density. I usually vote with him on it.

Councilmember Hall – Well, I think, clearly we all agree that the goal is to increase density. But just to offer a counterpoint, how much is too much, I guess? I think there's so many things that we continue to struggle with that continue to just give us a single housing type. So that, to me – I haven't changed my tune much, either, in the last couple years, so I think, to me, that is relevant to all of these different pieces. So that's why we have to make sure that the pieces all fit together correctly for what the end goal is, which is trying to simplify how this is interpreted for our Planning Department which, in turn, allows for our developers to clearly understand what they can and can't do and we're not spending excessive amounts of time parsing words and stuff. So the density piece, I think, we accept that, and I think one of the examples I probably used 2 years ago – clearly Stephen Holman and I come at this a little bit different, but it still results in increased density, and that is what we're replacing is generally a single-family home that had maybe 4 residents and 2 cars. So even if you double it or triple it, and have 12 people living there, that's increased density. When you're talking about ultimately wanting a walkable, pedestrian-friendly neighborhood – what is the end result? The end result, for me, has always been how do we achieve the vision of having multiple housing types to choose from that are attractive to lots of different kinds of people? Because that's really what we were trying to get.

Mr. McCabe – I'll always play Devil's advocate here. The area that we're talking about has been 96% rental property for the last 30 years. There's not a single-family home still – I always say not – there's very few. They were all converted by the Coltrane property in the late '70s, and they're all 6 and 7 units inside of 1 building.

Councilmember Hall – Not all of them, but a lot of them.

Mr. McCabe – A majority of them. So it's not a new issue that we're dealing with. We're not evicting a single family. Because of how this neighborhood has grown, we talked about it last week. How just the beauty of what we're seeing on Main Street, by the projects that the developers are doing – that I walk into every restaurant and see students on Main Street. It's changing it now. Maybe we're not getting the family that somebody wants, but I don't know that you're going to get a family that moves in beside a college kid anyway. I can't determine that. There's some beautiful single-family residences – neighborhoods – in Norman, and I will do everything in my power to protect that. This isn't where we're talking about. I will always bring that back up.

Mr. Adair – I hate you for reminding me that I knew Ray Coltrane and Dudley Sharp that many years ago, but I did. I can remember a lot of those projects being converted. If we pull back from 85% to 75% we're increasing your land cost by about 12%. I think there are going to be a number of areas to try and get to the product that I'm hearing most

of the table say they want to see here. We're going to be pushing the developers as it is, and to add 12% to their land costs on – I think it's working against ourselves. We want you to build this and, by the way, we've increased your land cost, which has nothing to do with what the physical building looks like on top of everything else. I'm having trouble – if we're accounting for the excess stormwater runoff, I'm having trouble justifying pulling back an existing standard on that.

Ms. Hudson – Not to get on my soap box. I don't disagree with any of you. I really don't. We've talked many, many times – I think I've talked to most of the people at this table many, many times about what staff is struggling with when it comes to the Center City Form-Based Code. This area is north of campus. This area was/is rental. I don't disagree with you and Keith by any stretch. And I'll speak for myself, so I won't throw my staff in there with this, but what this was originally set up for and what was presented to the community and what was presented to Council, as you said, is not what we're getting. Is that a bad thing? Is it a good thing? Keith is not wrong. We've got multi-family – and I say multi-family because 3, 4 units in some of these structures that are being built. Do I think that we will get families to move in next to these? Maybe. Maybe not. But I think the thing that we've got to recognize is we can't control the market. We're not going to make – it's like you said. Are we increasing the price of the lot? I've talked to many of the developers and the lots used to go for \$125,000 a piece. Now they're going for ...

Mr. McCabe – Over \$300.

Ms. Hudson – Over \$300,000. So, I, the Planning Department, get beat up frequently because we are not getting what was originally presented to City Council and the community and the Steering Committee 5 years ago. So I think that's – it's almost like we have to have the come to the meeting, because what are we going to do in this area?

Mr. McKown – There's so much that you just shared there. But the comment about we're not getting what we designed this to get – I really felt like, every time I drive through here, that so many things were in the pipeline, under construction, had been put on hold, and then ended up getting built that aren't subject to this form-based code at all, and that there's enough of that stuff that got built that are our micro-dorms, or whatever we want to call them, that don't conform to this, weren't built to the standard, that there's a real disconnect between the public's general dissatisfaction of what's happened in the area and what it all looks like. It's almost impossible to just go in and pull out isolated pieces and go, well imagine this everywhere.

Mr. McCabe – If I may, the pretty picture that was painted during all of this did not conform to the words that were in writing. What's being built is what was legally voted on and accepted. It's not the other way around. The pretty pictures were the dream that they sold, but that's not the words. We're building to the words. So where's the fault lie?

Mr. McKown – Okay. But there are a bunch of buildings that got built ...

Mr. McCabe – We did the charrette in response to the buildings.

Councilmember Hall – Yes.

Mr. McKown – But there were still a whole bunch that were in the pipeline.

Mr. McCabe – That got through.

Mr. McKown – And there haven't been that many buildings built under this code.

Mr. McCabe – No, there really hasn't.

Mr. McKown – So I feel like the general dissatisfaction with the public is all of the above. I'm not disagreeing with you, Keith. Words are a horrible way to build a building. You send out written instructions to your trade contractors and said read these words and build my building, they'd just walk off the job.

Mr. McCabe – We all talked about how we loved the courtyards on University, and we do. But we just sat here last week and realized that's an 85-100' lot. We don't have 85', 100' lots. Unfortunately, we buy 50' at a time, if we're blessed then we're able to buy this next one and it might be 2, 3, 4, or 5 years down the road and nobody can afford to sit on that dirt hoping in speculation that we're going to buy next door. So we have to build what we can build that will fit on that 50'. Until we have a large-scale developer come in and buy the whole block – and when he shows up, have him call me – but until we get that, we have to really, in my opinion – we need to deal in the reality of a 50' lot.

Mr. McKown – I agree with you.

Councilmember Hall – I do, too. In the end, we want to promote our local developers, and that's a fact.

Mr. Adair – Can we hold this decision off until we see what we're doing on unit count and really see the real shift we're getting ready to make here, I think?

Councilmember Hall – I think that's best. We have quite a few agenda items that we probably won't get to all of them, again, but we're going to do our best to get to some of them. I know there were some public comments, if you can be brief just to this particular section.

Mr. Petromilli – Sure. Richard, I apologize I didn't get back to you before now. The sketch that you sent me that you were working off of, not one of those parking or dumpster requirements meets the City standard. So I sketched over that. Not any of it.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. Peter, we're talking about this piece right here.

Mr. Petromilli – Yep. It has everything to do with it. So the impervious and the 75% and the 11 parking spaces that we talked about when we first started this. Right? That was his first thing. So I'm addressing that. So, in reality, if you meet the City's standards on the

drive aisles and the angles and parking sizes and the dumpster enclosure sizes, you're looking at 5-6 parking spaces max on that lot. So it's not 11. That's where it is in Oklahoma City and that's where it is in other areas, but those standards – like we talked about last time – those are the same standards we have on 36th Street and in the suburbs, but we have them here in the dense area. So there's no accounting for this. So going from 85 to 75 – it's going to reduce that to even less. We may achieve the goal of not being able to do anything here. But that's where we are right now. When we start reducing – because this isn't what I have to build to. This isn't what I can design to.

Mr. McKown – I'm glad you're bringing this up, because I have wondered what – if I were putting a deal together on a 50' lot, it would look just like this bottom drawing. That's 85% coverage, there's 15 parking spaces, and I would have a 2-bedroom apartment on each side of the hallway, a staircase, and I would build it 3 stories tall, and I've got one extra parking space. So 2 parking spaces per unit gives you a building that looks something like that. And what Pete's saying is there's no way to build this amount of parking ...

Councilmember Hall – If we go to 75?

Mr. McKown – No. There's no way to build this amount of parking based on the requirements of how a parking lot is drawn. Those are 18' wide stalls, 9' wide, but the drive aisle isn't wide enough and it's very hard in a 50' lot to be able to get and utilize both sides. It can be done – it's done in other cities, and one-way traffic. But here you're having to one-way traffic your way back out.

Mr. Petromilli – The other thing, Richard, when it comes to this impervious and everything we talked about with these enclosures and the rain barrels and things – we're talking about dumpster enclosures. We're talking about rain water collection and this is all together. We have service courts that we build into a lot of our designs. We do a lot in healthcare, so often we have all of our med gas and everything else that goes into the service court. Well, if both of these barrels were on one side next to this – I'm looking at a service court and right here on this image where both barrels are on one side, all the polycarts are in one small area, and it's screened with vegetation or even a fence, we wouldn't have this conversation about this project. It would be a model of how to actually make this whole thing work. So I don't think anything drastic needs to happen to this code to achieve something special. I think small tweaks in even just our maintenance of this. Shouldn't it be applying that the polycarts are just left in this?

Councilmember Hall – I think we're going to get back to that.

Mr. Petromilli – Fine the guy \$250. You don't have to put in dumpsters. You just make the people who live here be responsible for their property.

Councilmember Hall – Make the people who live there, or the people who own it?

Mr. Petromilli – Either way. Whichever one wants to be the responsible party. But when all of a sudden this doesn't – this problem goes away without having to create an unnecessary burden on everybody. Because one of the things we're not even thinking

about on dumpster enclosures are – well, one, it's twice as big as he's drawn. Second, we can't lift dumpsters when there's power lines overhead. So every one of these alleys has power lines on one side. Now what they're doing, instead of going underground, they're setting 2 poles. I have a lot – OG&E just came by. They set 2 poles for my new service on the other side. So an existing service – power lines all the way on one side, so no dumpster enclosures on those, so I don't know what we're going to do on that whole half. But now we're on the other half. Again, I guess we can't build on that half, because we can't put a dumpster. But now the other half – I used to have a power line that ran across the alley. They're not doing that anymore. They're setting 2 new poles, one on each side, and running power lines to the other side and then down. So here pretty soon, every time that something is developed – bam – no more dumpsters on that side of the alley. So this whole thing that we've talked about with dumpster enclosures – it's moot because it can't ever happen. All it's going to do is prohibit us from doing anything. We're going to approve this thing in a code, developer is going to come through and we're going to get to sanitation and they're going to say, sorry, I can't have my guy get electrocuted. Oh, and by the way, Public Works already told us before that it's twice as big as what you did, so you're going to have to remove a parking space, and it has to be at this really odd angle to actually get the huge truck to come in. There are substantial – and like Keith said last time, in a 12' alley. But a small service court and making these people responsible resolves all of this. It's a small design strip. I'm done.

Ms. Hudson – Just because we're kind of going different directions here – what I found out, these are actually the 3 sizes of dumpsters that the City has. This is the largest one here – that's the one we talked about before. The second one is the smallest one, and then the third one is kind of the medium size one. I'm not saying anything – I'm just letting you guys see that we actually do have different sizes of dumpsters. What I told you about last week or the week before, whenever we were trying to figure out a way to get a couple of these units to share the dumpster, the information that we had gotten was for this size of dumpster. Don't know the right question to ask, you don't get the right answer, so we didn't know that there's actually these two different sizes.

In addition to that, just addressing Peter's comments, the fines – we talked about fines – if they don't bring them back off of the alley – there is no fine established in the Code of Ordinances if the polycarts are left on the alley – that's only if they are street-serviced. So there is no fine that can be addressed whether they leave them out in the alley or not. As far as the service court area – I love it. I think it's a great idea. We have several of the developers in the room right now that are very involved in their developments that they have. You see them out there at their properties weekly, if not daily, taking care of the things that Peter was talking about. But we do have developers that don't live in Norman and students – the residents that are living in those units – well, it's not my turn to take the trash out and it's sure not my turn to bring them back. So that's what we deal with.

3. CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND REPORT REGARDING ON-STREET PARKING OPTIONS

Mr. Riesland – First of all, I'm not critiquing anything, necessarily. I'm offering things to think about. We got this first drawing here. I know this is a conceptual drawing, but in this particular example, what happens to the bike lane as you travel from right to left across that intersection? It just appears to die at the intersection. That's not a good thing

for multi-modal capabilities. The fact that the crosswalks are shown – if you're crossing the street that's more north/south, the crosswalks swing way out from the intersection. That is a little bit of violation of driver expectancy to have the crosswalk that far from the intersection. So you wouldn't want to do something like that. The angled parking – it couldn't be built that way. If that's asphalt, they're going to lay a whole path; they're not going to lay each space individually.

Mr. McKown – In terms of – 2nd Street, Oklahoma City – 3rd Street, Oklahoma Avenue – all three sides we built it like that. You're right, we didn't build them out of asphalt. We poured them in concrete. But it was less expensive than doing just a straight run, because we ended up with less concrete, and it created these really good landscaping opportunities.

Mr. Riesland – That comment was based on the assumption that they would be asphalt.

Mr. McKown – I hear you. But they don't have to be concrete, but it created a really good green infrastructure piece. So we have a precedent for it. I built it in Oklahoma City right across from the Aloft Hotel.

Mr. Riesland – The other comment I have about the angled parking is that Council has become very interested lately in back-in angled parking. Is that what we would want to show, instead of head-in angle parking? It works better with bike lanes than head-in angle parking does. And that would eliminate the problem with ...

Mr. McKown – Agnostic on it. If you all want to do back-in, that's fine. I don't care. I absolutely don't care.

Mr. Riesland – Just something to consider moving forward.

Councilmember Hall – Are you saying that would work better?

Mr. Riesland – It works better with bicycles, yes. Because they're not caught off-guard by somebody backing out of the space.

Mr. McCabe – It's just me asking, Sir – because I don't know. I know that when this was drawn he used different streets, just trying to do. But knowing the depth between the curb and the sidewalk, which is City easement at 8-9' – can I truly get angled parking – depth of angled parking from a side of a curb to the sidewalk without sticking out?

Mr. Riesland – That would have to be looked at on a case-by-case basis, but yeah.

Mr. McCabe – And we're talking Center City, so that's kind of where I'm projecting that. I love the concept, but I just – how much of the street are we willing to choke down, which I guess could slow down our traffic if we choke the street down. But you can't go into the yard. Correct?

Mr. Riesland – That's correct. If we're going to have parallel parking on a route that's identified in our Bike Plan or our Comprehensive Transportation Plan as a facility that will carry bikes via bike lanes, we really need to have a little buffer space between the bike lane and the parking, because cars open their doors and unsuspecting bicyclists just plow right into the door and not fare well.

On this drawing, it was a little harder to see exactly what we were talking about there. Obviously, we want to keep crossing distances at intersections as short as we can for pedestrians. That's much more safe for them. We don't want to create a situation like we have at Eufaula and Peters, where there's no place to put the stop sign and you can't see it. It's imperative that we maintain sight triangles at intersections and don't intentionally put parking in that sight triangle that's going to prohibit somebody from seeing oncoming traffic. Again, we talked about the bike lanes with angled parking, unless it's back-in. Our Comprehensive Transportation Plan now says everything is multi-modal, so we have to design for all modes. Need to make sure we include the bicycles in there as well. I'm not sure if this concept includes what's going to happen on Main Street once Gray Street becomes two-way. It's slated for two-way conversion as well. Got to make sure we account for that.

Councilmember Hall – I think we're talking about mainly the residential areas. Correct?

Mr. Adair – You can talk about two-way Main any time you want to.

Councilmember Hall – I mean with your concept, Richard, weren't you primarily focused on the residential areas?

Mr. McKown – Yeah. With that conceptual drawing, all I was trying to look at is you've got – okay, so Norman is crooked – bear with me. The north/south-ish roads are narrower – the right-of-way is much narrower than the east/west-ish roads. So you could do the 45° angle in the wider right-of-way condition, and you'd have to go to parallel parking in the narrower north/south-ish. That is about as simple as that is. What I was trying to look at was it generates a lot of parking if you really got aggressive. There are so many constraints. I learned years ago my job as a designer is to cause problems for engineers to solve, because engineers are really good at solving problems, and I'm really good at creating them. Right?

Mr. Sturtz – I can attest to that.

Mr. McKown – So I take my job seriously. What might be helpful in the next stage – and to cut us off before we get to the end, but if we picked just one intersection that had that narrower north/south condition and the wider east/west condition and said what would this block look like, going a block each direction from that intersection, and actually pull up the impediments, rights-of-way, the curb cuts – if we just picked one at random – or maybe one that could actually get built that wouldn't be at random, and it could become a demonstration project and we could look at it like that. I am happy to do the drawing, under adult supervision this next time and try and get it righter.

Mr. Riesland – We call those pilot projects.

Councilmember Hall – Yes. We love those. Experiments.

Mr. Riesland – The only other thing I wanted to add is that we have a grant that we will probably be starting on in the next couple of months to install bike lanes on a portion of Webster and a portion of University, so that will have to be, obviously, accounted for in this as well. But we're not there yet.

Councilmember Hall – What's the timeline on that do you think?

Mr. Riesland – It's going to Council Tuesday night. But it still has to go through ACOG and get approval through ACOG. Once they have it, then they'll let us know that we're good to go ahead out for bids. I would think sometime in April. That's all I have.

Mr. Adair – One last quick one on Scott's revisions on 905.A.5 – he set a requirement for inspection and annual reporting. I'm assuming when that gets done with this we'll know what happens if I thumb my nose at you and don't do it.

Mr. Sturtz – That is the one concern that I still have is enforcement.

Mr. Adair – It always worked better when you said and if you don't, you're going to get a whipping.

Ms. McMahon – We're seeing this now with stormwater – with some of our stormwater things, where once it's built we don't really have anything in place to make them keep it functional.

Mr. Sturtz – You are correct.

Councilmember Hall – And that's not unique to Center City. Any other questions for Mr. Riesland? Any other comments? We are at 5 til 1:00. Oh, how time flies when we're having a good time.

4. CONTINUATION OF ITEMS FROM 2/24/2002

a. GENERAL REPORT BACK ON DISCUSSION OF DUMPSTER/POLYCARBONATE PROVISION/PLACEMENT REQUIREMENTS/FINES

b. DISCUSSION OF DEFINITION OF BEDROOM

5. DISCUSSION OF QUALITY STRUCTURES AND ARCHITECTURAL REQUIREMENTS

6. DISCUSSION OF NEXT STEPS

Ms. Hudson – First of all, I would just like to go ahead and throw this out here now. I think that we need to go ahead and put on our calendars that we will be meeting on the 10th, which is next Thursday. So it would be the Thursdays in March – so the 10th, 17th, 24th, and

31st and we'll see where we are at that time and see how many – we'll only have 2 more meetings the beginning of April.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. So we're adding next week.

Ms. Hudson – I think we have to. We didn't get through. We've got several items that are coming next week. So we've got the 75% that's coming back for the next meeting. We've got the screening of the tank – wanted to talk about that next time, too. We'll put that on there.

Councilmember Hall – My other comment about what you just presented – would it be possible to pick an intersection to play around with that? I don't know what the investment of time would be for something like that.

Mr. McKown – I'm happy to do the homework.

Councilmember Hall – Do you have a suggestion of an intersection?

Mr. Riesland – I'll find one.

Councilmember Hall – I'd be curious to see what that looks like.

Ms. Hudson – You let me know where you are, Richard, and if you want it on the next one. If not, we'll put it on the one after.

Councilmember Hall – I'm thinking maybe the 17th, just to make sure. We have plenty to do next week, too. Is that okay?

7. MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Tom Bevel – I don't know how many other people in here ride bicycles. My wife and I do on a regular basis. Your comment about car pull-in or back-in. You think that the car backed in is able to see. The bicyclists look for back-up lights for the brake, because the people backed in don't see you and you can't tell they're moving until they start moving. Whereas the reverse, that's what you're looking for. There's a back-up light or a brake light. That's all.

Elizabeth Bevel – I've had them pull out on – where is it? Eufaula and Garner. They're backed in. I'm going by and I'm looking. There's a kid that pulls out and doesn't see me, and then on Symmes back-up lights – you see it. I hit the girl's tail as I'm going by because I know she's backing. To support what he's saying.

Councilmember Hall – And you're talking about the current pilot project on reverse angle parking on James Garner?

Ms. Bevel – Yes.

Councilmember Hall – Okay. That's been your experience. Thank you for adding that to the conversation.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.