



City of Broken Arrow

Minutes

Elm Place and New Orleans Small Area Plan - Advisory Committee

Chairperson Roy Wood
Vice Chair Chase Elkins
Member Tatum Adams
Member Jim Beavers
Member Scott Eudey
Member Christi Gillespie
Member Danny Miller
Member Scott Moore
Member Mindy Payne
Member James Ring
Member Lee Whelpley

Friday, July 2, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.
N.S.U. Broken Arrow
Administration Services Building, Annex Room
3100 East New Orleans Street
Broken Arrow, OK

1. Roll Call

Chairperson Wood called the meeting to order and called for roll call.

Present: Roy Wood, Chase Elkins, Scott Eudey, Christi Gillespie, Danny Miller, Scott Moore, Mindy Payne, Lee Whelpley

Absent: Tatum Adams, Jim Beavers, James Ring

2. Approval of June 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Chairperson Wood asked if there were any comments or corrections to the previously distributed June 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

MOTION: A motion was made by Chase Elkins, seconded by Scott Eudey.

Move to approve the June 18, 2020 Meeting Minutes

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Roy Wood, Chase Elkins, Scott Eudey, Christi Gillespie, Danny Miller, Scott Moore, Mindy Payne, Lee Whelpley

3. Update on Branding and Marketing RFQ Proposal

Vice Chair Elkins reported 27 proposals were submitted from branding and marketing firms. He reported the subcommittee read through the proposals, held a meeting a week ago at City Hall, and narrowed the 27 proposals to 7 proposals. He indicated emails were sent to the 7 chosen firms requesting additional information including a Request for Proposal (RFP). He noted three firms were from Kansas City, one was from Tulsa, one from Oklahoma City, a firm from Moore, and a firm from Fort Worth. He stated there were several firms from Tulsa who had submitted RFQs; however, he and the subcommittee were not impressed. He indicated the RFPs were due July 10 and the subcommittee would meet the following week to narrow the number down to three or four candidates with whom to hold in person interviews, following which a recommendation would be made.

Vice Chair Elkins discussed the recommendation timeline. He noted there were some excellent candidates and he was excited to receive the RFPs.

4. Comments on the draft copy of the updated Master Plan

Community Development Director Larry Curtis reported he received comments regarding the draft Master Plan from Chairperson Wood and Committee Member Mindy Payne. He noted he had not received comments from any other Committee Members as of yet. He asked for any additional comments to be given to him by Monday July 6, 2020. He commended Chairperson Wood for his excellent comments; he commended Mindy Payne as well.

Chairperson Wood reviewed his comments for the draft Master Plan which included: organizational revisions, added supporting information, highlighted sections, and additional graphics. He noted more of the Catalyst report needed to be written into the Master Plan as the Catalyst report would not be available as a point of reference.

Committee Member Danny Miller asked why more of the Catalyst report needed to be included in the Master Plan. He stated he found the Catalyst report to be too much of a consultant type approach. Mr. Larry Curtis responded, aside from the fact the City spent \$100,000 dollars on the Catalyst report, the Catalyst report was the supporting information behind the Master Plan. He noted Chairperson Wood was able to bridge the gap between the analytics between the data side and the executive summary. He explained the Executive Summary was the “meat and potatoes,” while the rest of the Master Plan was the supporting data.

Committee Member Eudey asked for some clarity.

Mr. Curtis explained the Elm and New Orleans Advisory Committee was tasked with reviewing the Catalyst report; this was done. He stated it was decided the Catalyst report was not reader friendly; the data was present, but it was not an actionable document. He reported through the research done by the Advisory Committee and Staff, the Catalyst report was basically rewritten into a Master Plan including an Executive Summary and an Appendix.

Chairperson Wood stated the Introduction and Executive Summary explained how the Committee and the City had reached this point by providing a history of what had been accomplished thus far. He indicated the Background provided information on the Elm and New Orleans area while the Rationale explained why this study and plan was being done. He reported the Recommendations and Focus Areas included reasoning, possible funding options, the need for multifaceted focus, the need for cooperation between property owners, merchants and the City, and the different focus areas: Focus 1) Improving Infrastructure and Public Use; Focus 2) Guiding Private Development; Focus 3) Programming and Promotion; Focus 4) Improving Circulation and Access; and Focus 5) Financing and Organization.

Mr. Curtis commented this page which Chairperson Wood developed summarizing the aforementioned information into a single page served as an excellent bridge between the Executive Summary and the actual Matrix.

Chairperson Wood stated there were initially eleven focus areas which he combined and reduced to five focus areas. He noted he did not eliminate any focus areas, simply reworded, and combined the focus areas in an effort to simplify the document.

Mr. Curtis discussed the need for generalized wording which would not limit the possibilities in the area; for example stating City Staff would explore all traffic and lane possibilities for this corner, rather than City Staff would explore traffic circle possibilities for this corner.

Chairperson Wood discussed the Focus Areas noting the recommended studies which applied to the focus areas and the recommendations for the areas. He asked the Committee Members to review the document and comment.

He discussed each Focus Area: Focus Area 1 was Improving Infrastructure and Public Use; Focus 2 was Guiding Private Development which included encouraging existing property owners to update covenants. Discussion ensued regarding encouraging property owners to update covenants, the City having no rights regarding private property covenants, the belief the property owners would generally be willing and cooperative regarding updating covenants, relaxing the 1980 parking requirements and allowing new pad areas out front serving as an encouragement to rewrite property covenants. Chairperson Wood stated Focus 2 also included a recommendation to conduct a study for infill residential/mixed-use/commercial development; and to work with the chamber of commerce to promote owners' and merchants' associations.

He stated Focus 3 was Programming and Promotion. He noted the area was renamed New Orleans Square which gave the area a unique brand and the recommendation was for the Chamber of Commerce and the City to assist with promotion of New Orleans Square.

He stated Focus 4 was Improving Circulation and Access Focus. He explained this would create opportunities for multi-modal transportation options, meaning buses, a trolley between the Rose District and New Orleans Square, etc., making the area walkable.

Committee Member Gillespie asked about golf cart transportation. Mr. Curtis responded transportation such as golf carts was governed by the State of Oklahoma; vehicles on public roads were required to be "road worthy." He noted if there were speed limits over 50 miles per hour golf carts were not permissible. He stated other transportation paths could be considered in an effort to permit golf cart and other slower type transportation vehicles. Discussion ensued regarding different areas in Broken Arrow where golf carts were permitted to cross main roads, and golf cart specific streets.

Chairperson Wood stated the final Focus was Financing and Organization which discussed various funding possibilities such as TIF districts, private funding, grants, low interest loans and the recommendation would be to begin studies using existing GO bond funds, and explore establishing a TIF district with key stakeholders. He stated the organization recommendation was to disestablish the New Orleans and Elm Advisory Board on acceptance of this report and establish a longer-term New Orleans Square Advisory Board (NOSAB) with five to seven members.

He stated following the Focus Area discussions the document goes into the Advisory Report which included background information and introduction, along with a broader study area description, existing conditions with infrastructure, ownership, setbacks, parking lots, potential development areas, the Catalyst Team corridor assessment, market potential, and housing demand. He noted he left out tangential things such as demographics, market conditions, etc. Mr. Curtis recommended adding this type of information back into the document in the appendix. Chairperson Wood agreed.

Chairperson Wood discussed the next section in the document: Advisory Committee Report, Planning Concepts, which included an Introduction, Study Area Description, Existing Conditions, Utility Infrastructure, and maps of the area.

Committee Member Gillespie discussed the Rose District and the reasons the Rose District worked. Mr. Curtis noted it would be difficult to capture the same feel at New Orleans Square with a four-lane road; however, things could be done to encourage residents to slow down when passing through such as additional landscaping, trees, bike paths, walking trails, etc. Discussion ensued regarding what could be done to slow drivers down while passing

through the area, where the merchant's association fit into the focuses, and the merchant's association being included in Focus 2 and Focus 3.

Vice Chair Elkins noted Steve Yoder from the Chamber of Commerce was present and actively involved; the Chamber was willing to assist, as well as the City TED Team. He recommended including this information in the document.

Mr. Curtis asked Steve Yoder from the Chamber of Commerce to speak about Chamber initiatives for the New Orleans Square. Mr. Steve Yoder indicated the goals for New Orleans Square were similar to goals for Rose District. He stated he wanted a recommendation from this group regarding how to move forward; would the association be TED team driven or Chamber driven.

Chairperson Wood further discussed the Focus Areas and Recommendations for each including: Focus 1) lane narrowing, roundabout, relocation of power lines, walkability, public use spaces, landscaping, gateway district signage; Focus 2) guiding private development, and different types of uses.

Committee Member Eudey asked about the different types of covenants and which covenants needed Planning Commission approval. Mr. Curtis responded if the language in the plat required the covenant to have Planning Commission approval then it was required; however, most plats removed this language beginning in 1983. He stated PUDs however included a caveat requiring Planning Commission approval of covenants. Committee Member Eudey commented the purpose of updating private covenants was to promote unity; however, if private covenants were rewritten privately, unity might not be achieved. Mr. Curtis agreed. He noted when the overlay district was developed the consultant would review the private covenants to see how the covenants interacted with the overlay district. Discussion ensued regarding not being able to force properties to comply with the overlay district, only redeveloped properties or new properties would be required to comply with the overlay district, the importance of bringing the property owners and business owners together in a single organization to promote a consistent and coherent feel in the area, the merchant's association serving this purpose, the merchant's association needing to include the property owners as well, the landowners changing covenants, merchants not having the ability to change covenants, and whether the property owners would be willing to cooperate knowing the City and Chamber were in support.

Assistant City Attorney Ewing stated she understood the New Orleans Square area had 10 or more plats, and each plat should contain language about amending covenants. She stated it might require a plat amendment from the Planning Commission, but not City Council. Mr. Curtis stated many covenants containing language which allowed the covenant to be amended privately. Assistant City Attorney Ewing stated regardless there were many plats, and many covenants, between many property owners; it would be a difficult and involved process getting all the covenants amended.

Committee Member Eudey indicated the covenant amendment objective might need a dedicated group of individuals whose sole purpose was to organize and encourage amendment of the covenants.

Discussion ensued regarding some companies having private agreements separate from the private covenants, this becoming a very challenging process, the possibility of "dividing and conquering" corner by corner, the success of a corner following covenant amendment encouraging the other corners to participate, there being at least two plats on each corner, how many plats were on each corner, and which corners had PUDs.

Chairperson Wood stated Focus 3 discussed Programming and Promotion, tactical urbanism possibilities. He stated Focus 4 was Improving Circulation and Access while Focus 5

discussed Financing and Organization. He reported the next section included acknowledgements followed by the appendix which included maps and various other information.

Vice Chair Elkins commented the Focus Areas were what the public would be most interested in.

Mr. Curtis commented Chairperson Wood did an excellent job pulling the focus areas to the front of the document. He stated he would provide updated copies of Chairperson Wood's version to the Committee Members prior to the next meeting. Chairperson Wood encouraged comments and input regarding the document.

Mr. Curtis noted any comments regarding Chairperson Wood's version should be sent to Chairperson Wood and any comments regarding the first draft copy should be sent to himself (Mr. Curtis).

5. Property Owners Subcommittee update

There was no Property Owners Subcommittee update.

6. Business Owners Subcommittee update

There was no Business Owners Subcommittee update.

7. Tactical Urbanism Subcommittee update

There was no Tactical Urbanism Subcommittee update.

8. Closing Comments

Committee Member Payne commended Chairperson Wood for the new document. She commented it was much easier to read.

Committee Member Miller noted several of the focus areas discussed tactical urbanism. He stated he felt this was encouraging. Committee Member Gillespie stated she felt it was important to plan a tactical urbanism event, regardless of COVID-19; it was important to keep moving forward.

Mr. Curtis asked if the Tactical Urbanism Subcommittee could meet and brainstorm a COVID friendly tactical urbanism event. Committee Member Whelpley responded in the affirmative. Discussion ensued regarding COVID friendly events, masks, etc. Mr. Curtis stated passive tactical urbanism could still be accomplished, for example, light pole decorating, landscaping, plantings, etc. He explained these could be done without attracting a crowd but still attracting attention to the area. Committee Member Eudey agreed. Discussion ensued regarding "drive by" tactical urbanism, the ease of social distancing in a parking lot, the question not being whether it was possible to properly social distance in a parking lot event, the question was whether people would practice proper social distancing in a parking lot event, large groups of people tending not to adhere to social distancing protocols, not holding certain types of events due to perception, holding a Mardi Gras mask event, holding a Halloween mask event, and the importance of being social when building a community.

Committee Member Beavers asked if the Committee could hold an event without Plan approval from City Council. Committee Member Eudey responded in the affirmative; City Council approval of an event could be obtained prior to the Plan approval. He noted the City was subject to State laws regarding events of any sort.

Chairperson Wood stated whatever event was hosted it was important to involve the merchants. Vice Chair Elkins agreed noting it was important to be very communicative with the merchants. Discussion ensued regarding the parking lot being City owned.

Vice Chair Elkins commented when reviewing the branding firm RFQs he considered whether the firm had experience in municipal government, experience branding districts, and experience branding areas holistically and developing a marketing plan. He stated the firms which were chosen provided examples of previously branded districts. He noted it was important to keep in mind this would be a long-term project. He noted things such as landscaping, light poles, monuments, etc., could be given priority which would beautify the area and distract from the empty buildings and such.

9. Confirmation of Next Meeting Dates and Location

Chairperson Wood stated the next meeting was to be held in two weeks. Discussion ensued regarding the Branding Subcommittee meeting on July 14, at 9:00 a.m., the Elm and New Orleans Advisory Committee being on July 16, holding a special Elm and New Orleans Advisory Committee Meeting at the end of the month to discuss branding firm recommendations, not holding a meeting on the 16th and instead holding only a special meeting at the end of July, the branding firm recommendation only needing to go before City Council, the Master Plan needing to go before Planning Commission prior to going before City Council, and dates were discussed. It was decided to hold the next Meeting on July 30, 2020 at NSU at 6:00 p.m.

10. Adjournment

Chairperson Wood adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:10 p.m.

MOTION: A motion was made by Chase Elkins, seconded by Christi Gillespie.

Move to adjourn

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 8 - Roy Wood, Chase Elkins, Scott Eudey, Christi Gillespie, Danny Miller, Scott Moore, Mindy Payne, Lee Whelpley

Roy Wood, Chairperson

Lisa Blackford, Deputy City Clerk