



# CITY OF NORMAN, OK CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL MEETING

Municipal Building, Executive Conference Room, 201 West Gray, Norman,  
OK 73069  
Tuesday, December 16, 2025, at 5:30 PM

## MINUTES

The City Council Special Meeting of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Special Session in the Executive Conference Room in the Municipal Building, on Tuesday, December 16, 2025 at 5:30 PM, and notice of the agenda of the meeting was posted at the Norman Municipal Building at 201 West Gray and on the City website at least 48 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

*It is the policy of the City of Norman that no person or groups of persons shall on the grounds of race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age, place of birth, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, familial status, marital status, including marriage to a person of the same sex, disability, relation, or genetic information, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to discrimination in employment activities or in all programs, services, or activities administered by the City, its recipients, sub-recipients, and contractors. In the event of any comments, complaints, modifications, accommodations, alternative formats, and auxiliary aids and services regarding accessibility or inclusion, please call 405-366-5424, Relay Service: 711. To better serve you, five (5) business days' advance notice is preferred.*

## CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Holman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

## PRESENT

Mayor Stephen Holman  
Councilmember Ward 2 Matthew Peacock  
Councilmember Ward 4 Helen Grant  
Councilmember Ward 6 Joshua Hinkle  
Councilmember Ward 7 Kimberly Blodgett  
Councilmember Ward 8 Scott Dixon

## OTHERS

Councilmember Ward 1 David Gandesbery  
Councilmember Ward 5 Brandon Nofire

## AGENDA ITEMS

### 1. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE INCLUSION OF THE CAMPUS CORNER AREA IN THE CENTER CITY FORM-BASED CODE.

Council discussed potential adjustments and policy considerations if the Campus Corner area is incorporated into the Center City Form Based Code(CCFBC).

Key discussion points included:

- Required Build Line (RBL): Councilmembers expressed support for a RBL generally aligning with the historic development pattern in Campus Corner, buildings located close to sidewalks/roadway. A suggestion was raised to consider setting new development slightly back one to two feet from existing build lines to allow for incremental sidewalk widening over time, citing narrow sidewalks in Campus Corner compared to wider sidewalks in other areas.
- Parking approach: Councilmembers discussed minimizing or avoiding project by project parking requirements in the Campus Corner district. Several comments supported a district wide, holistic parking strategy, including exploration of public parking structures/garages and other solutions to serve the area collectively, rather than requiring parking with each new development.
- Tax Increment Finance (TIF) and implementation planning: Council questions were raised about how the Center City TIF could be updated to address infrastructure and district needs for Campus Corner, including potential costs for improvements and parking solutions.

Ms. Kathryn Walker, Assistant City Attorney, noted that Campus Corner appears as a blank area in the existing planning documentation and lacks measurements/identified infrastructure needs necessary for cost development. Additional work may be needed to incorporate Campus Corner into the scope of the Johnson and Associates study; this could likely be handled through a contract amendment, pending a price estimate. She said a TIF amendment may involve updating the project plan dollar amounts and the referenced study to tie needed improvements to the plan.

Council discussed whether adding Campus Corner work would slow down the broader Center City urban design implementation plan. Ms. Walker indicated the Campus Corner portion would take time, but Council may still be able to authorize funding for other identified projects as appropriate.

Council noted that significant portions of Campus Corner previously received infrastructure upgrades under an earlier TIF, e.g., utilities, sidewalks, lighting, and parking meters, though some segments were not updated. Staff indicated the need to evaluate whether existing infrastructure is sufficient for anticipated density under the CCFBC, which may differ from earlier planning assumptions.

Council discussed that certain developments have occurred under existing zoning without additional parking requirements and noted that CCFBC inclusion could allow mixed-use development, e.g., commercial ground floor with residential above, with fewer approvals than the prior framework. Council emphasized that if the City imposes new height or parking mandates, it should consider what is being exchanged or provided in return.

Council discussed creating a Campus Corner-focused ad hoc committee comprised of district stakeholders (business owners, property owners, and potentially individuals with ties to the district who may not reside in Norman) to help shape recommendations and alignment with Center City goals.

Council noted the Center City TIF and CCFBC have been in place for approximately seven years and expressed that the City has time to engage stakeholders and do the work carefully. Ms. Walker indicating a parking structure does not necessarily have to be completed before moving forward if an appropriate funding mechanism is approved.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 2. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE HOMELESS SHELTER DESIGN.

Council received a conceptual design presentation from FSB Architects for a proposed homeless shelter facility on a newly acquired triangular property. Parks and Recreation staff explained the City's facilities role and stated a need for clear concepts and information prior to any potential request to voters for funding approval.

Mr. Shawn Long with FSB described design priorities focused on dignity, safety, neighborhood compatibility, and screening. The team reported touring the Oklahoma City shelter as part of their learning process and emphasized balancing client needs with surrounding neighborhood concerns.

Mr. Derrick Paus with FSB presented as a three-phase plan:

- Phase 1: A prefabricated metal building intended to be built quickly to relocate existing shelter operations. Proposed capacity included 48 men and 24 women, with a large lounge space intended to provide overflow capacity during extreme weather.
- Phase 2: A larger new shelter building with improved common spaces, intake, storage, and other support functions.
- Phase 3: Repurposing the building in Phase 1 into family shelter suites and respite rooms after the new shelter opens.

Mr. Long clarified that the family apartments shown are family shelter suites, not long-term housing. Mr. Paus described site constraints including a floodplain area where development is restricted and the need for stormwater detention. The design places buildings near the front with parking/queuing to the rear to discourage congregation along the street frontage and to provide screening. A community yard, family yard, and dog run were included.

Council asked about hardened shelter areas for severe weather. Mr. Paus explained options for hardened areas and the desire to maintain separation between men's and women's spaces while still providing adequate shelter capacity.

Councilmember Hinkle emphasized that accommodating pets reduces barriers to shelter use. The plan includes an indoor kennel with a wash station, similar to existing operations, and potential partnerships, e.g., veterinary services, were mentioned.

Item 2, continued

FSB discussed using prefabricated construction to reduce costs and potentially allocate more funds toward aesthetics and experience (masonry accents, residential-style treatments, controlled window placement, and a strong emphasis on landscaping and screening). Council asked about a proposed inspirational signage element at the entrance "I can be changed by what happens to me, but I refuse to be reduced by it." Mr. Long stated it was intended as a positive, mission-driven message.

The team noted discovery of an east-west utility easement, believed to be a gravity sewer/service line. The concept was adjusted to avoid relocation costs where possible.

Mayor Holman asked whether improvements to Reed Avenue would be addressed to support driveways/operations, noting current conditions resemble an alley. Mr. Jason Olsen, Director of Parks and Recreation, indicated roadway improvements, fencing, and curb/gutter goals were being evaluated as part of cost and value engineering discussions.

Councilmember Grant asked about drainage and runoff, including whether detention would drain toward future stormwater amenities; Staff indicated civil engineering review would further refine drainage details.

Council asked about family common space and services. City Care described shared common space with a warming kitchen and communal refrigerator, private locking family rooms, volunteer support (tutoring, activities), and housing navigation services, including coordination with school district liaisons under the McKinney-Vento framework. A potential partnership with Center for Children and Families was noted.

Mayor Holman noted the need for cost estimates prior to asking voters to approve funding. Mr. Olsen indicated cost estimating work was underway, with a goal of having numbers available on January 6, 2026, along with an update on polling results and discussed ballot timing constraints for an April election, noting alternative election dates may be available.

Council also clarified Phase 1 would relocate the current shelter and replicate existing capacity and services, with additional improvements dependent on future funding sources. Mr. Darrel Pyle, City Manager, said the funding for Phase 1 will come from the sale of the property on Gray Street

\*\*\*\*\*

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

**ATTEST:**

---

City Clerk

---

Mayor