



CITY OF NORMAN, OK PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Thursday, August 13, 2026 at 5:30 PM**

MINUTES

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Building, on Thursday, August 13, 2026 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 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Bird called the meeting to order at 5:34 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Commissioner Cameron Brewer
Commissioner Douglas McClure
Commissioner Liz McKown
Chair Erica Bird
Secretary Kevan Parker
Vice Chair Michael Jablonski
Commissioner Steven McDaniel
Commissioner Jim Griffith
Commissioner Maria Kindel

STAFF PRESENT

Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Kelly Abell, Planner I
Logan Gray, Planner II
Bailey LaChance, Admin Tech IV
Brandon Brooks, Capital Projects Engineer
Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney
David Riesland, Transportation Engineer
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist

GUESTS PRESENT

Lynn Golbeck, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Linda & Lennard Wright, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Jim & Carma Taylor, 1204 Sawgrass Dr., Norman, OK
Sharie Young, 7451 Franklin Ct., Norman, OK
Joe Krodel, 100 N Broadway Ave., STE 1700, OKC, OK
Jay Rippetto, 520 Post Oak Blvd., STE 575, Houston, TX
Dan Helmer, 1117 Caracara Dr., Norman, OK
John Proctor, 1505 Shadybrook, Norman, OK
Sherri Loach, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Linda Brown, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK

Debra Williams, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Linda Roop, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Lori Mouse, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Kissie Mouse, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Timothy Shannon, 4704 Augusta Dr., Norman, OK
Cynthia Darity, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Eldie Lois Morris, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
A Luanne Alexander, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Phil Hollingsworth, 4016 Morrison Ct., Norman, OK
Patrick Janeway, 7206 Franklin Ct., Norman, OK
Steve Guthrie, 6312 Sawgrass Dr., Norman, OK
Bonnie Homes, 4403 12th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK

CONSENT ITEMS

This section is placed on the agenda so that the Planning Commission, by unanimous consent, may designate those items that they wish to approve by one motion. Any of these items may be removed from the Consent Docket and be heard in its regular order.

Minutes

1. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE MINUTES AS FOLLOWS:

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 9, 2026.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. July 9, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Preliminary Plats

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2627-2, A PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR LUXNOVA LLC.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Preliminary Plat
4. Preliminary Site Development Plan

Certificates of Survey

3. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY NO. COS-2627-2 FOR CHEYENNE ESTATES

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report

2. Location Map
3. Certificate of Survey

Motion to approve all items on consent docket made by Commissioner Kindel,
Seconded by Commissioner McDaniel.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown,
Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Vice Chair Jablonski, Commissioner McDaniel,
Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel

The motion was approved.

NON-CONSENT ITEMS

404 E. Symmes

4. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2627-3: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 36-201 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN SO AS TO REMOVE THE TRACT OF LAND IN THE NORTHEAST 2.78 FEET OF LOT 5 AND ALL OF LOT 6, BLOCK 29, OF THE ORIGINAL TOWN OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, FROM THE C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, AND PLACE SAME IN THE R-3, MULTIFAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (404 E SYMMES; WARD 4)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report
2. Supporting AIM Documents
3. Location Map
4. Site Plan

Staff Presentation

Kelly Abell, Planner I, presented the staff report for the 404 E. Symmes project.

Applicant Presentation

Phil Hollingsworth, applicant, presented the 404 E. Symmes project.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

There was no Commission discussion.

Motion to approve made by Commissioner McKown, **Seconded** by Commissioner McDaniel.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Vice Chair Jablonski, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel

Planning Commission recommended approval of O-2627-3.

Uses in I-1

5. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PCR-2627-1: A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION DETERMINING WHETHER THE USE OF OUTDOOR STORAGE/PARKING OF THIRD-PARTY EQUIPMENT, VEHICLES, TRAILERS, BOATS, AND RECREATIONAL VEHICLES UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS IS APPROPRIATE IN THE I-1, LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, PER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 36-529(A)(4).

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report
2. I-1, Light Industrial District Code

Staff Presentation

Logan Gray, Planner II, presented the staff report for Uses in I-1.

Commissioner McDaniel sought clarification as to whether the gravel parking area would be located behind a screening fence and whether stored vehicles and equipment would be screened by an opaque fence. Mr. Gray confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner McDaniel also sought clarification regarding the current code, asking whether gravel could be used as a surface behind the fence if no items were being stored. Mr. Gray stated gravel is permitted, but it cannot be used as a parking surface.

Commissioner Bird sought confirmation that the request would apply comprehensively to all I-1 zoned properties, rather than only the property associated with the request. Mr. Gray confirmed that was correct.

Applicant Presentation

No applicant presentation as staff is the applicant.

Public Comments

John Proctor, 1505 Shadybrook Drive. (Support)

Mr. Proctor sought clarification as to whether the paved area would be designated for stored vehicles or for customers visiting the property. Mr. Gray stated any public parking area would be required to be paved, while the vehicle storage area could be gravel.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Kindel expressed support for allowing gravel parking surfaces, noting the City's stormwater runoff concerns. She sought clarification on how tall the fence must be. Mr. Gray confirmed the fence would be eight feet tall.

Commissioner Bird asked whether taller fencing could be used to screen vehicles such as RVs. Mr. Gray stated alternative fence heights may be requested administratively or through the Board of Adjustment. Commissioner Bird supported allowing taller fencing when necessary for screening.

Commissioner McDaniel asked whether a taller vehicle could comply if positioned far enough from the fence that it was not visible. Mr. Gray stated the requirement is for vehicles and equipment to be completely screened and indicated a non-visible vehicle would comply. Commissioner McDaniel supported providing staff flexibility in applying the requirement. Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager, clarified fences over eight feet require Board of Adjustment approval.

Commissioner Jablonski asked about current regulations for trailer and vehicle storage, noting some existing facilities he has seen do not appear to have opaque fencing. He stated the proposal appeared more restrictive in its screening requirements but less restrictive by allowing gravel. Mr. Gray stated he could not address a specific property without knowing its zoning.

Commissioner Kindel asked whether this type of vehicle storage is currently permitted in a specific zoning district. Ms. Hoggatt stated requirements depend on the zoning and type of storage and some existing uses may be grandfathered. Mr. Gray added vehicles held for sale may be considered business inventory in certain districts.

Commissioner Brewer noted auto repair and similar commercial businesses may have different vehicle storage allowances depending on zoning.

Commissioner McKown asked whether a tree line could satisfy the opaque screening requirement. Mr. Gray stated typical fencing material would be required.

Commissioner Bird stated that clarification may be needed regarding what constitutes "completely screened" and supported allowing staff to determine whether taller items are adequately screened based on placement and sight lines.

Commissioner Kindel noted elevation and lot size could affect whether stored items are visible. Commissioner Bird added existing properties may be grandfathered and the proposed requirements are primarily applying to future uses.

Commissioner McDaniel emphasized the need for clear language so property owners and developers understand the requirements. Ms. Hoggatt explained she would interpret "completely screened" as requiring the storage area to be screened on all sides rather than requiring the fence to match the height of stored items. Commissioner McDaniel supported incorporating that interpretation into the language.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether the proposed language was available for review. Mr. Gray stated there was no PowerPoint presentation because the amendment would

apply throughout the I-1 district not just at one property. Commissioner Brewer also suggested clarifying acceptable screening materials.

Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney, clarified the Commission was determining whether the proposed use was similar in character to permitted I-1 uses and, if approved, it would become an allowable use going forward. She stated screening language used elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance already has established interpretations and any different application should be specifically stated.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether similar eight-foot opaque fence requirements existed elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Muckala deferred to Planning staff and noted that the Commission could deny the request with recommendations for revised language rather than developing new language during the meeting.

Commissioner Kindel asked whether existing screening standards already establish acceptable materials. Ms. Hoggatt explained that opaque fencing may use various materials but cannot include corrugated fiberglass, corrugated metal, unpaneled sheet metal, or barbed wire. She noted similar eight-foot screening requirements apply to I-1 impoundment yards and that the Commission could modify or expand that language.

Commissioner Jablonski expressed concern that vehicle storage on gravel could generate more dust than an impoundment yard and questioned how the existing dust provisions would apply.

Commissioner Kindel noted other permitted I-1 uses, including the storage of sand, gravel, and cement, could generate more dust than vehicle storage. She stated the proposed use was similar in character and supported allowing gravel surfaces subject to applicable screening requirements.

Ms. Muckala clarified that dust generation is a factor in determining whether the proposed use is similar in character to existing I-1 uses. If the Commission determined the use would generate more dust than comparable uses, that could provide a basis for denial.

Commissioner Bird noted existing I-1 language allows outdoor storage to be screened by ornamental fences, walls, or evergreen plantings so it cannot be seen from a public street. Ms. Hoggatt confirmed that the language is contained within the same zoning provisions.

Ms. Muckala questioned whether the word “completely” was creating ambiguity in the screening requirement. Commissioner McDaniel agreed and supported removing it. Commissioner Bird summarized the apparent consensus as finding the use similar in character, allowing gravel, and requiring screening by ornamental fences, walls, or evergreen plantings so stored vehicles cannot be seen from a public street. Commissioner Kindel agreed.

Commissioner Jablonski remained concerned that frequent traffic on larger gravel areas could generate significant dust and suggested addressing regular dust generation while still allowing gravel parking. Ms. Hoggatt noted frequently traveled gravel can also become compacted and lose permeability.

Brandon Brooks, Capital Projects Engineer, explained gravel materials and different drainage characteristics of each.

Commissioner Parker asked for clarification regarding the determinations before the Commission and how dust would be addressed. Commissioner Bird stated that the Commission was considering whether the use was similar in character to other I-1 uses and whether gravel was appropriate for vehicle storage, with dust being a concern related to gravel.

Commissioner Kindel stated that many existing I-1 uses could generate greater dust concerns and did not believe additional dust language was necessary. Commissioner Bird noted a general consensus not to add additional dust provisions while acknowledging Commissioner Jablonski's concerns.

Motion to approve the uses as similar in character and gravel to be an appropriate use but with language change to strike the word completely from completely screened and to strike that it be screened by an eight-foot- tall opaque fence to replace it with by ornamental fences, walls, or evergreen planting that cannot be seen from a public street, made by Chair Bird, **Seconded** by Commissioner McKown.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel
Voting Nay: Vice Chair Jablonski

The motion was approved.

Juniper Sage at Cobblestone Creek

6. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2627-2: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 36-201 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN SO AS TO REMOVE A TRACT OF LAND LYING IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 8 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST, OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA FROM A PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND PLACE THE SAME IN PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (4403 12th AVE S.E.; WARD 7)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report
2. Supporting AIM Documents
3. Location Map
4. Amended PUD
5. Site Plan
6. Green Space Plan
7. Sign Location
8. Pre-Development Summary
9. Protest Letters

Staff Presentation

Logan Gray, Planner II, presented the staff report for the Juniper Sage at Cobblestone Creek project.

Commissioner McDaniel sought clarification on the wording used to describe the age restriction in the original PUD. Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager, stated it was for 55 plus.

Applicant Presentation

Joe Krodel, the applicant's representative, presented the Juniper Sage at Cobblestone Creek project.

Jay Rippeto, applicant, presented the Juniper Sage at Cobblestone Creek project.

Commissioner Kindel asked how removing the age restriction would affect who could live at the property. Mr. Krodel explained age restrictions generally must qualify under 55-and-older housing requirements to comply with fair housing laws. He stated families with children could reside there, but the unit mix and price point are intended to attract adult professionals rather than by-the-bed student tenants.

Mr. Rippeto added that fair housing requirements prevent excluding families with children or designating individual buildings exclusively for seniors. He stated the development would not offer by-the-bed rentals and that rent levels, unit mix, and location are expected to influence the resident demographic.

Commissioner McClure asked how the development intended to discourage student occupancy while complying with fair housing requirements. Mr. Rippeto stated they do not intend to accept parental guarantees or offer seasonal or by-the-bed leasing, although some students could independently qualify. Commissioner McClure expressed support for the request.

Commissioner McDaniel asked whether the federal 80/20 rule for senior housing could allow some residents under age 55 without modifying the PUD. Mr. Krodel explained federal regulations allow certain exceptions, including up to 20 percent of occupancy by persons under 55, but felt that flexibility would not sufficiently address the development's occupancy and financial concerns.

Commissioner McDaniel asked whether the existing PUD prevented use of the 80/20 flexibility. Mr. Krodel stated that the PUD and covenants identify the development as senior housing. Mr. Rippeto added that the property has historically been marketed as a 55-and-older community, making it challenging to attract younger residents while retaining that designation. He stated that they had recently begun adjusting their marketing.

Commissioner Jablonski asked whether alternatives to removing the age restriction had been considered, including conversion to assisted living. Mr. Rippeto stated the property was designed to accommodate a potential future conversion to independent or assisted living, although modifications such as a commercial kitchen would be

necessary. He stated they would consider selling or leasing for such a use but had not actively sought an operator for a conversion.

Commissioner Bird asked whether the property's Opportunity Zone status affected the owners' ability to sell. Mr. Rippeto stated selling before approximately 2030 or 2031 could result in the loss of certain tax benefits. However, an earlier sale could become necessary if occupancy does not improve and the owners discontinue financial support.

Commissioner Bird asked about current occupancy. Mr. Rippeto stated approximately 95 or 96 of the 168 units were occupied, or roughly 57 percent.

Commissioner Bird asked whether a portion of the development could remain 55-and-older while opening the remaining units to other residents. Mr. Krodel stated his understanding was that senior housing requirements generally apply to the development as a whole, subject to the 80/20 framework, and the proposed arrangement would not be permitted under the current zoning and covenants.

Commissioner Bird asked whether dividing the property or individual buildings could affect that determination. Ms. Hoggatt stated her understanding was federal requirements apply to the development as a whole and at least 80 percent would need to qualify as senior housing for the applicable fair housing exemption.

Public Comments

Linda Wright, 4403 12th Ave. S.E. (Protest)

Eldie "Lois" Morris, 4403 12th Ave. S.E. (Protest)

Lori Mouse, 4403 12th Ave. S.E. (Protest)

Kissie Mouse, 4403 12th Ave. S.E. (Protest)

Timothy Shannon, 4704 Augusta Dr. (Support)

Bonnie Holmes, 4403 12th Ave. S.E. (Protest)

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Bird thanked those in attendance for their participation and feedback and acknowledged the strong sense of community surrounding the development.

Commissioner Brewer asked when the zoning change would take effect if approved and whether the effective date could be deferred to give current residents additional time. Mr. Gray stated the change would take effect 30 days after City Council approval and he was unaware of deferred zoning.

Commissioner Brewer noted a 30-day effective date could create a significant change for current residents with existing leases. Ms. Muckala stated she would need to research whether a deferred effective date was possible but noted zoning decisions generally address the property and surrounding development as they currently exist.

Commissioner Bird asked whether City Council could postpone consideration of the item. Ms. Muckala explained first reading is generally required for public notice, while postponements at second reading are within City Council's discretion.

Commissioner Bird asked whether City Council could postpone the item on its own motion rather than at the applicant's request. Ms. Muckala confirmed City Council could do so.

Commissioner Jablonski asked whether City Council could require residents to be released from their leases if the PUD change were approved. Ms. Muckala stated lease provisions are generally better addressed through private contracts rather than zoning regulations.

Commissioner Bird noted that the Commission had also received a request regarding HOA dues and stated private HOA dues and rental rates would not be appropriate matters for the Planning Commission to regulate.

Commissioner Brewer asked about the development's current policy regarding children. Mr. Rippeto stated children may visit, but households with children are not currently permitted to lease units.

Mr. Rippeto stated, if the request is approved, management intends to allow residents to terminate their leases with 60 days' notice regardless of the remaining lease term. Residents whose leases expire before City Council consideration could also transition to month-to-month arrangements, and additional leasing incentives may be offered.

Commissioner Griffith asked about proposed rent incentives and noted some residents had not previously heard about them. Mr. Rippeto stated approximately 40 to 50 residents attended an earlier meeting where these issues were discussed, out of an estimated 120 residents.

Commissioner Griffith asked whether rent incentives would be standardized or individually negotiated. Mr. Rippeto stated management intends to publish a standardized leasing plan allowing residents to terminate with 60 days' notice or renew with incentives based on the length of the lease term.

Commissioner Griffith asked whether future marketing would target graduate students and young professionals. Mr. Rippeto stated the property would be marketed to applicants meeting the income requirements, noting the requirement of approximately three times the monthly rent could make it difficult for many full-time students to qualify.

Commissioner Jablonski supported moving the request forward rather than postponing it, noting both the applicant and residents would benefit from certainty. He suggested the applicant put its lease commitments in writing before City Council consideration so residents and Council would have a clear understanding of what was being offered.

Commissioner Bird stated lease agreements and negotiations are private matters that should not be mandated through the Commission's recommendation. She encouraged the applicant to improve communication with residents through meetings, newsletters, or other formal communications.

Commissioner Bird added residents could contact City Council members, submit additional letters, and provide public comment at the meeting before Council considers the request. She encouraged continued transparency from the applicant but reiterated lease terms should remain a private matter.

Commissioner McKown agreed additional communication from management could help residents understand their options and make informed decisions. She agreed it was not the Commission's role to dictate how those private matters should be handled.

Commissioner Kindel emphasized clear communication could affect residents' trust and the property's future occupancy. She noted management has an incentive to thoroughly screen future tenants to maintain the quality of the community and retain existing residents.

Commissioner Kindel acknowledged the development challenges faced by the applicant and encouraged greater communication with residents before City Council consideration. She stated increased transparency could help residents feel more informed and potentially build support for the proposed change.

Commissioner Parker expressed concern that the discussion had become too focused on how the applicant should operate its business. He noted the applicant developed the senior housing requested by the community, but it had not performed as anticipated and stated the Commission should focus on the requested change to the age restriction.

Commissioner McKown acknowledged existing residents were being asked to accept a significant change from what they originally agreed to. She encouraged residents to remain open to the potential benefits of intergenerational living.

Commissioner McKown also emphasized adequate occupancy is necessary to maintain the development's financial viability, amenities, and overall quality. She stated the request was reasonable given changing market conditions and expressed support for the PUD amendment.

Commissioner Bird reminded the Commission zoning runs with the land rather than the applicant. She acknowledged the significant support and opposition to the request and noted that the issue was complex, with strong perspectives on both sides.

Commissioner Bird highlighted the development's one-bedroom units, noting this type of housing is limited within the community and could provide valuable options for working professionals and other residents.

Commissioner Brewer thanked the residents for participating and the applicant for appearing before the Commission. He noted the discussion allowed the applicant to hear residents' concerns directly while providing transparency regarding the development's financial challenges.

Motion to approve made by Commissioner Brewer, **Seconded** by Commissioner Griffith.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Vice Chair Jablonski, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel

Planning Commission recommended approval of O-2627-2.

Cedar Lane

7. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-65: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 36-201 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN SO AS TO REMOVE A TRACT OF LAND LYING IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4) OF SECTION SIXTEEN (16), TOWNSHIP EIGHT (8) NORTH, RANGE TWO (2) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA FROM A PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND PART OF THE EAST HALF (E/2) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION SIXTEEN (16), TOWNSHIP EIGHT (8) NORTH, RANGE TWO (2) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW/4) OF SECTION SIXTEEN (16), TOWNSHIP EIGHT (8) NORTH, RANGE TWO (2) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA FROM PL, PARK LAND DISTRICT, AND PLACE THE SAME IN THE R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (NEAR 12TH AVE SE AND CEDAR LANE RD; WARD 7)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report

The applicant requests postponement to the September 10, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

8. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2627-3: A PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR CEDAR LANE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report

The applicant requests postponement to the September 10, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion to postpone O-2526-65 and PP-2627-3 to the September 10, 2026 Planning Commission meeting made by Commissioner Kindel, **Seconded** by Secretary Parker.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Vice Chair Jablonski, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel

The motion was approved.

Franklin Baptist Church

9. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2627-4: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 36-201 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN SO AS TO REMOVE LOTS ONE (1) THROUGH TWENTY (20), INCLUSIVE, OF BLOCK TWO (2), BEING PART OF THE ORIGINAL TOWN PLAT OF FRANKLIN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA AS FILED IN PLAT BOOK 1 AT PAGE 99, DATED MAY 29, 1908 IN THE CLEVELAND COUNTY CLERK'S RECORDS, FROM THE A-2, RURAL AGRICULTAL DISTRICT, AND PLACE SAME IN A SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (7327 E FRANKLIN RD, WARD 5)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report

The applicant requests postponement to the December 10, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion to postpone O-2627-4 to the December 10, 2026 Planning Commission meeting made by Commissioner Kindel, **Seconded** by Commissioner McKown.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Vice Chair Jablonski, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel

The motion was approved.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

ADJOURNMENT