



# CITY OF NORMAN, OK PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069  
Thursday, May 09, 2024 at 6:30 PM

---

## MINUTES

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2024.

Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <https://norman-ok.municodemeetings.com> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Erica Bird called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

#### PRESENT

Cameron Brewer  
Steven McDaniel  
Michael Jablonski  
Erica Bird  
Jim Griffith  
Kevan Parker

#### ABSENT

Liz McKown  
Doug McClure  
Maria Kindel

A quorum was present.

#### STAFF PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Planning & Community Development Director  
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager  
Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney  
David Riesland, Transportation Engineer  
Jack Burdett, Subdivision Development Coordinator  
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer  
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist  
Roné Tromble, Admin. Tech. IV  
Whitney Kline, Admin. Tech. III

\*

## **NON-CONSENT ITEMS**

### **Norman 2025, PUD & Preliminary Plat**

3. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTION R-2324-126: A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN SO AS TO REMOVE PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION ELEVEN (11), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE THREE (3) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN (I.M.), CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE OFFICE DESIGNATION AND PLACE THE SAME IN THE COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION. (EAST OF 36<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE N.W., NORTH OF W. TECUMSEH ROAD, AND WEST OF I-35)

#### **ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Staff Report
  2. NORMAN 2025 Plan Map
4. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-42: 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 PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION ELEVEN (11), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE THREE (3) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, AND PLACE SAME IN THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (EAST OF 36TH AVENUE N.W., NORTH OF W. TECUMSEH ROAD, AND WEST OF I-35)

#### **ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Staff Report
  2. Location Map
  3. PUD Narrative with Exhibits A-E
  4. Pre-Development Summary
  5. Preliminary Site Plan
5. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2324-15: CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY CARROLL FARM, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR CARROLL FARM ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED East of 36th Avenue N.W., North of W. Tecumseh Road, and West of I-35 WITH ALLEY WAIVER FOR COMMERCIAL LOTS LESS THAN ONE ACRE.

#### **ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Staff Report
2. Transportation Impacts
3. Location Map
4. Request for Alley Waiver
5. Preliminary Plat
6. Preliminary Site Plan



**PRESENTATION BY STAFF:** Lora Hoggatt reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes.

Mr. Jablonski asked if requests for alley waiver are common. Mr. McLellan explained that alley waivers are pretty common since we don't really require alleys.

**PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:** Gunner Joyce, representing the applicant, reported that the prior preliminary plat also had an alley waiver. With the larger commercial lots, they can take care of deliveries and access without needing an alley in the back.

He reviewed the area surrounding the subject property, and the site plan for the proposed development. The current plan has reduced parking substantially and increased green space, and has a more creative layout. The PUD allows for commercial, office, and multi-family. The far north portion next to the detention pond is a senior living site. There are 42 townhouse units proposed just south of that detention pond, with walking trails around the pond. The preliminary plat shows 30 lots over 44.68 acres. There have been no filed protests. A full TIA was done.

Ms. Bird asked about concerns from All Saints School at Pre-Development about specific uses. Mr. Joyce reported that their representatives spoke with the owner, and have not filed a protest. There are substantial and very restrictive covenants on file, and some of the uses in the allowable use list are currently prohibited, and the covenants might be further updated. The owners want to make sure that they control the tenant mix to keep the property values as high as possible.

Mr. Brewer asked why uses that are already restricted are being included in the allowable use list. Mr. Joyce responded that circumstances change over time; if everyone was happy with a change at the covenant level, they wouldn't have to come back for a PUD amendment. Ms. Bird asked for an explanation how covenants can be amended. Mr. Joyce explained that the statutes for covenants include a timing mechanism for covenants which don't have an amendment procedure; he believes it takes 65-75% of the owners to agree to an amendment. After the time mechanism is up, he believes it takes 50% of the owners to amend.

Mr. Jablonski asked about the amount of green space. Mr. Joyce responded there is currently 35% for the whole development. The PUD statute requires a minimum of 10%.

Mr. Griffith asked when construction will start. Mr. Joyce said he doesn't believe they have a specific date, but there are very interested parties. Ms. Bird added that she has seen that the lots are being marketed for sale.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:** None

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

Ms. Bird commented that she was happy to see some smaller lots being available that might allow for a local business to locate in the development.

Motion made by Griffith, seconded by Parker, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-2324-126, Ordinance No. O-2324-42, and PP-2324-15 for Carroll Farm Addition, A Planned Unit Development, to City Council.

Voting Yea: Brewer, McDaniel, Jablonski, Bird, Griffith, Parker

The motion to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-2324-126, Ordinance No. O-2324-42, and PP-2324-15 to City Council passed by a vote of 6-0.

\*