



CITY OF NORMAN, OK
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
Development Center, Room A, 225 N. Webster Ave., Norman, OK 73069
Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 4:30 PM

MINUTES

The Board of Adjustment of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in Conference Room A at the Development Center, on Wednesday, October 22, 2025 at 4:30 PM. Notice of the agenda of the meeting was posted at the Development Center at 225 N. Webster Ave, the Norman Municipal Building at 201 West Gray, and on the City website at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Curtis McCarty called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Curtis McCarty
Brad Worster
Micky Webb
Ben Bigelow
James Howard
Eric Williams
Matt Graves

STAFF PRESENT

Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Justin Fish, Planner I
AshLynn Wilkerson, Assistant City Attorney I
Laci Witcher, Permit Technician
Amy Woolington, Permit Technician

GUESTS PRESENT

Colton Wayman, Wallace Design Collective, 410 N. Walnut Avenue

MINUTES

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

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2025.

Motion by Mr. Worster to approve the minutes of September 24, 2025, Board of Adjustment regular meeting; **Second** by Mr. Bigelow.

The motion passed with a vote of 6-0. Mr. Webb abstained.

VARIANCE REQUESTS

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF BOA-2526-5: DP GAMBLE HOMES REQUESTS A VARIANCE TO SECTION 36-514(C)(1)(A) OF 7'1" TO THE REQUIRED 25' FRONT YARD SETBACK, AND A VARIANCE TO SECTION 36-514(C)(2)(C) OF 5" TO THE REQUIRED 20' OF DISTANCE BETWEEN A GARAGE WHICH FACES A STREET TO FRONT PROPERTY LINE FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1817 INGLENOK DRIVE.

The applicant has withdrawn this request.

Motion by Mr. Bigelow to approve the withdrawal; **Second** by Mr. Graves.

The motion passed with a vote of 7-0.

3. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF BOA-2526-6: ALPHA PHI SORORITY REQUESTS A VARIANCE TO SECTION 36-551(B)(2)(B) OF 10' TO THE REQUIRED 20' LANDSCAPING STRIP AND THE REQUIRED THREE-FOOT TO FOUR-FOOT MASONRY OR ROCK WALL FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1401 COLLEGE AVENUE.

Staff Presentation

Justin Fish, Planner I, presented the staff report.

Mr. McCarty asked Mr. Fish to outline the options provided for the applicant to meet the City's requirements.

Mr. Fish proposed narrowing the angled parking aisle to 12 feet to allow expansion of the landscape buffer, relocating parking to the north side of the lot, or pursuing a SPUD to allow a 10-foot variance without requiring a masonry wall.

Mr. Worster confirmed the issue stems from adjacent R-3 zoning and asked if a landscaping strip and a rock wall were required. Mr. Fish said only the landscaping strip is needed, however, adding a 3-to-4-foot masonry wall would allow a smaller strip without a variance.

Mr. Williams asked if a detention pond was located to the north. Mr. Fish deferred to the applicant, and Mr. Wayman confirmed it was a retention pond, not a detention pond.

Mr. McCarty asked for input from the legal department.

Ms. Wilkerson had no additional comments but said she would be happy to answer questions.

Applicant Presentation

Colton Wayman of Wallace Design presented the proposed project for an interior remodel and site improvements, including a new parking lot. Mr. Wayman said the change is needed for safe vehicle traffic flow and to meet the City's 84 parking space requirements. Mr. Wayman further

stated due to an underground electric easement, a masonry wall is not feasible, and the design aligns with nearby properties.

Mr. McCarty confirmed the project primarily involves interior work with no exterior expansion. Mr. Wayman added the circular drive would be modified and minor building alterations made to meet code requirements.

Mr. McCarty asked about current occupancy. Mr. Wayman stated the facility has 84 beds, likely full, with no plans to expand. Mr. Wayman further stated the primary goal is to bring parking up to code.

Mr. McCarty asked if the 84 parking spaces included ADA spaces. Mr. Wayman said none currently exist and new ADA compliant spaces would be added. When asked about shifting the site north to avoid the east side, he explained it would be impractical, increase impervious surface, and be difficult to implement. Mr. Wayman was unsure of the current pervious area.

Mr. McCarty asked how the City's proposed drive angle changes would affect the site. Mr. Wayman responded they reviewed the parking configuration and concluded it would not help achieve the 20-foot buffer from the property line.

Mr. McCarty asked whether OG&E had been consulted about installing a masonry wall. Mr. Wayman confirmed they had been contacted and noted that doing so would require digging up existing lines and possibly installing conduit. Mr. McCarty asked if OG&E would allow them to pave over the connection to the house. Mr. Wayman responded yes.

Mr. Bigelow stated while this was possible it would be costly. Mr. Wayman responded and warned there is a chance this may not be allowed. Mr. Bigelow noted OG&E had previously approved paving with conduit or relocation, but Mr. Wayman clarified discussions are ongoing with OG&E and approval is not guaranteed.

Mr. Worster asked if the existing parking lot had been reconfigured. Mr. Wayman replied it had been considered but it was not within the client's preferred range.

Mr. Williams questioned the City's parking ordinance, thinking it was canceled. Mr. Wayman clarified non-residential properties no longer have parking requirements. Ms. Hoggatt added that single-family and two-family homes require two spaces per unit, and fraternity/sorority houses require one space per accommodation.

Mr. Worster asked if the lines inside the easement were located. Mr. Wayman confirmed a private locate was completed and referred to the site plan for spacing and proximity to the house. Mr. Williams noted there were 84 beds but not 84 parking spaces. Mr. Wayman responded it was an old development, and a non-conforming use at this point.

Mr. McCarty asked about shifting parking, moving the retention area into the landscape zone, and using part of the buffer for retention. Mr. Wayman said the easement is likely the main constraint.

Mr. McCarty noted the easement is already within the landscape buffer and suggested angling the first part of the car therefore parking toward the northeast corner. Mr. Williams added the north side drive on the east could remain but be moved closer to the building.

Mr. Wayman said the retention area is best where it is due to the grade change. Mr. McCarty asked about adding parking in the circular drive. Mr. Wayman confirmed it is planned, estimating around eight spaces.

Mr. McCarty asked how many parking spaces were offered without the circular drive. Mr. Wayman said they were short 16 parking spaces. Mr. McCarty confirmed 13 parking spaces would be added in the back, including the circle drive. Mr. Waymon agreed.

Mr. Williams noted the survey shows 79 existing spaces.

Mr. Wayman noted new ADA spaces and reconfiguration, including stairs on the building's south side, will reduce existing parking spaces. Mr. McCarty confirmed he observed the ADA spaces that would be lost.

Mr. Wayman stated the existing parking lot striping will be modified.

Mr. Bigelow asked about the proposed number of parking spaces. Mr. Wayman said 84 parking spaces will meet the requirements for 84 beds.

Mr. Worster stated 87 parking spaces, excluding the circle drive. Mr. Wayman agreed and mentioned the site plan might be outdated.

Board of Adjustment Discussion

Mr. McCarty stated any approval, or denial should be based on the information presented by the applicant.

Mr. Wayman asked if the site plan is binding. Mr. Worster stated it absolutely is binding.

Mr. McCarty suggested postponing the item to gather more information, including showing parking spaces in the circular driveway for a total count or exploring alternatives without granting the adjustment.

Mr. Wayman asked whether it would be worthwhile to return to the Board of Adjustment in the future with the same proposal.

Mr. McCarty agreed, stating additional details such as parking counts, pervious surface data, an OG&E letter, and a revised site plan would help the Board evaluate the proposal more effectively. He also suggested enlarging the circular drive to add parking if impervious surface limits allow.

Ms. Hoggatt informed the applicant the next meeting would be on December 3, 2025.

Mr. Wayman requested postponement to the December 3, 2025 meeting.

Ms. Hoggatt clarified that decreasing aisle and space widths may not achieve the 20-foot buffer but would reduce the variance needed.

Mr. Bigelow asked why it was important for the staff report to note that the easements had been granted.

Ms. Hoggatt explained noting the easement relates to the variance criteria requiring special conditions, not resulting from the applicant's actions. In this case, the easement arose from the applicant granting the easement.

Motion by Mr. Webb to postpone BOA-2526-6 to December 3, 2025 Board of Adjustment meeting; **Second** by Mr. Graves.

The motion passed unanimously with a vote of 7-0.

Public Comments

There we no public comments.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Ms. Hoggatt reminded the Board about the Special Meeting scheduled for November 5, 2025. She explained the meeting was necessary due to advertising issues and revised figures from a survey that required re-advertising. She also thanked the Board members for agreeing to attend the additional meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Passed and approved this _____ day of _____ 2026.