

November 4, 2025

Norman Planning Commission  
225 N. Webster Avenue  
Norman, OK 73069

FILED IN THE OFFICE  
OF THE CITY CLERK

ON 11/7/25

RE: Premium Homes, LLC  
Requested Amendment of AIM Norman Comprehensive Land Use Plan

From: Urban Reserve Designation and Urban Low Density  
To: Urban Low Designation and from A-2, Rural Agricultural District, to a PUD  
Case Number: PD25-25

Applicant: Premium Homes, LLC (AKA Premium Land, LLC., Whispering Hills  
Premium Land, LLC, Taber Homes)

Planning Commission:

Thank you for allowing the Public & surrounding residents the opportunity to express our sincere input into whether this proposed change to the AIM Norman Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Plan) should be approved. As a directly adjacent resident I respectfully request patient consideration of the value of the change as well as intent as this decision will represent a "precedence" in how future applications will be evaluated and decided. **I am sternly opposed to the requested Amendment of the AIM Plan and the proposed PUD resulting in densifying an area of rural east Norman that is not currently an established need or consistent with the character of the area.**

I have been a resident of Norman my entire life and my family has previously owned the property in question and surrounding properties far longer (some dating back as far as the Land Run). My home and family properties align with the extent of the property in question directly adjacent of the west property line. I am a licensed architect & interior designer in the state and professionally familiar with the development process in Norman having worked on an extensive number of projects over the last 25 years. When not an architect, we are ranchers and farmers of the land. As an architect I am not against development, though I am fiercely thoughtful to responsible development and design intent. The proposed request does not appear in keeping with the current approved AIM Plan as thought out and presented by the City of Norman, DEQ general requirements, and City of Norman development requirements.

As described in the original notice letter the current property, and most of the adjacent properties are zoned A-2. While the letter notes a 350' foot notification to adjacent properties, a zoning request change affects a far larger community in the area than the potential recipients noted. When I built my home approximately 16 ½ years ago the minimum allowable plat to build a home was 10 acres. Our family were made to believe that intent was to preserve the open acreages in rural Norman and promote the densification of homes closer to the central part of town. A notion that appears still in keeping with the current AIM Plan strategy. However, that also suggests that the population of homeowners & land owners are more "spread out" and to that end a potentially smaller response to voice concern to this zoning change request simply because they are out of the noted radius. It certainly does not mean the outcome of this decision would not have a greater impact on others in the surrounding area.

I would like to specifically draw attention to three important points about the new AIM Planning Maps as it specifically notes in Bullet Item #1 of Property Owners Decide that these changes were anticipated to occur "slowly." The submission occurs on the heels of many residents in the affected areas already losing homes & property to the Turnpike and makes this specific request appear **very** suspect as to its intent and need. The original issuance of this proposed change included a plan of intent to the planned development with represented (60) sixty homes in a slightly less than 50 acre area. When asked during the residents presentation the developer admitted sixty homes would not be realistic if they were forced to comply with water detention nor were they prepared to address compliance to Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) regarding storm water, septic, well permit use, and where the water would ultimately go. As a property owner I am left with an assumption that the property is in the proposed OTA Turnpike North /South pathway and a property zoned A2 would not profit as much in damages from acquisition /eminent domain, but sixty houses in a PUD would be financially different if approved. If the OTA process were halted, the developer has still deviated from the AIM Plan and gained property graphically shown in the Reserve 2045 Map. The developer noted even if the turnpike goes through, if the zoning request passed the intent would still be to place as many homes allowed immediately adjacent to the turnpike.

The AIM Future Land Use Map denoting the affected area in reference to Bullet Item #3 states The Generalized Land Use locations and transitions are meant to show APPROXIMATE areas for transition, rather than rigid boundaries. This development is a significant jump or "leap" into the current planned uses of the land and is geographically far from a similar development and would not in my opinion be a reasonable "transition" based on the City of Norman's projected pace of needed growth to allow a PUD



development in density this far east of established natural progression and are supposed to develop “evenly.”

As shown below, no other zoning (PUD) with this density has progressed even remotely close to this location so there is a good argument that the PUD density zoning is not progressing at an appropriate transitional pace based on surrounding uses and need. Additionally, the proposed density jump location has not had progressive roadway improvements capable of safely supporting this type residential development onto Robinson at the frontage due to the existing roadway profile and line of sight. The current intersection of Robinson & 48<sup>th</sup> Street has over the years been a dangerous intersection with a number of fatalities due to poor line of sight and the current 50 mph speed limit. The proposed PUD would exponentially increase the threat to driver safety for any increased traffic pulling out onto Robinson with the blind spot of traffic coming from westbound traffic as well as any westbound traffic potentially pulling off of Robinson. Should the OTA extension move forward they generally prefer to bridge under roadways. The proposed location has a significant large diameter City of Norman Treatment Plant water line (running East /West) which would force OTA to go above Robinson Street, further restricting safe line of sight. Other site plan feasibility issues are the gas transmission pipeline easement and development limitations.



The gas transmission pipeline and its easement is designated “plow depth” which plainly means just that farm plow depth. The physical line itself in a number of locations within the length of this acreage are only a few inches deep. When asked of the developer how they intended to control or detail water they noted a likelihood of significant grading would be required (the gas line is the highest point on the ridge and all of the acreage slopes down to the west) and I would question if the current line depth complies with the City of Norman depth requirements to have a residence in proximity that shallow and knowing it is fuel.

All of the proposed acreage are graphically represented and shown in the AIM Mapping as 2045 Reserve. The proposed PUD does not reflect the noted 2045 Reserve Areas Characteristics & Intent and I would specifically note the clause "New Development in this area should be done with sensitivity and ONLY when City services are available to adequately serve future use." The current location has a 12" reduced well line extension on the north side of Robinson (originally installed to help service the lift station of the Water Treatment Plant line), no existing storm water or sanitary sewer infrastructure exists in the area and the Reserve 2045 clause clearly states a development like the proposed would require this infrastructure and be at the cost of the developer. The slide that was graphically presented during the initial presentation by the developer appeared to take some liberty with the extents of the purple Urban boundary (incorrectly) where the AIM Plan shows the property as Reserve 2045. I personally believe the boundary is reflected in the AIM Plan as Reserve 2045 due to the extents of acreage grade sloping west which is a origin point to the Thunderbird Watershed and there is not any infrastructure to control it or support this type of development.

The proposed PUD plan represented 60 houses on  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre lots and unclear as to how permanent structures would sit on these lots and still provide access to easements. As previously noted the insufficient and complete lack of City service infrastructure would require all residences to use septic systems and well-line water. DEG regulations Title 252 Oklahoma Administrative Code Chapter 641 specifically states 10,000 sqft separation between septic and well systems. It does not appear that the site, the proposed layout, nor the number of residents could be supported under those conditions and still meet DEQ regulations & qualified registration.

The proposed PUD appears to eliminate the existing pond and has no apparent provisions for detention or storm water run-off. All City Planning Developments are supposed to NOT increase storm water run-off onto adjacent developments, and property holders than what was naturally occurring before said development. Extensive site modifications would be required to prevent uncontrolled, excess storm water from the proposed increased paved hard scape & roof shed surfaces and would violate a number of City development requirements as well as create a dramatic increase to the watershed and residences to the north.

Existing PUD developments that back up to green belts often require additional fencing setbacks and must be mowed /maintained. The existing abutting properties are zoned and actively used as agricultural & grazing (in keeping with the intent of why the 2045 Reserve designation was implemented) meaning the only separation between residence and livestock cattle is implied fencing or setback.



In summary, the proposed PUD does not appear to be in keeping with the current city growth & development, lacks need and supporting infrastructure, and does not meet the stated AIM Plan projections, intent, and requirements to justify any consideration of the proposed development.

The PUD request appears to be a property flip effort in light of the recent Turnpike South Extension announcements. The property has changed ownership twice since the end of July 2025 making the rushed intent of this PUD request very suspect to adjacent property owners and developers alike. The property is shown to be in the direct path of the proposed Turnpike extension and allowing a zoning change would enable the current owner grounds to claim development damages on 60 houses, significantly more than what they could be claimed with 50 acres of undeveloped agricultural land. Similar instances can be referenced in Moore City Council Meeting Agendas with PUD requests of properties within the OTA Turnpike East /West Corridor path.

I personally believe The City of Norman was standing up for rural east Norman residents in support against the turnpike and others coming in to adversely push developments in east Norman, but this change if we make it would be self-imposed and difficult to not step back and say "we did this to ourselves." The damage that would do to the City of Norman would be that this instance would set a precedent to other developers and land grabbers to file for PUD's in any 2045 Reserve allocations they wanted as it was already allowed in this location. Now, this developer can potentially still claim development damage even without a City of Norman approved zoning change and the City of Norman would still protect the implied intent of the AIM Mapping plans.

As a resident, and property owner in rural east Norman, I politely ask for that consideration and appreciate your time. If you would like to discuss any of these comments, please feel free to call me at 405.550.6220 or email at [fattylebruski@gmail.com](mailto:fattylebruski@gmail.com)

Sincerely,



Mike Bruehl, AIA, ID

1001 48<sup>th</sup> Ave NE