

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

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 grew up on this land, having been passed down through generations for the last 137 years. My parents used to own the property in question and now my brothers, and I own the surrounding properties. Our family properties align with the length of the west property line in question, and I own properties both East and North that abut to or would potentially be affected by watershed into the creek below. I am a self-employed (technically retired), now full-time rancher /farmer. I raise and trade cattle livestock, farm hay for us to feed our livestock & surrounding neighbors who do the same. I also support my two brothers in maintaining the properties owned in the area clearing cedars, scrub trees, and unwanted native rose bushes for the cattle. We are generational born ranchers and farmers of the land taught to us by our parents and their parents. Reviewing the proposed documents provided amongst our affected family, the proposed request does not appear to be in keeping with the current approved AIM Plan as thought out and presented by the City of Norman. Our properties, homes, and acreages are already being threatened by the Turnpike Authority (OTA), mine

probably more than most. Our family collectively had taken some comfort and hope in preservation for our way of life when we viewed the City of Norman AIM Plan mapping, specifically referencing the Reserve 2045 Map.

Nearly all the properties in the surrounding areas are currently zoned A2, and I farm and cut hay on many of them. When the new mapping got posted from the City of Norman, we had some serious concerns that almost of our properties were planned to be zoned as future Urban Development. The land is truly our way of life; we do not plan to move or sell. The land has been in my family far longer than we can remember, some as old as the Land Run and for decades we have fought to keep it. The Reserve 2045 Map at least notes conditions that appear to preserve the rate of expansion in the city to protect rural east Norman residents and we personally value that stance very much. Also concerning the noted radius of the notification letters. While some properties do not have a residence on them, MANY have livestock leases and are used with the honest intent of agriculture. Those individuals may be unaware of the zoning request, and it allowed in this instance could set an example for others to do the same. It certainly does not mean the outcome of this decision would not have a greater impact on others in the surrounding area.

Of real concern is the proposed developments intend to place (60) sixty homes on this property. I traverse and have farmed this land almost every day all my life so I can confidently say ALL drainage of this site gets confined to one location. The location is a starting inlet to the Thunderbird Watershed and directly affects every home, rancher, and farmer north of this location until it turns back east to the lake. Our family has strived hard to maintain the natural landscape of native grasses for the cattle, so we are acutely aware of erosion, potential damage to the landscape's natural growth, and the likely increased introduction of pesticides, fertilizers, soaps, detergents, etc into the watershed should this rezoning occur. The abutting property immediately west of the proposed rezoning has not one but two of the largest sandstone /rose rock shelves in the surrounding area and these formations continue north along this creek line to the property where my brothers and I grew up. What makes this significant is that the sandstone is naturally porous and the creek below contains three natural drip springs pools. Pools that drip continuously year-round, so we do not have to break ice in the winter to assure the cattle have water (we are losing the only other source with the pond that currently exists in the zoning request area, the overflow of that pond runs directly toward one of the rock shelves). We have all been made aware of rules regarding development water runoff and not increasing what goes onto adjacent properties more than before it was developed. Like my other family members quite honestly do not see how that would be possible in this location with the amount of hard surface that is proposed to be introduced and not be a frowned upon development with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) regarding storm water



(no existing infrastructure and required per the Reserve 2045 Map), septic proximity, well permit use & proximity to septic, and where the water would ultimately go, but what might be introduced to the watershed from this proposed development and the number of homes to be on well service and septic as well. How might the increased demand on ground water (if the infrastructure of treated water does not suffice) with sixty homes potentially affect the naturally occurring dripping springs below?

As currently proposed, I will be a very direct target affected by OTA Turnpike North /South pathway. I stand to lose significant property from acquisition /eminent domain, and we are concerned sixty houses in a PUD would dramatically affect the water quality & water table in this location. If the OTA progresses and developments like this continue, quite frankly ranchers /farmers are running out of acreage to sustain a living. For some, this is all we know and does not appear to coincide with the intent of the Reserve 2045 Map.

In summary, I sternly do NOT support the proposed PUD as it does not appear to be in keeping with the current city development plan, lacks supporting infrastructure, does not meet the stated AIM Plan projections implied intent, and lacks many of the noted requirements to justify any consideration for this kind of development.

The Rural East City of Norman Residents are being asked and will continue to face a lot of assumed compromise, but the intent as residents understood shown in the AIM Maps and clearly denote "planned growth and infrastructure." The proposed appears to be neither, but in fact a rushed effort to get a zoning passed with utter disregard for the surrounding owner. East Norman residents very sincerely hope the City of Norman considers the real need, the real intent (knowing a Turnpike through this area appears imminent), but also the precedent that would be set for other PUD's like this in the future that would directly affect properties graphically represented in the 2045 Reserve plan. As a property owner raised rancher and farmer that continues to utilize the land as we always have, these developments are a concern.

I politely ask for consideration of the comments & concerns noted and appreciate your time.

Sincerely,



Elmer Bruehl  
510 60<sup>th</sup> Ave N.E.