



CITY OF NORMAN, OK
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - AMENDED
Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Thursday, May 14, 2026 at 5:30 PM

MINUTES

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, will meet in Regular Session in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Building, on Thursday, May 14, 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.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

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

ABSENT

Commissioner Douglas McClure
Commissioner Jim Griffith

STAFF PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Planning & Community Development Director
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Jonah McGuffie, Planner I
Anais Starr, 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

GUEST PRESENT

Cheryl & Norman Davis, 1401 36th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Trey Kirby, 201 W Gray, Norman, OK
Kyle & Aimee Dais, 1501 36th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK
Billy Jewell, 5201 Rustic Acres Trail, 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 APRIL 9, 2026.

Short Form Plats

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF SFP-2526-2: CONSIDERATION OF A SHORT FORM PLAT SUBMITTED BY RUSSELL VENTURES, LLC FOR 2710 36TH AVENUE N.W., FOR 0.49 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ONE-QUARTER MILE NORTH OF WEST ROCK CREEK ROAD ON THE WEST SIDE OF 36TH AVENUE N.W. (2710 36TH AVE N.W.; WARD 8)

Motion made by Commissioner McDaniel to approve all items on the Consent Docket, **Seconded** by Commissioner McKown.

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

The motion was approved.

NON-CONSENT ITEMS

Bellatona Addition

3. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-48: 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 (SW/4) AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW/4) OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 8 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM PL, PARK LAND DISTRICT, AND PLACE THE SAME IN R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (NEAR WILTSHIRE DRIVE AND ARCADY AVENUE; WARD 5)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. **Staff Report**
2. **Location Map**
3. **Preliminary Plat**
4. **Pre-Development Summary, 4-23-26**

4. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2526-16: CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY SHAZ INVESTMENT GROUP, LLC FOR BELLATONA ADDITION, FOR 104.49 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED NEAR WILTSHIRE DRIVE AND ARCADY AVENUE. (WARD 5)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. **Staff Report**
2. **Location Map**
3. **Preliminary Plat**
4. **Pre-Development Summary, 4-23-26**

5. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-49: 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 (SW/4) AND THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW/4) OF SECTION 2, TOWNSHIP 8 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, AND PLACE THE SAME IN PL, PARK LAND DISTRICT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (NEAR WILTSHIRE DRIVE AND ARCADY AVENUE; WARD 5)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. **Staff Report**
2. **Location Map**
3. **Preliminary Plat**
4. **Pre-Development Summary, 4-23-26**

Staff Presentation

Jonah McGuffie, Planner I, presented the staff report for the Bellatona Addition project.

Applicant Presentation

Libby Smith, representative of the applicant, presented the Bellatona Addition project.

Commissioner McDaniel asked whether the new park location is the same size as the previous park area. Ms. Smith stated that while the park location has changed, it still meets the park requirements for both Bellatona Addition and Summit Valley.

Commissioner Bird asked whether the proposed road connection could serve as an alternate route to Highway 9 for residents east of the site if traffic is blocked at 36th Avenue and Lindsey Street. Ms. Smith confirmed that it could.

Public Comments

Norman Davis, 1401 36th Ave. S.E., Norman, OK (protest)
Billy Jewell, 5201 Rustic Acres Trail, Norman, OK (protest)

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Parker asked about stormwater concerns raised during public comments and whether the applicant had a plan to address runoff impacts. Chris Anderson, SMC Consulting Engineers, explained that most runoff would be intercepted and directed south and west into an open space area where detention and drainage would be managed. He noted that some backyard drainage may still flow toward neighboring properties, but those concerns would be addressed as part of the project.

Commissioner Bird asked how the runoff would be intercepted, and Mr. Anderson stated the road layout would help collect the water and storm sewer infrastructure could be added if needed.

Commissioner Jablonski expressed concerns about long-term stormwater impacts on neighboring properties and asked what recourse property owners would have if drainage issues worsened over time. Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney, explained that the Commission's role is to determine whether the project meets applicable development standards, while any private legal remedies would fall outside the Commission's review.

Commissioner Brewer asked when additional drainage improvements would be reviewed during the development process. Mr. Anderson explained the project is currently at the preliminary plat stage and that future phases will require final plats, construction plans, and a detailed drainage report to be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer before construction begins.

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

Commissioner Jablonski stated he supports additional housing development but remains concerned about the City's ability to protect nearby property owners from future stormwater impacts. He emphasized the importance of addressing drainage concerns early in the development process and expressed concern that current procedures may not provide enough protection for residents. He also stated that uncertainty surrounding long-term stormwater management makes it difficult to support projects that could create future drainage issues.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Kindel

Voting Nay: Vice Chair Jablonski

Planning Commission recommended approval of O-2526-48, PP-2526-16, and O-2526-49.

Dolese North

6. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-50: 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

PART OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4) OF SECTION THIRTEEN (13), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE THREE (3) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, AND PLACE THE SAME IN SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (NEAR THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF N. FLOOD AVENUE AND W. ROCK CREEK ROAD; WARD 8)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

- 1. Staff Report**
- 2. Location Map**
- 3. Narrative**
- 4. Preliminary Plat**
- 5. Pre-Development Summary, 3-26-26**

Staff Presentation

Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager, presented the staff report for the Dolese North project.

Commissioner Jablonski asked about the City's billboard regulations and what additional allowances the SPUD zoning would provide compared to standard C-2 zoning. Ms. Hoggatt explained that billboards are permitted in areas depending on roadway classification and proximity to Interstate 35. She noted the applicant is requesting 600 square feet per side, while only 300 square feet per side is typically permitted near an arterial roadway by I-35. She stated the primary difference requested through the SPUD is the billboard allowance.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether 300-square-foot billboards are permitted by right. Ms. Hoggatt explained that the code requires off-premise signs to be located on parcels abutting I-35 and within 660 feet of the interstate centerline, in addition to meeting roadway classification standards. Commissioner Brewer asked whether a SPUD would still be required for the billboard regardless of size, and Ms. Hoggatt confirmed that it would.

Commissioner Brewer also asked about typical billboard sizes along I-35. Ms. Hoggatt stated billboards along I-35 are generally allowed up to 672 square feet per side. Jane Hudson, Planning & Community Development Director, added that applicants have previously requested variances through the Board of Adjustment related to billboard size requirements.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Peacock, representative of the applicant, presented the Dolese North project.

Commissioner Bird asked Mr. Peacock to clarify the proposed billboard location on the site plan. Mr. Peacock identified the location on the site plan and explained that while the billboard appears closer to Flood Avenue than other nearby examples, the southernmost existing billboard is located at a similar distance. He noted the separation appears greater farther north because Flood Avenue curves away from the railroad tracks. Commissioner

Bird also asked whether the red rendering shown in the presentation reflected the billboard's proposed appearance, and Mr. Peacock confirmed that it did.

Commissioner McDaniel asked whether there were any concerns related to the nearby airport or flight paths. Mr. Peacock stated the applicant has coordinated with the FAA and confirmed that all required information has been submitted.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Jablonski stated he supports the development overall but does not support the proposed digital billboard.

Commissioner Brewer asked the applicant to confirm that a digital billboard was being proposed and whether the applicant would consider a non-digital billboard instead. Mr. Peacock confirmed both.

Commissioner Bird stated the project fits the industrial character of the corridor but noted the nearby example billboards are not digital. She indicated she could support the proposal if the billboard were limited to a non-digital format.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether the applicant preferred to proceed with a vote or postpone the item. Mr. Peacock stated the project was on a timeline and preferred an up-or-down vote. He added that even if the billboard portion was not supported, the applicant still requested approval of the plat.

Commissioner McDaniel asked whether the code differentiates between digital and traditional billboards. Ms. Hoggatt explained that the code distinguishes between the two, though placement requirements remain the same, with additional standards for brightness and image display applying to digital billboards. Mr. Peacock added that digital billboards must comply with restrictions on flashing or moving images and minimum display times.

Commissioner Jablonski asked whether the applicant wanted Items 6 and 7 voted on separately. Mr. Peacock confirmed the request.

Commissioner McDaniel stated that while he personally does not prefer digital billboards, he believed those concerns should be addressed through future code updates rather than through this individual application. He stated he supported the request because it complies with current regulations.

Commissioner Jablonski asked for clarification that billboards located outside the I-35 corridor are limited to a smaller size. Ms. Hoggatt confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether a digital billboard that met all zoning and placement standards could otherwise be approved administratively. Commissioner Bird asked whether any compliant billboard could be digital. Ms. Hoggatt confirmed that compliant billboards may be digital.

Commissioner Brewer stated his concern was that the proposal exceeds existing size allowances and differs from current billboard standards in the area. He stated he would prefer a proposal more consistent with existing billboard conditions.

Commissioner Bird asked whether existing billboards in the area could later be converted to digital signs. Ms. Hoggatt explained that legal non-conforming billboards could not be changed.

Commissioner Brewer stated he was comfortable with the proposed billboard size because it appeared comparable to nearby existing billboards. Commissioner Kindel agreed and stated the billboard should remain consistent with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether staff knew if the nearby billboards had been approved through previous SPUD applications. Ms. Hoggatt stated she was unsure.

Commissioner Bird stated she would support the proposal if the billboard were restricted to a non-digital format and indicated support for a motion including that condition.

Commissioner Jablonski asked whether the sizes of the nearby billboards were known. Commissioner Bird noted the applicant provided the examples for context and asked whether the applicant knew their dimensions. Mr. Peacock stated he did not know the sizes of the nearby billboards.

Motion to approve as amended to add billboard must be non-digital and the size must be in line with surrounding billboards made by Commissioner Brewer, **Seconded** by Commissioner Kindel.

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

Planning Commission recommended approval of O-2526-50.

7. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2526-17: PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY CRADLE INVESTMENTS, LLC FOR DOLESE NORTH, FOR 4.32 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED NEAR THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF N. FLOOD AVENUE AND W. ROCK CREEK ROAD. (WARD 8)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

- 1. Staff Report**
- 2. Location Map**
- 3. Preliminary Site Plan**
- 4. Preliminary Plat**
- 5. Pre-Development Summary, 3-26-26**

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

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

Planning Commission recommended approval of PP-2526-17.

126 W Apache

8. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-58: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 36-201 OF CHAPTER 36 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN SO AS TO REMOVE LOTS NINETEEN (19) AND TWENTY (20), IN BLOCK THREE (3), D.L. LARSH'S FIRST ADDITION, TO THE CITY OF NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF, FROM CCFBC, CENTER CITY FORM-BASED CODE DISTRICT, URBAN RESIDENTIAL FRONTAGE, AND PLACE SAME IN A CCPUD, CENTER CITY PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (126 W APACHE; WARD 4)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

- 1. Staff Report**
- 2. Location Map**
- 3. Narrative**
- 4. Preliminary Site Plan**
- 5. Floor Plan**
- 6. Pre-Development Summary, 4-23-26**

Staff Presentation

Anais Starr, Planner II, presented the staff report for the 126 W. Apache project.

Commissioner Bird discussed the project's impervious surface calculations and noted that adjacent tree lawn and right-of-way areas maintained by the property owner are not included in the lot calculations because they are outside the fee simple property boundary. She stated that if those areas could be counted, the project's impervious surface percentage would be reduced and could potentially meet the proposed limits. She also noted the City confirmed there are no plans to widen the roadway. Ms. Starr confirmed that right-of-way areas are not counted toward impervious surface calculations and stated this is consistent with other properties throughout Norman. Commissioner Bird commented that the situation along Apache Street is somewhat unique due to the property line configuration and referenced similar issues involving alley vacations and roadway acquisitions where property owners maintain land they do not own.

Commissioner Jablonski asked what benefit the City would receive from the proposed zoning change and requested clarification on the Center City Form-Based Code requirement for a minimum of three dwelling units. Ms. Starr explained that the code requires at least three dwelling units, while the applicant is requesting approval for two units. Commissioner Jablonski questioned how three units could realistically fit on the site, and Ms. Starr explained that additional units could be achieved through townhome-style configurations with multiple floors and entrances. Commissioner Jablonski also asked what practical benefit the City gains from requiring more units when the proposal already includes a comparable number of bedrooms. Ms. Starr explained that the requirement is intended to increase the number of residential dwelling units and support the urban density

goals of the Center City Form-Based Code, even though overall occupancy could be similar.

Applicant Presentation

Gunner Joyce, representative of the applicant, presented the 126 W. Apache project.

Commissioner Jablonski asked about the proposed side setbacks and noted the surrounding development pattern already differs from the build-to-line concept envisioned by the code. Mr. Joyce explained the setbacks were intended to maintain consistency with the existing development pattern while also providing space for pervious area, poly carts, air conditioning units, and future bike racks.

Commissioner Brewer asked about the street width and fire access requirements for the project. Mr. Joyce explained that the 2018 International Fire Code requires buildings over 30 feet tall to have a 26-foot-wide fire access route. Because Apache Street is currently about 24 feet wide, the proposal includes inset parking areas within the right-of-way to achieve the required width while still allowing parking. He noted that on-street parking is not permitted in that section of Apache Street.

Commissioner Bird asked City staff how Apache Street compares to current street design standards. Brandon Brooks, Capital Projects Engineer, stated that new residential streets are typically required to be 26 feet wide. He noted that while inset parking widens the curb area, he considers the actual street width to be the travel lanes used by vehicles.

Commissioner Brewer stated support for the proposal and emphasized the importance of respecting adopted code changes while also considering context-sensitive development. He noted that the surrounding street already contains similar development patterns and stated the proposal maintains visual continuity with the area.

Commissioner McKown expressed concern about the precedent that could be created by approving the proposal, particularly regarding the Center City Form-Based Code changes intended to address “mini dorm”-style developments. She emphasized the importance of considering how approval could influence future applications and interpretations of the code.

Commissioner Kindel stated support for the design, noting it fits the surrounding neighborhood pattern. She also commented that larger rental units can serve families as well as students and stated the six-bedroom layout could function as either family housing or student housing due to the site’s proximity to campus.

Commissioner Jablonski asked whether reducing the side setbacks would provide any meaningful benefit, such as increased density. He noted that while the setbacks affect impervious surface calculations, the proposal still complies with the revised 65 percent coverage limitation.

Commissioner Bird expressed support for the project’s walkability, bike racks, and compatibility with the surrounding area. She noted the site’s proximity to campus, churches, City parking, and other shared parking opportunities supports reduced reliance on on-site vehicle parking. She also discussed construction and maintenance considerations associated with building directly on property lines and stated the proposal’s

setbacks could make redevelopment more practical for smaller property owners. Commissioner Bird added that tandem parking is already common in the area and stated she would support the application for this specific block and context.

Commissioner Brewer stated support for the proposal and commented that tandem parking can support the walkability goals of the Center City Form-Based Code by encouraging residents to rely less on vehicles. He noted the area already experiences significant pedestrian activity, particularly from students walking to nearby destinations.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Commission Discussion

There was no further commission discussion.

Motion to approve made by Vice Chair Jablonski, **Seconded** by Commissioner Kindel.

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

Planning Commission recommended approval of O-2526-58.

214 W Apache

9. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-59: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 36-201 OF CHAPTER 36 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN SO AS TO REMOVE LOTS TWENTY-FIVE (25) AND TWENTY-SIX (26), IN BLOCK SIX (6), D.L. LARSH'S FIRST ADDITION, TO THE CITY OF NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF FROM CCFBC, CENTER CITY FORM BASED CODE DISTRICT, URBAN RESIDENTIAL FRONTAGE, AND PLACE SAME IN A CCPUD, CENTER CITY PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (214 W APACHE; WARD 4)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

- 1. Staff Report**
- 2. Location Map**
- 3. Narrative**
- 4. Preliminary Site Plan**
- 5. Floor Plan**
- 6. Pre-Development Summary, 4-23-26**

Staff Presentation

Anais Starr, Planner II, presented the staff report for the 214 W. Apache project.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether the City has previously widened streets to create fire lanes. Ms. Starr stated that within the Center City Form-Based Code area, staff was not aware of prior examples but noted the issue has become more common due to updated enforcement of fire code requirements. Brandon Brooks further explained that new residential streets are typically built to current fire access standards, including required street widths. However, in older neighborhoods such as Apache Street, widening only one section of roadway creates practical challenges because the street would have to taper back to its existing width beyond the development site. He stated it would not be feasible to require a single developer to widen an entire block of roadway.

Applicant Presentation

Gunner Joyce, representative of the applicant, presented the 214 W Apache project.

Commissioner McKown asked for clarification on the amount of impervious surface proposed for the project. Mr. Joyce stated it is 58.9 percent.

Commissioner Brewer asked about the lot across the street and whether it had been redeveloped. Mr. Joyce explained that the property remains a single-family home and noted that the existing driveway access was one reason inset parking improvements were not extended to that property. He further explained that under the Center City Form-Based Code, future redevelopment would require alley access rather than direct driveway access from Apache Street unless a separate CCPUD request was approved.

Commissioner Jablonski noted that only one side of the street has been redeveloped in this area, which could allow future redevelopment on the opposite side to better meet the build-to-line goals of the Form-Based Code. Mr. Joyce agreed and explained that the proposed side setback was intended to provide separation from the neighboring single-family home and reduce the impact of building directly adjacent to the property line.

Commissioner Brewer stated he appreciated the discussion regarding the fire lane potentially serving as a temporary condition until future redevelopment occurs across the street. He asked whether the proposed improvements could eventually function as on-street parking if the street configuration changes in the future. Mr. Joyce explained that the inset parking design is consistent with nearby redevelopment projects along Apache Street and noted that under current fire code enforcement, vehicles would need to park within designated inset parking areas rather than directly on the street.

Commissioner Bird commented that portions of Apache Street already contain intermittent curb extensions and inset parking areas. She stated she would support a more comprehensive street improvement project that creates a consistent inset parking configuration along the corridor to address both parking and fire access concerns. She suggested a Center City TIF or similar funding source could potentially support such improvements in the future, while acknowledging that existing single-family homes still relying on driveway access would need to be considered.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Brewer clarified his comments were directed toward broader City infrastructure and planning concerns rather than the applicant or the proposed development itself. He stated that the Center City TIF could potentially be used to improve streets in the area and suggested the City could have addressed anticipated street widening and infrastructure needs earlier as redevelopment occurred. He expressed concern that the lack of infrastructure improvements has complicated development review and noted concerns about the recent enforcement of fire access standards after several developments had already been approved under previous practices. Commissioner Brewer stated similar issues are likely to arise on other streets in the future and recommended Fire Department representatives be present during City Council consideration of the item to better address questions regarding fire access requirements. He also acknowledged that the fire lane requirement was not initiated by the developer and noted the applicant would likely have preferred additional parking instead.

Commissioner Jablonski stated the current proposal differs from previous examples because only one side of the street has been redeveloped. He noted that future redevelopment on the opposite side could better achieve the build-to-line goals of the Form-Based Code. He questioned whether allowing additional setbacks in this situation could create an inconsistent development pattern rather than the continuity intended by the code and stated it may make sense to encourage future projects to build closer to the property line where feasible.

Commissioner Brewer responded that the difference between the proposed setback and the current code requirement is relatively minor and noted that much of the surrounding street was developed under the earlier setback standards. He stated the proposal maintains consistency with the existing streetscape and referenced previous discussions about inconsistent setbacks along Boyd Street. Commissioner Brewer suggested that if the Form-Based Code committee reconvenes in the future, it may be beneficial to evaluate setback requirements on a more site-specific or block-by-block basis rather than applying uniform changes citywide. He emphasized the importance of considering existing development patterns when evaluating future code updates.

Motion made by Commissioner McDaniel, Seconded by Commissioner Kindel.

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Kindel

Voting Nay: Vice Chair Jablonski

Planning Commission recommended approval of O-2526-59.

Alameda Trails

10. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-45: 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 LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 9 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE R-1, SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT, RM-2, LOW-

DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, RM-6, MEDIUM-DENSITY APARTMENT DISTRICT, A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, AND C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, TO A PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (NW CORNER OF INTERSECTION OF 36TH AVE NE AND E ALAMEDA STREET; WARD 6)

The applicant requests postponement to the June 11, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

11. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2526-14: A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY THE CALARA GROUP, LLC FOR ALAMEDA TRAILS A PROPERTY LOCATED NEAR THE NW CORNER OF INTERSECTION OF 36TH AVE NE AND E ALAMEDA STREET. (WARD 6).

The applicant requests postponement to the June 11, 2026 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion made by Commissioner Kindel to postpone O-2526-45 and PP-2526-14 to the June 11, 2026, meeting, **Seconded** by Commissioner McDaniel.

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

The motion was approved.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Passed and approved this _____ day of _____ 2026.
