



CITY OF NORMAN, OK PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Thursday, November 10, 2022 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 10th day of November, 2022.

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 6:31 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Cameron Brewer
Kevan Parker
Liz McKown
Steven McDaniel
Erica Bird
Doug McClure
Jim Griffith
Shaun Axton
Michael Jablonski

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Director, Planning & Community Development
Colton Wayman, Planner I
Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer
Jami Short, Traffic Engineer
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary

1. Election of Secretary for Remainder of 2022

Motion made by McKown, Seconded by McDaniel, to nominate Michael Jablonski as Secretary for the remainder of 2022.

Voting Yea: Brewer, Parker, McKown, McDaniel, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Axton, Jablonski

NON-CONSENT ITEMS

Premium Land, L.L.C.

3. Consideration of Approval, Acceptance, Rejection, Amendment, and/or Postponement of R-2223-53: Premium Land, L.L.C. requests amendment of the NORMAN 2025 Land Use Plan from Low Density Residential Designation and Office Designation to Mixed Use Designation for approximately 79.88 acres of property generally located north of Indian Hills Road between 48th Avenue NW and 36th Avenue NW.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. 2025 Map
2. Staff Report

And

4. Consideration of Approval, Acceptance, Rejection, Amendment, and/or Postponement of O-2223-16: Premium Land, L.L.C. requests rezoning from R-1, Single Family Dwelling District, and CO, Suburban Office Commercial District, to PUD, Planned Unit Development, for approximately 79.88 acres of property generally located north of Indian Hills Road between 48th Avenue NW and 36th Avenue NW.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Gateway Park and Trails
4. Redlands PUD Narrative with Exhibits A-E
5. Preliminary Plat
6. Preliminary Plat-Conceptual Site Plan
7. Preliminary Phasing Plan
8. Preliminary Site Development Plan
9. Open Space Plan

And

5. Consideration of Approval, Acceptance, Rejection, Amendment, and/or Postponement of PP-2223-3: Consideration of a Preliminary Plat submitted by Premium Land, L.L.C. (Crafton Tull) for REDLANDS ADDITION for approximately 79.88 acres of property generally located north of Indian Hills Road between 48th Avenue NW and 36th Avenue NW.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Preliminary Plat
3. Staff Report
4. Transportation Impacts
5. Preliminary Plat-Conceptual Site Plan

PRESENTATION BY STAFF: Mr. Wayman reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes.

Mr. Griffith asked whether the proposed parkland dedication meets or exceeds the requirement. Mr. Wayman believes it meets the requirement. Ms. Hudson added there is 2.66 acres dedicated at the northeast corner.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

Gunner Joyce, Rieger Law Group, representing the applicant, presented the project.

Mr. Parker asked for clarification of the Gateway Park and Trails with regard to the subject tract. Mr. Joyce responded. Mr. Parker asked about parking for the trailhead. Mr. Joyce said the parkland will be dedicated as City parkland, so the final design of the park will be done by the City. Ms. Hudson discussed her understanding of the original plan.

Mr. Parker asked what happens to Indian Hills Road if the turnpike comes through. B.J. Hawkins, Traffic Engineering Consultants, explained that if it goes through, Indian Hills would become a frontage road.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Adam Ross, 3308 Winchester Circle, spoke with regard to his preferences for the area and made some recommendations.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Mr. Jablonski asked about planned trees throughout the development. Mr. Joyce responded they will meet or exceed the requirement for landscaping and trees.

Mr. Brewer asked about the square footage to parking ratios. Kendall Dillon, Crafton Tull, responded.

Mr. Brewer asked if there has been any consideration of additional connections within the neighborhood, specifically pedestrian and biking connections. Mr. Joyce responded.

Ms. Bird asked about the shape of the dedicated park space, and the area behind some of the houses. Mr. Joyce responded.

Ms. Bird asked how much open space would be lost if there was an eminent domain situation with the turnpike and how that would affect the site. Mr. Joyce responded.

Mr. Jablonski spoke regarding the amount of open space, and in favor of connecting the green space to the lot to the west.

Mr. Brewer spoke in support of reducing parking and increasing connectivity internal to the development, and suggested making some of the recommendations part of the motion.

Mr. Axton suggested modifying the area around the drainage easement to make it common area.

Mr. McDaniel asked who owns the property to the west. If the property to the west did not make provision in their PUD for greenspace, how would that benefit this owner? Mr. Joyce responded that the applicant is open to considering a connection to the west.

Ms. Bird commented on the idea of a connection to the west, and costs involved in making changes to the plans. Mr. Joyce responded.

Mr. Parker suggested maybe moving a couple of the lots at the northwest part of the tract to another area in order to make the open space connection possible. Ms. Bird agreed with that suggestion. Mr. Joyce indicated they are open to that suggestion.

Ms. Bird noted that Parks Board has made a recommendation based on the current plat, so they may have to return to Parks Board to make a change for anything that would be a publicly dedicated park; however, common area could be treated differently.

Ms. Bird also commented that she would like to see less parking.

Motion made by Brewer, Seconded by Jablonski, to recommend adoption of Resolution No. R-2223-53, Ordinance No. O-2223-16, and PP-2223-3 to City Council, with the recommended conditions of a reduction in parking, exploring a connection to the west of the property, and exploring additional connectivity internal to the property.

Voting Yea: Brewer, Parker, McKown, McDaniel, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Axton, Jablonski

The motion, to recommend adoption of R-2223-53, O-2223-16, and PP-2223-3 to City Council with recommended conditions, was approved by a vote of 9-0.