



CITY OF NORMAN, OK CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS & COMMUNITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

**Municipal Building, Executive Conference Room, 201 West Gray, Norman,
OK 73069**

Thursday, October 02, 2025 at 4:00 PM

MINUTES

The City Council Business & Community Affairs Committee of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Executive Conference Room on the 2nd day of October, 2025, at 4:00 p.m. and notice of the agenda of the meeting were posted at the Municipal Building at 201 West Gray and on the City website at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Peacock called Meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

Councilmember Ward 2 Matthew Peacock- Chair
Councilmember Ward 4 Helen Grant
Councilmember Ward 5 Brandon Nofire
Councilmember Ward 6 Joshua Hinkle

ABSENT:

Councilmember Ward 8 Scott Dixon

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mayor Stephen Holman
Councilmember Ward 1 David Gandesbery
Councilmember Ward 7 Kimberly Blodgett
Mr. Anthony Francisco, Finance Director
Ms. Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney III
Ms. Brenda Hall, City Clerk
Mr. Chris Mattingly, Utilities Director
Mr. Darrel Pyle, City Manager
Ms. Jane Hudson, Planning and Community Development Director
Mr. Rick Knighton, City Attorney
Mr. Scott Sturtz, Public Works Director
Ms. Lora Hoggart, Planning Services Manager
Ms. Shaakira Calnick, Internal Auditor
Mr. Taylor Johnson, Transit and Parking Program Manager
Mr. Scott Martin, Norma Chamber President
Ms. Sandra Simeroth, Administrative Technician IV

AGENDA ITEMS

1. DISCUSSION REGARDING MINIMUM LOT SIZES FOR DEVELOPMENT.

Ms. Jane Hudson, Planning and Community Development Director, provided a brief presentation on minimum lot sizes, building upon a previous discussion held in April 2025. Key points of the presentation and subsequent discussion included:

Current Minimum Lot Size Requirements (By Zoning District):

- R-1A: 4,500 sq. ft.
- R-1: 6,000 sq. ft.
- R-2: 5,000 sq. ft. for single-family; 7,000 sq. ft. for duplexes or homes with garage apartments.
- RM-2 & R-3: 5,000 sq. ft. minimum, with additional 3,000 sq. ft. required per unit over three in multifamily developments.
- Setbacks & Lot Coverage:
 - Setbacks: 25' front, 5' side, 20' rear.
- Lot Coverage: Maximum 65%, simplified from a previous two-part formula (structure + paving).

Ms. Hudson continued with proposed options for lot size reform. Option one is to eliminate all minimum lot size requirements in the applicable zoning districts. Option two sets a reduced minimum lot size reduced minimum, such as 1,400 square feet. Suggested reducing front yard setback from 25' to 20' to allow for greater buildable area, while maintaining a minimum garage setback to prevent vehicle encroachment on sidewalks. Current frontage regulations: 50' minimum frontage (35' for cul-de-sacs) and 100' depth. Proposed frontage and depth is to reduce street frontage to 35 feet with discussion on revisiting lot depth as part of the reform.

Ms. Hudson also cites The Villages and St. James Park subdivisions both feature 30'-35' wide lots with 100' depths and noted that they did have challenges including lot usability particularly on corner lots with driveway and garage conflicts.

Potential Changes to Accommodate Smaller Lots:

- Reduce front setbacks (e.g., 15' for home, 20' for garage).
- Maintain or adjust 65% lot coverage; flexibility may be needed depending on site conditions and engineering capacity.
- Ensure functional stormwater infrastructure.
- Require more detailed engineered site plans for smaller or irregularly shaped lots.
- Consider maintaining minimum street frontage but not square footage.

Councilmembers expressed support for eliminating the minimum lot size, provide other development regulations (setbacks, coverage, access) remain. Emphasis on a market driven design, allowing developers to propose what works based on site context and demand. Councilmembers also desire guidance values (e.g., recommended 1,500 sq ft. lot size) rather than fixed minimums.

Ms. Hudson noted support for using this change as a steppingstone toward a larger zoning and subdivision regulation overhaul.

Item 1, continued.

Councilmembers would like to move forward with no minimum lot sizes, keep garage setbacks to at least 20' to ensure vehicles do not block sidewalks and develop design expectations for developers while maintaining coordination with engineering staff on infrastructure implications (e.g., stormwater).

2. DISCUSSION REGARDING A POSSIBLE CHARTER ELECTION AND OTHER SPRING ELECTIONS.

Chairman Peacock introduced the concept of placing a charter amendment questions on the ballot in the spring election possibly aligned with other municipal elections along with Street Maintenance Bond and put it in on the ballot in February with City Council Elections or in April if we had something to pair it with.

Ms. Brenda Hall, City Clerk, said based on the conversations at Council Retreat, Councilmembers were wanting to try to get items on Swearing in time changed, Council pay increase and Term lengths put on spring ballot elections. These were all together last time and failed.

Chairman Peacock asked if Council brought the question back do they have to be all together or can we parse them out.

Ms. Hall said she would want to check with legal, but believes Council can place them on the ballot parsed out.

Mayor Stephen Holman said he would support amending swearing in timelines and Council pay and length of terms. He also stated a couple of years ago the Charter Amendment Elections there were nine questions on the ballot, and the first question had over 1000 more votes than the ninth question. I would like to see less items with more election days because ballot fatigue is a real thing.

Main priorities now:

- Street maintenance bond is popular and time-sensitive, needs renewal before expiration.
- Staff prefer April, which allows better public engagement and planning
- Changing swearing-in dates to occur after election certification
- Possibly revisiting Council pay and utility rate oversight

Election timing complexity:

- A potential TIF (Tax Increment Financing) referendum may be required if the state Supreme Court reverses a lower court ruling.
- Election must occur during a "general municipal" or county election—not a standalone/special one.
- There's uncertainty around when the court ruling will come.

Councilmembers are wanting to strategically spread ballot items across February, April, and potentially November 2026 to manage voter attention and legal requirements.

Item 2, continued.

Additional Insights:

- Past misuse of utility rate increases for non-utility purposes led to current charter restrictions.
- New proposals suggest a community board or authority could recommend rate changes, with council retaining final approval—ensuring transparency and public trust.
- Any change to allow that structure would likely require a charter amendment.

Mr. Rick Knighton, City Attorney, said that the ballot language must be precise and must comply with state and local election laws and the City deadlines for a charter amendment proposal to be finalized in time.

Councilmembers agreed to move forward with planning for a possible charter election in the Spring of 2026, contingent on further staff work.

ADJOURNEMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

MAYOR