



CITY OF NORMAN, OK PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Thursday, April 11, 2024 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 11th day of April, 2024.

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 6:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Steven McDaniel
Liz McKown
Michael Jablonski
Chair Erica Bird
Doug McClure
Jim Griffith
Maria Kindel
Kevan Parker (arrived at 6:48 p.m.)

ABSENT

Cameron Brewer

A quorum was present.

STAFF PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Planning & Community Development Director
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Kelly Abell, Planner I
Justin Fish, Planner I
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development Manager
David Riesland, Transportation Engineer
Beth Muckala, Assistant City Attorney
Nathan Madenwald, Utilities Engineer
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist
Roné Tromble, Admin. Tech. IV

CONSENT ITEMS

Ms. Bird asked if any member of the Planning Commission wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked if any member of the audience wished to remove any item from the Consent Docket. There being none, she asked for a motion.

Motion made by Kindel, seconded by McDaniel, to approve the Consent Docket as presented.

Voting Yea: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel

The motion to approve the Consent Docket as presented passed by a vote of 7-0.

Minutes

1. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 14, 2024 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. March 14, 2024 Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the March 14, 2024 Regular Planning Commission meeting were approved as presented on the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

*

Short Form Plats

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF SFP-2324-11: CONSIDERATION OF A SHORT FORM PLAT SUBMITTED BY GREGORY & JENNIFER EMMERT AND JOSEPH & TERRI CARTER (CENTERLINE SERVICES, L.L.C.) FOR McGEE STREET ANIMAL HOSPITAL CANINE PET SPA FOR 0.34 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1134 McGEE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Short Form Plat
4. Site Plan

SFP-2324-11 for McGEE STREET ANIMAL HOSPITAL CANINE SPA was approved as presented on the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

*

Certificates of Survey

3. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF COS-2324-3: CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY PATRICIA L. COOK LIVING TRUST (MARK DEAL & ASSOC.) FOR COOK FAMILY FARM FOR APPROXIMATELY 33 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF 48TH AVENUE N.E. AND TECUMSEH ROAD.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Certificate of Survey

COS-2324-3 for COOK FAMILY FARM Norman Rural Certificate of Survey was approved as presented on the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

*

4. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF COS-2324-4: CONSIDERATION OF A NORMAN RURAL CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY SUBMITTED BY DOYLE & JANET REICH (RDM SURVEYING) FOR FISCHER ACRES FOR 19.81 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ½ MILE SOUTH OF THE INTERSECTION OF E. LINDSEY ST. AND FISCHER AVE. AT THE END OF FISCHER AVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Certificate of Survey

COS-2324-4 for FISCHER ACRES Norman Rural Certificate of Survey was approved as presented on the Consent Docket by a vote of 7-0.

*

NON-CONSENT ITEMS

Rezoning & Preliminary Plat

5. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-46: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTION 36-201 OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN TO REMOVE PART OF LOT ONE (1), BLOCK ONE (1) OF SALYER ADDITION, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND PLACE THE SAME IN THE C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (2505 W. MAIN STREET)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
 2. Location Map
 3. Transportation Impacts
 4. Pre-Development Summary
6. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2324-16: CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY NYSSA RAATKO, L.L.C. (MAXBAS LAND SURVEYING, P.L.L.C.) FOR REPLAT OF SALYER ADDITION FOR 0.543 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 2505 WEST MAIN STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Preliminary Plat
4. Preliminary Site Plan

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

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT: Ashley Bernatski, representing Brakes Plus, explained that they would like to build a new Brakes Plus on the new parcel. She briefly reviewed their operations and hours.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Motion made by McKown, seconded by Griffith, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-46 and PP-2324-16 for Replat of Salyer Addition, to City Council.

Voting Yea: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel

The motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-46 and PP-2324-16 was adopted by a vote of 7-0.

*

Amendment of PUD, Planned Unit Development

7. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-47: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT ESTABLISHED IN ORDINANCE NO. O-2122-10, TO AMEND THE SITE PLAN AND PUD NARRATIVE FOR PART OF THE NORTH HALF (N/2) OF SECTION TWENTY-SIX (26), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE TWO (2) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (3766 E. ROBINSON STREET)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Summary of Project
4. Site Plan

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

Ms. McKown asked how many buildings are being proposed. Mr. Fish responded that they are proposing to construct a barn, a new shop, and to change the use of the existing shop to be a grow facility.

Ms. McKown noted references in the staff report to things not on the site plan, and asked whether those things were worked out. Ms. Hoggatt responded that the site plan is the one that Public Works cannot approve.

Ms. McKown asked about waiving of the landscape requirement. Ms. Hoggatt explained that our landscaping requirements are tied to parking; 6 spaces or 900 sq. ft. of pavement for parking would require landscaping. He is requesting to not provide landscaping.

Ms. Bird asked if the approved PUD had a provision for the dirt park in the front. Ms. Hoggatt responded that it was not addressed in either PUD.

Mr. McDaniel asked if there were some fencing requirements in the prior PUD, and whether they have been completed. Ms. Hoggatt was not aware of fencing having been provided.

Ms. Bird asked about the driveways. Mr. Riesland stated that any applicant who wants to add an additional driveway that may not meet the Engineering Design Criteria can submit a request for a variance. He did not think one was ever submitted for this property. This does not meet the criteria for driveway spacing. The further you move to the west from the approved driveway there is a vertical curve in Robinson Street that creates a sight distance problem and it would be an unsafe driveway.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT: Geoffrey Arce, the applicant, stated they are only looking to amend the site plan. The previous PUD allowed A-2 fencing, so that requirement has been met and there were no additional fencing requirements. They need a turnaround for business traffic to keep big trucks away from the residence. They need additional buildings to accommodate customer vehicles that have been brought in.

The main building that was originally put in is to be the main commercial facility and will house most of the vehicles. The barn that is currently there doesn't have a foundation; he constructed it without obtaining a permit because he thought it was a temporary canopy structure. They are trying to clean up the property and fix the dirt park.

Mr. Griffith asked what they do on the property. Mr. Arce responded it is a used power sports dealership – dirt bikes, jet skis, parts, sales, and service. They recently got a license for used cars as well.

Ms. Bird asked how many cars they service at any given time. Mr. Arce said they do not service cars. They are usually working on 3 or 4 vehicles, and they have others waiting for pick up, and others waiting for work. He said the aerial photo seems fairly accurate for what would be average.

Ms. Bird asked about the parking in the front. Mr. Arce indicated he moved some dirt to level out the land. The metal poles in the aerial photo are where he just constructed the barn. Between the barn and the road frontage is the site proposed for the new main 30x70 metal shop. He will be planting grass.

Ms. Bird asked about the addition of the grow operation. Mr. Arce responded that the building has two stories, and the top story was built as a grow. He was recently given a license by someone getting out of the business, so he will run a little grow in the upstairs of the shop.

Ms. Kindel asked how much traffic there is on a daily basis. Mr. Arce responded 1 or 2 customers. They also get deliveries. There should not be any traffic coming into the grow operation; they will be delivering the product to dispensaries. They will not be adding more vehicles for the deliveries.

Mr. Jablonski asked about the problems listed in the staff report that need to be addressed. Mr. Arce said he thinks the only remaining problem is the driveway. The driveway across from Bryant Circle was approved with the original PUD. The chip-sealed driveway is supposed to be removed, and a new driveway added to the adjacent property, which is a shared driveway.

Ms. Bird asked about the dirt driveway. Mr. Arce indicated it was never supposed to be there. All the deliveries come in and then drive out the dirt drive. That is why a turn-around is needed for the trucks.

Ms. McKown commented that, with everything being moved closer to Robinson, she would really like to see some landscaping. Mr. Arce said he has been saving some pine trees to put out there. Ms. Bird asked why the request was to waive the landscaping requirement. Mr. Arce said there might have been a miscommunication. He does not have a problem providing some trees.

Mr. Madenwald stated that on the south side of Robinson the water lines from Lake Thunderbird are located in large easements, and landscaping there will be a challenge.

RECESS
7:07 to 7:12 p.m.

Ms. Bird felt it would be helpful to see the prior PUD Narrative and site plan along with the new documents. She is concerned that Public Works does not endorse the project. She asked if he is aware he could request a postponement to make changes to the site plan before the Commission votes on it. Mr. Arce stated he can't afford another month because of money he has had to put down on the building. He has been told that Public Works is not going to accept any other driveway.

Ms. Kindel asked about the site plan. Mr. Arce explained that the red is what is going in, and the gray is what was already approved. Mr. McDaniel asked if the gray has been completed. Mr. Arce said it is completed up to the Bryant concrete approach. Both drives were in existence prior to the previous PUD.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Barry Saltus, 1340 Bryant Circle, thinks the intersection at Bryant is unsafe. If you are driving east, there is a hill going down to Bryant Circle. Traffic is doing 50 mph. If there are large vehicles making a left turn out of the property it creates a high risk for danger. It looks like a junk yard looking at the picture. He asked if they would be able to get everything in the barn.

Mike Fore, 3735 E. Robinson Street, presented a petition from surrounding properties. The applicant built a building without a permit; the penalty should be that he have to tear the building down. They oppose any changes to anything the applicant wants to do. Right now it looks like a dump and junk yard. All the neighbors have complained; none of them want it in the area. They don't know how City Council approved it for a commercial business. He has pictures of the property which he took on April 10.

Ms. Bird noted that the petition and a radius map will be forwarded to City Council. She suggested that Mr. Fore send the pictures to staff so those can be forwarded to City Council.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Ms. Bird did not go back and watch the meeting when this was previously considered. She recalled talk of how many units would be on site for work. There was discussion about the dealership, and concerns were raised for the area. She has concerns about how much this has escalated over what was considered for the prior PUD. She also has concerns about the road, the barn, and other things that have happened that were never on the PUD to begin with. She does not feel that shielding and impact to the neighbors has been adequately addressed for this neighborhood. She has concerns about allowing further increase. She thinks a single driveway could work with circular options on-site.

Mr. Parker said he thinks, with proper design, you could have a single drive in and have room for trucks to turn around.

Motion made by Jablonski, seconded by McDaniel, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-47 to City Council.

Voting Nay: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel
Abstaining: Parker

The motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-47 to City Council failed by a vote of 0-7, with 1 abstention.

*

SPUD Zoning, Utility Easement Closure & Preliminary Plat

8. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-49: 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 PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION TWENTY-SIX (26), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE THREE (3) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT AND THE C-2, GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, AND PLACE THE SAME IN THE SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (418 N. INTERSTATE DRIVE)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. SPUD Narrative with Exhibits A-F
4. Preliminary Site Development Plan
5. Transportation Impacts
6. Pre-Development Summary

9. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-50: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, CLOSING A PORTION OF THE 17-FOOT-WIDE UTILITY EASEMENT LOCATED IN LOT TWO (2), BLOCK ONE (1), AN AMENDED PLAT OF STIDHAM ADDITION NO. 1, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Location Map
3. Request to Close a Public Easement

10. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2324-18: CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY ORRKLHOMA REALTY-NORMAN, L.L.C. (GRUBBS CONSULTING, L.L.C.) FOR SOONER KIA NORMAN, A SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR 4.77 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 418 N. INTERSTATE DRIVE.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

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

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

Mr. Jablonski asked about the easement. Ms. Hoggatt responded that, as far as we know, there is nothing in it and there have been no objections to closing it.

Mr. Jablonski asked why they don't just make everything C-2. Ms. Hoggatt responded that they wanted to keep the conditions that were part of the previous approval that protect the residential to the west of the site. Those included landscaping, and providing parking, and showing more specifically how the site would be used so it would have less of an impact.

Mr. Jablonski noted that the narrative requests a 5' setback on the north and south. He asked what it would be if it were zoned C-2. Ms. Hoggatt responded that C-2 doesn't have large setbacks.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT: Mark Grubbs, Grubbs Consulting, 1800 South Sara Road, representing the applicant, said the purpose of the SPUD is to incorporate the north undeveloped lot into the already developed land. They will be removing the building and redeveloping it with a new building, and cleaning the site up. There are two different zonings: C-2 and the PUD. Because they are developing it all as one lot, it has to be combined into a single lot. The easement closure is needed because the building will be located over it, and there is nothing in the easement. They are requesting a SPUD, because it is under 5 acres, and they essentially copied the contents of the old PUD into the SPUD with all the same protections that it had historically for the residential to the west: keep the landscape buffer, add the requirement for the 8' sight-proof fence along the west, and to keep the barriers in place. The SPUD specifically only allows the use for automotive sales and the accompanying services that go with it.

Mr. Griffith asked if the new building will be south of the old building. Mr. Grubbs responded that the gray shading under the north portion of the building on the site plan is the existing building. The building will extend south almost to the south property line. It will increase the size of the building quite a bit.

Mr. Jablonski asked about the dark gray shading to the west, and the buffers between the SPUD and the residential area. Mr. Grubbs clarified that the dark gray does not allow automotive sales to happen; only parking from the apartments and the employees can park there. There is a 5' landscape buffer with trees that exist within that, which was in the original PUD. Mr. Jablonski asked how well it works to block light and sound. Mr. Grubbs did not know. The lighting will meet City code.

Mr. McDaniel asked if they anticipate any change to the buffer zone. Mr. Grubbs does not anticipate changing that area.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Mr. Jablonski expressed concern about a future heat problem with the amount of asphalt and concrete for the project. He wondered if there were some places they could put trees in the back parking lot for employees. Mr. Grubbs said they are not changing the west line. Ms. Hoggatt pointed out the landscape plan included in the packet. Mr. Grubbs indicated they are adding additional trees to meet the current landscape code requirements. Additional trees are being added to the west lot, but they do not plan to

disturb the existing trees along the west line. Ms. Bird suggested container plants could be added for additional vegetation.

Motion made by McDaniel, seconded by McKown, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-49, Ordinance No. O-2324-50, and PP-2324-18 for SOONER KIA NORMAN, A Simple Planned Unit Development, to City Council.

Voting Yea: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel, Parker

The motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-49, Ordinance No. O-2324-50, and PP-2324-18 to City Council passed by a vote of 8-0.

*

Zoning Code Amendment

11. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-51: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING SECTIONS 36-101 ("DEFINITIONS"), 36-508 ("NONCONFORMING USES"), AND 36-548 ("OFF STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS"), ALL IN CHAPTER 36 ("ZONING") OF THE CODE OF THE CITY OF NORMAN TO REMOVE PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS WHERE ALLOWED, TO CLARIFY APPLICABILITY OF PROVISIONS TO GARAGE APARTMENTS, "NON-CONFORMITY" AND TO IMPLEMENT OTHER LANGUAGE CHANGES AS ARE CONSISTENT THEREWITH; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

- 1. Staff Report
- 2. Ordinance No. O-2324-51 Annotated

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

Ms. Bird asked when ADUs can be more than 650 sq. ft. Ms. Hoggatt explained that the 650 sq. ft. requirement is in the R-1 and R-1-A zones. In A-1, A-2, and RE, a guest house was already an allowance in the code, so the size was not limited. The difference is that those can now be rented or leased, and can have a full kitchen.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Motion made by Kindel, seconded by Griffith, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-51 to City Council.

Voting Yea: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel, Parker

The motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2324-51 to City Council passed by a vote of 8-0.

*

PUD Amendment & Preliminary Plat

12. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-35: 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 THE PART OF THE EAST HALF (E/2) OF SECTION FOURTEEN (14), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE THREE (3) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, AND PLACE SAME IN THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (GENERALLY LOCATED EAST OF I-35 BETWEEN CORPORATE CENTER DRIVE AND ROCK CREEK ROAD)

The applicant has requested postponement to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

13. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2324-12: CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY UNIVERSITY NORTH PARK, L.L.C. FOR UNIVERSITY NORTH PARK ENTERTAINMENT DISTRICT, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR APPROXIMATELY 90 ACRES OF PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF I-35 BETWEEN CORPORATE CENTER DRIVE AND ROCK CREEK ROAD.

The applicant has requested postponement to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Postponement Memo
2. Request for Continuance
3. Location Map

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Motion made by McKown, seconded by Kindel, to postpone Ordinance No. O-2324-35 and PP-2324-12 to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Jablonski asked how many times these items have been postponed. Ms. Bird thought three times, but part of this needs to move together with other parts of the TIF.

Gunner Joyce, representing the applicant, agreed with Ms. Bird's explanation. The Statutory TIF Review Committee was just formed and held their first meeting. There is a project plan that body will review and make a recommendation, which will also come to the Commission with this item.

Voting Yea: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel, Parker

The motion to postpone Ordinance No. O-2324-35 and PP-2324-12 to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting passed by a vote of 8-0.

*

NORMAN 2025, PUD & Preliminary Plat

14. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTION NO. R-2324-126: A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING THE NORMAN 2025 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN SO AS TO REMOVE PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION ELEVEN (11), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE THREE (3) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN (I.M.), CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE OFFICE DESIGNATION AND PLACE THE SAME IN THE COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION. (East of 36th Avenue N.W., North of W. Tecumseh Road, and West of I-35)

The applicant has requested postponement to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

15. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE NO. O-2324-42: 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 PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW/4) OF SECTION ELEVEN (11), TOWNSHIP NINE (9) NORTH, RANGE THREE (3) WEST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, AND PLACE SAME IN THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (East of 36th Avenue N.W., North of W. Tecumseh Road, and West of I-35)

The applicant has requested postponement to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

16. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF PP-2324-15: CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT SUBMITTED BY CARROLL FARM, L.L.C. (SMC CONSULTING ENGINEERS, P.C.) FOR CARROLL FARM ADDITION, A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED East of 36th Avenue N.W., North of W. Tecumseh Road, and West of I-35.

The applicant has requested postponement to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Postponement Memo
2. Location Map

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Mr. Jablonski asked why this item is being postponed. Mr. Joyce responded that they are working on some designs of the layout and want to make sure the applicants are happy with it before bringing it to the Commission.

Ms. Bird asked how many times this has been postponed. Mr. Joyce was not sure but thought it had been postponed twice before.

Motion made by Jablonski, seconded by Griffith, to postpone Resolution No. R-2324-126, Ordinance No. O-2324-42, and PP-2324-15 to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting.

Voting Yea: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel, Parker

The motion to postpone Resolution No. R-2324-126, Ordinance No. O-2324-42, and PP-2324-15 to the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting passed by a vote of 8-0.

*

Planning Commission Resolution

17. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTION PCR-2324-1: A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA ESTABLISHING CERTAIN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES RELATING TO THE TIME SET FOR REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND PROVIDING A DURATION FOR THIS RESOLUTION.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Staff Report
2. Resolution No. PCR-2324-1

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Ms. Hudson noted that most of the other Boards and Commissions meetings under the Planning Department have been moved to 5:30 p.m.

Ms. Bird thanked Mr. Jablonski for bringing this issue up in a meeting. She thanked staff for getting the item on the agenda for discussion. She mentioned the possibility of overlap with Council committees and issues that causes with broadcasting the meetings.

Motion made by Griffith, seconded by McClure, to adopt Resolution No. PCR-2324-1.

Ms. Hudson noted that the change in meeting time will begin with the June 13 meeting.

Voting Yea: McDaniel, McKown, Jablonski, Bird, McClure, Griffith, Kindel, Parker

The motion to adopt Resolution No. PCR-2324-1 passed by a vote of 8-0.

*

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

Ms. Bird reminded everyone to look at the AIM Norman question every month. She attended an AIM Listening Session, and made a comment that she would like to see the Center City Form Based Code Ad Hoc Committee meet at a regular interval.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objection, the meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Planning Commission