



CITY OF NORMAN, OK PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Municipal Building, Council Chambers, 201 West Gray, Norman, OK 73069
Thursday, June 11, 2026 at 5:30 PM

MINUTES

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers at the Municipal Building, on Thursday, June 11, 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.

Chair Bird called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT

Commissioner Cameron Brewer at 5:39 p.m.
Commissioner Douglas McClure
Commissioner Liz McKown
Chair Erica Bird
Secretary Kevan Parker
Vice Chair Michael Jablonski
Commissioner Jim Griffith
Commissioner Maria Kindel

ABSENT

Commissioner Steven McDaniel

STAFF PRESENT

Jane Hudson, Planning & Community Development Director
Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager
Logan Gray, 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

GUESTS PRESENT

Phillip Starr, 915 E Apache St., Norman, OK
Zhicheng Xu, 914 E Eufaula St., Norman, OK
Russell Rice, 1854 Rolling Hills Ct, Norman, OK
Heidi Smith, 801 84th Ave. N.E., 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 MAY 14, 2026.

Motion to approve by Vice Chair Jablonski, Seconded by Commissioner McKown.

Voting Yea: Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Vice Chair Jablonski, Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel

The motion was approved.

NON-CONSENT ITEMS

Arce Rezoning

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-44: 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 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, FROM A PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, AND PLACE THE SAME IN THE A-2, RURAL AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT, OF SAID CITY; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (3766 E. ROBINSON ST.; WARD 5)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report
2. Supplemental AIM Documents
3. Location Map

Staff Presentation

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

Commissioner Brewer arrived during the staff presentation at 5:39pm

Commissioner McKown asked about unpermitted structures on the property and vehicles stored within the floodplain. Ms. Hoggatt explained two accessory structures were not included on a previously approved site plan, one completed and one consisting only of a

slab. She noted vehicles may be stored in the floodplain if they can be removed within 24 hours of a flood event.

Commissioner McKown asked about recourse for the unpermitted structures, and Commissioner Jablonski asked whether they would be allowed if the property reverted to A-2 zoning. Ms. Hoggatt stated the structures would be permitted under A-2 but could not be used for commercial purposes. Ms. Muckala explained the City is pursuing zoning and code enforcement action while working with the property owner toward compliance and noted construction has ceased since enforcement efforts began.

Commissioner Bird asked about the timeline of the northern slab. Ms. Hoggatt stated she was uncertain but noted the southern accessory structure was already present when the item was previously considered. Ms. Muckala added the northern slab had been identified as encroaching into an easement and the applicant must demonstrate compliance with easement and setback requirements. Ms. Hoggatt also confirmed a requested survey had not been received.

Commissioner Bird asked whether uses permitted under the PUD would be grandfathered if the property reverted to A-2. Ms. Hoggatt stated only uses allowed in A-2 would be permitted. Ms. Muckala added the request has been processed as a rezoning to A-2 and additional information is needed regarding the property's future use and compliance with current regulations.

Commissioner Kindel asked about the property's historical lot size requirements and whether approval would effectively constitute a variance. Ms. Hoggatt explained the property was platted with a five-acre minimum lot size before the A-2 standard increased to ten acres in 1997 and noted additional information from the applicant is needed to determine future regulation of the property. Ms. Hoggatt also clarified A-1 zoning has a two-acre minimum lot size requirement.

Commissioner Bird asked about the Commission's authority to postpone the application in the applicant's absence. Ms. Muckala stated the Commission may either postpone the item or proceed with a recommendation. In response to a question from Commissioner Kindel, Ms. Muckala explained the Commission could recommend A-1 zoning instead of A-2 as part of its motion.

Applicant Presentation

The applicant was not present.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner McKown stated there was insufficient information from the applicant to properly evaluate the request and expressed support for postponing the item until additional information could be provided.

Commissioner Kindel expressed support for either postponing the item or recommending A-1 zoning instead of A-2, citing the property's size and the lack of information provided by the applicant. She noted concerns approving A-2 could be viewed as granting an exception but acknowledged historical precedent exists.

Commissioner Jablonski asked whether the applicant had intended to attend the meeting and stated they would support postponement if that were the case; otherwise, they would favor denial of the application. Ms. Muckala explained, due to ongoing litigation, communications with the applicant have been conducted through legal counsel and staff is confident the applicant was notified of the hearing through those channels.

Commissioner Bird expressed concern about the lack of information regarding the applicant's intent for the rezoning request, the absence of the requested survey, and unresolved compliance issues. She stated understanding the future use of the property was an important factor in evaluating the request and indicated a willingness to consider various options for moving forward.

Motion to reject made by Commissioner Jablonski.

Commissioner Kindel noted denying the application could result in additional staff time and continued proceedings and questioned whether denial would be the most productive option for all parties involved.

Commissioner Griffith expressed support for postponement, stating additional information is needed and the issues should be fully addressed before making a recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Brewer agreed with postponement, stating there was not enough information to support either approval or denial of the application. He noted staff had identified outstanding information requests and indicated additional information would be helpful for future consideration of the request.

Motion to reject withdrawn by Commissioner Jablonski.

Motion to postpone to the July 9, 2026 Planning Commission meeting made by Commissioner Kindel, **Seconded** by Commissioner McKown.

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

The motion was approved.

Housing Hub

3. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-68: 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 ADOPT A ZONING DESIGNATION FOR A TRACT OF LAND LYING IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4) OF SECTION TWENTY-NINE (29), TOWNSHIP NINE NORTH (T9N), RANGE

TWO WEST (R2W), OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN (I.M.), NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, AND PLACE IN A SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF REED AVENUE AND EUFAULA STREET. WARD 4)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

- 1. Staff Report**
- 2. Supplemental AIM Documents**
- 3. Location Map**
- 4. Narrative**
- 5. Preliminary Site Plan**
- 6. Greenspace Exhibit**
- 7. Pre-Development Summary, 5-28-26**
- 8. Protest Map & Protest Letters**

Staff Presentation

Logan Gray, Planner II, presented the staff report for the Housing Hub project.

Commissioner Jablonski asked what proportion of Norman's homeless population would be served by the proposed Housing Hub. Mr. Gray stated he did not have information available. The applicant clarified the facility is expected to serve 146 individuals rather than 120 but also did not have the percentage available.

Commissioner Jablonski asked about the proposed signage standards. Mr. Gray explained the SPUD would allow up to 75 square feet of signage, compared to 25–26 square feet under the underlying zoning standards. Commissioner Jablonski expressed concern with the larger sign allowance, and Mr. Gray noted the sign is intended to be located toward the rear of the property and oriented away from nearby residences.

Commissioner Jablonski asked about the amount of impervious surface proposed on the site. Brandon Brooks, Capital Projects, Engineer, stated the project complies with applicable requirements. Commissioner Bird noted the plan limits impervious coverage to 75 percent.

Commissioner Kindel asked about comments in protest letters alleging that notice was not received by mail. Mr. Gray stated, to his knowledge, all property owners within the required notification area were notified by U.S. mail but could not speak to individual claims of nonreceipt.

Commissioner Bird asked about the property's relationship to the Griffin Memorial and Original Townsite Special Planning Areas. Mr. Gray clarified the property is located within the Central Norman Neighborhoods Study Area. Jane Hudson, Planning & Community Development Director, added, a master plan concept for part of the Griffin area was developed during the AIM Norman planning process, though the area south of Main Street was not included.

Commissioner Bird referenced a previous ULI study of the Griffin area and asked whether it depicted the subject property as a conceptual mixed-use development with smaller lots to the north and parkland to the south. Mr. Gray confirmed characterization was accurate.

Commissioner Bird asked about the intent and status of the Original Townsite Special Planning Area. Mr. Gray stated the plan is dated and needs updating. Commissioner Bird summarized its focus on preserving neighborhood character, limiting commercial encroachment, and encouraging context-sensitive redevelopment, which Mr. Gray confirmed.

Commissioner Bird asked about comments in a protest letter regarding fencing around the detention pond. Mr. Brooks confirmed the feature is a detention pond and explained fencing is generally permitted if it does not interfere with drainage or floodplain flows. He noted the proposed fence is located near, but not on, the detention basin berm.

Commissioner Kindel asked about the impacts of tents within the floodplain on drainage and water quality and whether their removal would be enforced. Mr. Brooks stated impacts would depend on the circumstances and could not be specifically quantified. Commissioner Kindel expressed concerns about litter and waste affecting nearby waterways. Ms. Hudson noted CityCare would manage the facility and determine whether tents would be permitted on site.

Commissioner Bird asked about requests for stop signs and streetlights referenced in protest letters. David Riesland, Transportation Engineer, explained residents may request evaluations through the Transportation Division and requests are reviewed against established criteria. He added previously denied requests may be reconsidered as conditions change.

Commissioner Bird asked whether fencing improvements along the residential side of Reed Avenue were City-funded. Mr. Gray stated, to his knowledge, the fencing was installed by private property owners.

Commissioner Bird asked whether Reed Avenue connects to Alameda Street. Mr. Brooks confirmed Reed Avenue terminates before reaching Alameda and does not provide a connection.

Commissioner Bird asked about ownership of Reed Avenue. Mr. Brooks explained portions are owned by the City, while a segment between East Main Street and East Eufaula Street remains under state ownership. He stated he was unaware of any plans to acquire the remaining right-of-way and noted site access would be routed through Symmes Street and Eufaula Street if the state-owned segment were ever closed.

Commissioner Bird asked about site circulation and emergency vehicle access. Mr. Brooks explained the proposed drive provides two-way access from both ends of the site. He added emergency vehicles would likely access the building from the east side and the sidewalk along Reed Avenue is expected to be extended in front of the property.

Commissioner Brewer asked about the public notification process. Mr. Gray explained City staff sends notices via certified mail to property owners within 350 feet of the subject tract using a certified ownership list obtained from county records. Ms. Hudson clarified the

notices are sent by standard mail, not certified mail. He noted renters may not receive notice and outdated County Assessor records can affect delivery.

Applicant Presentation:

Shawn Lorg and Derrick Paus, representatives of the applicant, presented the Housing Hub project.

Commissioner Griffith asked whether partnering with the Norman Police Department for an on-site security presence had been considered. Mr. Lorg stated the Police Department has been involved in planning discussions and will continue to be a partner as the project moves forward.

Commissioner Bird introduced Shawn Lloyd, operator of CityCare, to answer questions regarding shelter operations.

Commissioner McClure asked about staffing, security, and surveillance. Mr. Lloyd stated the facility is expected to employ approximately 15–18 staff members and currently utilizes private security. He added security cameras monitor both the interior and exterior of the facility.

Commissioner McClure asked about the building's height in relation to nearby residences. Mr. Paus stated the tallest portion of the building is approximately 29.5 feet and the lowest portion is approximately 15–16 feet.

Commissioner Kindel asked about intake procedures. Mr. Lloyd explained clients meet with a resource coordinator for assessment and service referrals before being entered into the shelter system. He added the facility will operate 24 hours a day, reducing lines and improving privacy.

Commissioner Kindel asked about identification requirements. Mr. Lloyd stated the shelter operates as a low-barrier facility and does not require identification for entry, but staff assist clients in obtaining necessary documents and maintaining records through the Homeless Management Information System.

Commissioner Parker questioned the number of restroom fixtures and whether the design had been evaluated for efficiency. Mr. Lorg and Mr. Paus explained fixture counts are based on International Building Code requirements and may be refined as the design progresses.

Commissioner Parker asked about CityCare branding shown in the conceptual renderings. Mr. Lorg stated the renderings are conceptual and signage and branding will be refined during the design process. Commissioner Parker emphasized the importance of fiscal stewardship.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether the project design was driven primarily by CityCare or the City. Mr. Lorg stated the design has been a collaborative effort informed by both CityCare's operational expertise and City input regarding site layout and neighborhood compatibility.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether lessons learned from CityCare's Oklahoma City facility influenced the design. Mr. Lloyd stated the project incorporates operational improvements, including additional gathering and circulation space, and durable materials will be used to support long-term stewardship.

Commissioner Brewer asked about the roof design and building height adjacent to the neighborhood. Mr. Lorg explained the roof includes a central ridge for drainage and variations in height were incorporated to provide architectural interest while maintaining a lower profile in some areas.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether the project's contingency budget was adequate. Mr. Lorg stated the estimates were developed with contractor input and intentionally structured to provide a conservative upper-end project cost. Commissioner Brewer encouraged consideration of multiple bids and additional cost review.

Commissioner Brewer asked whether staffing levels and operational needs were comparable to CityCare's Oklahoma City facility. Mr. Lloyd stated the Oklahoma City shelter serves approximately 140 individuals with about 16 employees, and the Norman facility was designed based on similar operational experience.

Commissioner Brewer asked how CityCare addresses tent encampments on nearby properties. Mr. Lloyd stated camping would not be allowed on site and CityCare works with law enforcement and outreach teams to connect individuals with services and address issues in surrounding areas.

Commissioner Kindel asked whether CityCare has a working relationship with the Cleveland County Sheriff's Office. Mr. Lloyd stated no formal relationship currently exists but CityCare would be willing to develop one if needed.

Commissioner Kindel asked about potential partnerships to offset facility costs. Mr. Lloyd stated CityCare plans to pursue partnerships and private funding opportunities as the project moves forward.

Commissioner Kindel asked how outdoor spaces would be managed. Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Lorg explained families and single adults would be separated through dedicated spaces and operational practices to maintain safety.

Commissioner Brewer asked about the safety and design of outdoor recreation areas. Mr. Lorg confirmed the family recreation yard would be fenced and monitored, and both he and Mr. Lloyd stated design concepts are informed by experiences at similar facilities.

Commissioner Kindel asked whether the facility is adequately separated from nearby schools. Mr. Lloyd responded similar populations are already served in the area and the goal of the project is to improve safety by bringing more individuals indoors and connected to services.

Commissioner Brewer asked about services currently provided by Food and Shelter. Mr. Lloyd explained Food and Shelter offers transitional housing, tiny homes, and daily meals, and the organizations hope to work collaboratively to maximize available resources.

Commissioner Bird asked about parking, staffing, and the potential for spillover parking. Mr. Lloyd stated staffing would be similar to the Oklahoma City facility and nearby parking from other resources may help accommodate demand. He added operations are intended to minimize impacts along Reed Avenue.

Commissioner Brewer asked how the proposed parking count was determined. Mr. Lorg stated the layout is based on preliminary estimates and could be adjusted as the design progresses, though floodplain constraints, fire access requirements, and outdoor amenities limit expansion opportunities.

Commissioner Bird expressed concerns about the proposed building height and requested additional clarification in the PUD. Mr. Lorg stated flexibility was intentionally included in the standards but agreed further refinement may be appropriate. Commissioner Bird also requested clarification regarding fencing and the relationship between the facility and neighboring service providers. Mr. Lloyd explained residents would continue to travel for work and services, but site operations are intended to minimize large gatherings and pedestrian activity along adjacent streets.

Public Comments

Phillip Starr, 915 E Apache St., Norman, OK (Protest)

Zhicheng Xu, 914 E Eufuala St., Norman, OK (Protest)

Russell Rice, 1854 Rolling Hills Ct., Norman, OK (Support)

Heidi Smith, 801 84th Ave N.E., Norman, OK (Support)

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Brewer expressed support for CityCare and its reputation for quality operations. He stated many of his concerns had been addressed and encouraged continued refinement of the signage and design to ensure the facility is attractive, compatible with the neighborhood, and not institutional in appearance.

Commissioner Jablonski acknowledged both the City's need to address homelessness and the concerns of nearby residents. He suggested the City consider complementary investments in the area to help mitigate neighborhood impacts.

Commissioner Parker reflected on Norman's history and stated addressing homelessness should include helping individuals become active contributors to the community while promoting stability and self-sufficiency.

Commissioner Bird stated, while she supports homeless services, she was not convinced the proximity of existing facilities alone justified another high-impact institutional use adjacent to a single-family neighborhood. She expressed concern about cumulative impacts and favored postponement until additional planning and impact analysis could be completed.

Commissioner Kindel agreed additional planning and analysis are needed before moving forward. She emphasized her concerns relate to neighborhood impacts and the lack of

supporting studies rather than the need for homeless services and expressed support for postponement.

Commissioner Jablonski stated the Commission could provide recommendations in addition to taking action on the application and suggested emphasizing both the need for homeless services and the need for additional planning.

Commissioner Brewer acknowledged neighborhood concerns but emphasized the time-sensitive nature of the project, noting delays could affect project costs and feasibility. He stated the City must find a way to move forward while addressing impacts.

Commissioner McKown agreed neighborhood impacts should be addressed but stated there is no ideal location for a facility of this type. She expressed support for moving forward with the project while conducting an impact study.

Commissioner Brewer noted voters approved funding for the shelter project and stated this should be considered as part of the Commission's deliberations.

Commissioner Bird clarified, while voters approved funding for a shelter, the ballot language did not identify a specific site.

Commissioners noted City Council later approved acquisition of the property and the site has been publicly identified throughout the project planning process.

Commissioner Jablonski stated both the need for homeless services and neighborhood concerns can be addressed and suggested a task force or similar effort to identify solutions and mitigation measures.

Commissioner McClure supported additional study, community engagement, and the formation of a task force, stating more detailed planning information would have been helpful during the review process.

Commissioner Griffith emphasized the importance of addressing neighborhood concerns alongside the project and supported a task force to explore public safety and mitigation measures.

Commissioner Brewer supported including recommendations with the Commission's action, noting neighborhood impacts, infrastructure, and public safety concerns should continue to be addressed through the City Council process.

Commissioner Bird suggested neighborhood improvements, such as buffering and traffic modifications, be considered as part of a broader planning effort and expressed concern about the timeline for implementation.

Commissioner Brewer stated additional studies and neighborhood improvements should occur concurrently with the project rather than delay it, citing concerns about escalating costs and project viability.

Commissioner Kindel stated the true cost of the project includes investments in neighborhood safety, infrastructure, and community support. She advocated for specific

recommendations, including a stakeholder task force and a defined timeline for addressing neighborhood impacts.

Commissioner Jablonski agreed neighborhood impacts should be addressed and supported a focused effort to improve conditions and reduce impacts on nearby residents.

Commissioner Bird stated, if prioritized by the City, neighborhood planning and mitigation efforts could be expedited. She indicated support for approval if accompanied by recommendations for an intensive impact study, infrastructure improvements, stakeholder coordination, and implementation timelines.

Commissioner Griffith emphasized the need to focus on neighborhood impacts and supported robust outreach and engagement with affected residents to ensure their concerns are addressed as planning moves forward.

Motion to approve with the recommendation of a contingency that there be an intensive neighborhood impact study that accounts for the as-is conditions and future proposed use, there be a plan for infrastructure accordingly, a takedown schedule of ideally two years and not longer than five years for said infrastructure to be installed, a task force collaboratively done with Norman Police Department and other neighboring partners, and that several meetings for engagement with a variety of outreach and contact methods, similar to AIM, so that the maximum number of neighborhood citizens can have input and buy-in for this plan, made by Chair Bird, **Seconded** by Commissioner McClure.

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

Planning Commission recommended approval of O-2526-68.

Chapter 30 Amendment and Resolution

4. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTION R-2526-158: A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA AMENDING THE AIM NORMAN COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN TO REMOVE THE 30-ACRE URBAN RESERVE LAND USE MINIMUM REQUIREMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. **Staff Report**
2. **UR Update**

Staff Presentation

Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager, presented the staff report for the 30 to 10-acre Resolution.

Commissioner Bird stated Norman has approximately 50 parcels in Norman that are 30 acres or larger and asked for staff to confirm. Ms. Hoggatt stated that was correct.

Applicant Presentation

No applicant presentation

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Jablonski reiterated his support for focusing growth within existing developed areas of the city to better utilize infrastructure and public services. He expressed concern that continued subdivision of large tracts could contribute to long-term costs and urban sprawl.

Commissioner Kindel stated the current AIM Norman policy language was developed through a deliberate public process and should be respected. She noted mechanisms already exist to address unique situations and expressed concern about amending the policy preemptively.

Commissioner Bird stated she had previously viewed the policy primarily as a stormwater measure but had since learned it may also be intended to preserve larger tracts for future development opportunities. She expressed interest in better understanding the rationale behind the 30-acre threshold.

Commissioner Bird introduced Lee Hall.

Lee Hall, a member of the AIM Norman Steering Committee and Land Use Work Group, explained the 30-acre policy was developed in response to public input, particularly from Ward 5 residents who wanted to preserve undeveloped land and limit future development. She stated the provision was intended to protect larger tracts for the duration of the AIM Norman plan and was the result of extensive public engagement.

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

Commissioner Kindel stated the current policy language was developed through a deliberate planning process and should be preserved. She noted existing processes can address unique situations and expressed concern about amending the policy to accommodate hypothetical future scenarios.

Ms. Hudson clarified no variance process currently exists for exceptions to the 30-acre requirement. She explained the proposed amendment, along with related subdivision regulation changes, was intended to allow such divisions in limited circumstances.

Commissioner Kindel expressed concern that the amendment could open the door to development of land the policy was originally intended to preserve, which she felt would conflict with its purpose.

Commissioner Jablonski reiterated his support for directing growth toward existing developed areas to maximize infrastructure and public services and voiced concerns about policies that could contribute to urban sprawl.

Commissioner Bird noted, while the policy had previously been discussed as an open-space preservation tool, she had since learned it may also have been intended to preserve larger tracts for future comprehensive development opportunities.

Commissioner Bird sought clarification on options for dividing parcels smaller than 30 acres and confirmed no variance process exists. Jane Hudson, Planning and Community Development Director, explained rezoning and platting would be required. Commissioner Bird stated a 10-acre minimum seems reasonable from a stormwater and low-density perspective but acknowledged the competing goal of preserving larger tracts for future development.

Commissioner Kindel noted development in Ward 5 is constrained by environmental regulations, septic limitations, and the lack of municipal utilities. She stated these factors provide additional support for maintaining the current 30-acre standard.

Commissioner Griffith asked whether engineered stormwater requirements near the lake and floodplain remain in effect. Ms. Hoggatt explained stormwater regulations continue to apply through the Stream Planning Corridor and Water Quality Protection Zone standards when property is subdivided. Commissioner Parker added engineered solutions can effectively address drainage and water quality concerns during development.

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

Planning Commission recommended rejection of R-2526-158.

5. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-76: AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NORMAN, OKLAHOMA, AMENDING CHAPTER 30 ("SUBDIVISIONS") OF THE CODE, SECTION 30-606(a) IN ORDER TO REMOVE THE 30-ACRE MINIMUM LOT SIZE REQUIREMENT FOR RURAL CERTIFICATES OF SURVEY WITH AN URBAN RESERVE LAND USE DESIGNATION; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. Staff Report

Staff Presentation

Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager, presented the staff report for the 30 to 10-acre Ordinance.

Applicant Presentation

No applicant presentation

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Commission Discussion

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

Voting Nay: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McClure, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Vice Chair Jablonski, Commissioner Griffith, Commissioner Kindel

Planning Commission recommended denial of O-2526-76.

MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS OF PLANNING COMMISSION AND STAFF

Lora Hoggatt, Planning Services Manager, presented an update on the Zoning Code Update.

Jane Hudson, Planning and Community Development Director, stated she has received emails about Center City and appendix D and she is trying to have someone at the July meeting to discuss and answer questions the commission may have.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:53 p.m.

Passed and approved this 9th day of July 2026.


