

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

**JULY 9, 2020**

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session via Video Conference and in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2020.

Notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Norman Municipal Building and online at <http://www.normanok.gov/content/boards-commissions> at least twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

Chair Lark Zink called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

\* \* \*

Item No. 1, being:

**ROLL CALL**

MEMBERS PRESENT  
via Video Conference

Erin Williford  
Tom Knotts  
Lark Zink  
Erica Bird  
Dave Boeck  
Sandy Bahan  
Steven McDaniel

MEMBERS ABSENT

Nouman Jan

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT  
(in person, unless otherwise noted)

Jane Hudson, Director, Planning &  
Community Development  
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary  
Lora Hoggatt, Planner II  
Ken Danner, Subdivision Development  
Manager  
Bryce Holland, Multimedia Specialist  
Nathan Madenwald, Capital Projects  
Engineer  
Beth Muckala, Asst. City Attorney (video)  
Kelvin Winter, Code Compliance Supervisor  
(video)  
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer (video)

\* \* \*

Item No. 7, being:

**O-2021-2 – LEKTRON BRANDING SOLUTIONS REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT APPROVED IN ORDINANCE NO. O-1415-29, TO AMEND THE SIGNAGE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR A MONUMENT SIGN AT A ZERO SETBACK TO THE PROPERTY LINE.**

**ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:**

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Photo – Location of Existing Sign
4. Photo – Location of Existing Sign in Context of Property Fence
5. Amended PUD Narrative – Legacy Trail Apartments with Exhibits A-E

**PRESENTATION BY STAFF:**

1. Kelvin Winter reviewed the staff report, a copy of which is filed with the minutes.
2. Mr. Knotts – If this application requires a Consent to Encroach, shouldn't we wait until that is acquired before we talk about this?  
Ms. Hudson – They submitted their application to the City Clerk's office a little later than they had submitted their application for the rezoning for the PUD amendment. We were going to have this item go forward after the Consent item goes to Council on August 11. This will not go to City Council before the Consent goes to City Council.
3. Mr. Boeck – This just seems to me like – it makes me uncomfortable. I mean, we're talking about zero setback and you're supposed to have a 25' setback. The reason they're coming forward is because it's already there? That's not proper planning. That's not good planning. Why did you even bring it to us?  
Ms. Hudson – Well, it's the applicant's application. The current owners were not the owners that placed this sign here. These are some new owners and they just purchased the property and they realized that the sign was not permitted, and so they're trying to make it right with the PUD that's in place, as well as the location there in the easement area.  
Mr. Boeck – Well, that's where people start complaining about what we do with PUDs and how we get around things, because this, to me, is like getting around it by just not addressing it and by putting a PUD together just so you don't have to do something. I think this is stupid – that it even came forward to us.  
Ms. Muckala – Just on the ability to consider the application without the encroachment addressed. This is why it's written into the Planning Commission's authority that you have the power to approve subject to specific conditions. So if you would only approve this based on the idea that the encroachment would be granted, you can condition the motion on that and make that clear in your recommendation.  
Mr. Boeck – Well, I could never move to approve an encroachment. Encroachments just don't meet what we do.  
Ms. Muckala – Right. What I'm saying is the Planning Commission's approval would be subject to the City Council reviewing and approving the encroachment. In other words, you only recommend it if the City Council otherwise finds that it can grant the encroachment. That's what I mean.  
Mr. Boeck – Well, I would move to approve, but then I would hope that we would vote against it. It goes against everything we believe in.
4. Ms. Hudson – We just received a message from Josh Clark in the chat. He says, yes, that he's here. He says his mic is not working, but they've already started the encroachment process and have approved by two of the city utility easements.

**PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:**

1. Josh Clark, representing the applicant, was present via video conference, but did not have the ability to be heard.
2. Ms. Zink – With the applicant's permission, I'd like to skip the applicant presentation portion, but if we do have any questions from Commissioners, the applicant will be able to respond to them in Chat and we'll have them read into the record. Josh, can you let us know via Chat if that's acceptable to you? Okay. So the response was yes. Do we have any questions from Commissioners for the applicant? I don't see any.

**AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:**

None

**DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:**

*Erica Bird moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-2, contingent on receiving approval for the Consent to Encroach, to City Council. Tom Knotts seconded the motion.*

There being no further discussion, a vote on the motion was taken with the following result:

YEAS	Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Erica Bird, Sandy Bahan, Steven McDaniel
NAYES	Lark Zink, Dave Boeck
MEMBERS ABSENT	Nouman Jan

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-2021-2, contingent on approval for the Consent to Encroach, to City Council, passed by a vote of 5-2.

\* \* \*