

**NORMAN PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR SESSION MINUTES**

JUNE 11, 2015

The Planning Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session in the Council Chambers of the Norman Municipal Building, 201 West Gray Street, on the 11th day of June, 2015. 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.

Vice Chair Tom Knotts called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

* * *

Item No. 1, being:

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Roberta Pailes
Erin Williford
Tom Knotts
Jim Gasaway
Dave Boeck
Chris Lewis
Cindy Gordon

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Sherrer
Sandy Bahan

A quorum was present.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Susan Connors, Director, Planning &
Community Development
Jane Hudson, Principal Planner
Janay Greenlee, Planner II
Roné Tromble, Recording Secretary
Kathryn Walker, Asst. City Attorney
Larry Knapp, GIS Analyst II
Terry Floyd, Development Coordinator
David Riesland, Traffic Engineer
Todd McLellan, Development Engineer

* * *

Item No. 10, being:

O-1415-42 – EAT-1403, L.L.C. (A.K.A. MILLENNIUM APARTMENTS, L.L.C.) REQUESTS AMENDMENT OF THE PUD, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, ESTABLISHED IN O-1314-18, TO ADDRESS SIGNAGE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 900 E. LINDSEY STREET.

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

1. Location Map
2. Staff Report
3. Amended PUD Narrative with Exhibits A through E-4/5

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

1. Jane Hudson – The existing PUD was approved by Council in November of 2013. At that time, they came through for this Planned Unit Development for a student housing project. At that time, the sign package had not been fully vetted. They didn't know what they were going to do out there. They came back in a couple weeks ago with an application for the signs there on site and realized, due to the underlying zoning for this PUD, which is RM-6 for the multi-family use, the signs that they were proposing actually do not fit under the PUD Narrative that was adopted for this site. So the only changes that you're looking at for this application are to the allowed signage. And, as stated in the staff report that outlines what they're proposing on Exhibit E in the packet that you have. The existing zoning in the area – of course, this is just reviewing what we saw a year ago, but the existing zoning is R-1 across Lindsey and R-2. You have the apartments to the east. Again, there's R-2 to the south, and then there's some commercial development to the west. The existing land use: multi-family on the east; some single family/duplexes on the north; again single family/duplexes on the south; and then we have the commercial development to the west of this project. Just a review, again, of the area. The homes on the north side of Lindsey, apartments on the south. This is the site itself. This will be their main entrance off of Lindsey. This is the parking garage. The west side. And here's part of the commercial development there on the west side – the Braum's. This is the parking lot of Braum's, and this is the north face of that extension which goes out and touches on Classen on this east side. Staff received no protests for this proposal and we do recommend approval of Ordinance No. O-1415-42. I'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have. The applicant's representative is here with a brief presentation for you as well.

PRESENTATION BY THE APPLICANT:

1. Sean Rieger, 136 Thompson Drive, representing the applicant – I can be very brief if you wish. I didn't know how much to show you about this one, because it is a different request. You don't typically get a signage request. So let me quickly tell you why. It's a big building. This was the first kind of building like this that was approved in Norman and, regretfully, at the time, like Jane said, when you do zonings you don't have detailed plans yet down to the level of signage. So when it was done, the sign code is basically set by types of uses. Well, this is a residential use so it fell within the residential category. Residential sign code does not allow much signage; it's pretty slim on what they allow for residential. So for a large building like this – now we learned that. When we went back through with Bishop's Landing, by the way, we then realized that and Bishop's Landing we put the signage in the PUD and it was approved in the PUD and, actually, there's larger signage in Bishop's Landing than what we're asking for here tonight. So we learned that in Bishop's Landing that the residential signage package didn't really work for large buildings like this. But we didn't know that at the time here and so we're back asking for your approval. It is not a real significant signage change. You can see it in actual fashion, and Mike Hughes with Signs Now is here to talk through it even deeper if you wish. But that's it. A little M right there – and I say little because it looks little on a big building like that. It's five feet and that takes it beyond the signage code. The scale of it fits. And so that's the issue of why we're here tonight. You can see the little M we're proposing right there. There's the Braum's right there, and an M right up there between those windows. That's one sign. The second one is that Millennium right there. Again, that looks in scale to the building, but it's over the size if you were to actually do a smaller one. And I would note that image was shown at City Council. City

Council saw that when they approved it. You did as well. So that's not changing. Again, it just doesn't fit within the actual code of the City of Norman for signs. There's another M – the same M as you saw on that other one. This one is proposed on the east side. This is a pole sign. This pole sign would be proposed on both the frontage of Lindsey and then all the way around the corner on the frontage of Classen. That's a smaller sign than what University House at Bishop's Landing was approved for within its own PUD. And that is really it. And I just want to show there's the University House sign at Bishop's Landing. It's larger than that last pole sign. I've asked for your approval here tonight. It's kind of a big building scale issue is what happened. That was the slide from City Council when it was approved. Staff supports it. Nobody came to the Pre-Development hearing. We've gone through the whole zoning process with this because it really is a PUD change and so legally we have to go through the process. But that is it. I'll be that brief. And that's what we're asking for tonight is to allow us to have that signage package, which is in scale with the buildings and that's why we're here, because it doesn't really fit within the existing residential signage code. Thank you very much. Happy to answer any questions.

2. Ms. Gordon – Are they illuminated? And I'm assuming that they fall within our – whatever our guidelines are for illuminated signs. They're all illuminated, right?

Mr. Rieger – Back lit.

Ms. Gordon – Back lit. But they're within our ...

Mr. Rieger – They're not the electronic signs that blink.

Ms. Gordon – Right. But they don't violate any kind of our lighting.

Ms. Connors – They do not.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

None

DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

*Chris Lewis moved to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1415-42 to the City Council.
Jim Gasaway seconded the motion.*

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

YEAS

Erin Williford, Tom Knotts, Jim Gasaway, Dave Boeck, Chris Lewis, Cindy Gordon

NAYES

Roberta Pailes

MEMBERS ABSENT

Andy Sherrer, Sandy Bahan

Ms. Tromble announced that the motion, to recommend adoption of Ordinance No. O-1415-42 to the City Council, passed by a vote of 6-1.

* * *