

1130 Rambling Oaks Drive

2. CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL, ACCEPTANCE, REJECTION, AMENDMENT, AND/OR POSTPONEMENT OF ORDINANCE O-2526-39: 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 LOT THREE (3), IN BLOCK ONE (1), OF SPRING BROOK ADDITION SECTION 11, A REPLAT OF LOT 6, BLOCK 1, SPRING BROOK ADDITION SECTION 6, TO NORMAN, CLEVELAND COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, FROM THE C-1, LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, AND PLACE SAME IN A SPUD, SIMPLE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT; AND PROVIDING FOR THE SEVERABILITY THEREOF. (1130 RAMBLING OAKS DRIVE; WARD 3)

ITEMS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

1. **Staff Report**
2. **Location Map**
3. **Narrative**
4. **Site Plan**
5. **Landscape Plan**
6. **Utility Plan**
7. **Traffic Memo**
8. **Pre-Development Summary, 8-28-25**

Staff Presentation

Kelly Abell, Planner I, presented the staff report for the 1130 Rambling Oaks project.

Commissioner Jablonski sought clarification regarding the inconsistency in signage expectations. Ms. Abell stated all signage would be required to comply with medium-density residential signage standards. Jane Hudson, Planning & Community Development Director, added that, after consulting with staff responsible for approving sign permits, the applicant had requested to install three wall signs for the proposed use.

Commissioner Jablonski asked what would be consistent with the code. Ms. Hudson stated she believed one sign would be permitted by current code.

Commissioner Bird stated, from memory, there are different signage standards for commercial uses compared to multifamily residential (medium density) developments. She added she believed the residential standards, which are more restrictive than commercial standards, were those that had been presented.

Applicant Presentation

Libby Smith, representative of the applicant, presented the 1130 Rambling Oaks project.

Commissioner Bird asked Ms. Smith to further clarify the previously discussed signage allowance. Ms. Smith stated the applicant is requesting more signage than is currently

permitted under the medium-density residential signage code. She explained the request includes additional wall signage visible from Robinson Street on the south side of the building, as well as increased square footage for the sign located near the entrance.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Brewer stated he appreciates the adaptive reuse of the project.

Commissioner Bird noted the lot is already paved, and the addition of units would not significantly increase the impervious area but would make the site more usable.

Commissioner Jablonski raised concerns regarding which signage standards should apply, noting residential zoning typically allows one sign, while commercial zoning allows two. He emphasized the need for consistency in applying signage regulations and questioned the City's overall preference regarding the number of signs permitted. He stated he was not in favor of the proposed signage, expressing concern that approval could set a precedent for similar requests and lead to an increase in signage throughout the City. While he supported the adaptive reuse of the project and acknowledged no increase in impervious surface, he indicated a preference for the proposal to align more closely with established residential or commercial standards and expressed opposition to the signage as proposed.

Commissioner Bird asked Ms. Hudson whether the sign code would be reviewed as part of the zoning update following adoption of the AIM Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Hudson confirmed it would not be reviewed.

Commissioner Bird asked whether signage is regulated on a per-parcel basis and whether the sign code would apply to the entire parcel despite the presence of two buildings with different uses. Ms. Hudson explained sign regulations are typically based on street frontage and the number of businesses within a structure. She noted the development is primarily residential with a single commercial component. Under medium-density residential standards, wall signage is limited to 20 square feet at the setback line, with one sign permitted per street frontage.

Commissioner Bird asked whether commercial sign standards should be considered due to the mixed-use nature of the development. Ms. Hudson stated the proposal references medium-density residential standards, and any signage not specifically addressed would be required to comply with those standards rather than commercial regulations.

Commissioner Bird asked Ms. Smith to clarify how the requested square footage compares to commercial sign standards. Ms. Smith stated medium-density residential signage is less intensive than commercial standards and the request represents a modest increase beyond what is typically permitted under residential regulations.

Commissioner Bird stated she interpreted the proposal as applying commercial signage standards to the commercial component, with remaining signage subject to residential standards. She noted, given the mixed-use nature of the development, applying commercial standards to the commercial portion may not be inconsistent. She further suggested as mixed-use developments become more common, the City may need to clarify applicable signage standards or consider developing a mixed-use signage code to address similar situations in the future.

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

Voting Yea: Commissioner Brewer, Commissioner McKown, Chair Bird, Secretary Parker, Commissioner McDaniel, Commissioner Griffith

Voting Nay: Vice Chair Jablonski

Planning Commission Recommended Approval of O-2526-39.