

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1591  
Wednesday, February 12, 1986, 1:30 p.m.  
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	<b>MEMBERS ABSENT</b>	<b>STAFF PRESENT</b>	<b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>
Doherty, 2nd Vice-Chairman	Carnes Young	Frank Gardner Lasker Setters	Linker, Legal Counsel
Draughon Kempe Paddock, Secretary Parmele, Chairman Selph VanFossen Wilson, 1st Vice-Chairman Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, February 11, 1986 at 11:40 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**Minutes of January 29, 1986, Meeting No. 1589:** Mr. Frank advised the request for discussion of these minutes comes from Staff, and is requested in regard to the Development Standards for PUD #166-D, Development Area 1 (page 11). Mr. Frank advised a modification is needed in the Permitted Uses for PUD 166-D to include the tire service center, as amended under PUD 166-C. Staff feels this applicant did not intend to drop this use in the 166-D application and recommended the minutes be corrected to state, "as permitted in a CS shopping district and including a tire service center."

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-1** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Doherty, "abstaining"; (Carnes, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Modification to the Minutes of January 29, 1986** in regard to **PUD #166-D**, as recommended by Staff.

**NOTE:** The TMAPC initially voted to add "tire service center" to these uses, however, it was determined that PUD 166-D did not include this use and said verbiage was amended out of the minutes at the time of final approval on February 19, 1986.

## Minutes - Cont'd

Ms. Wilson asked for a correction to a statement she made in regard to parking requirement studies and PUD #166-D on page 16 of the above minutes.

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Doherty, "abstaining"; (Carnes, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Correction to the Minutes of January 29, 1986** (page 16), as requested by Ms. Wilson.

### REPORTS:

#### Director's Report:

Mr. Jerry Lasker advised the annual meeting with the Citizen Planning Team Chairmen, Co-Chairmen and the TMAPC will be scheduled for February 26th. Mr. Lasker asked the Commission members to be thinking of items to be placed in next year's work program and how to further develop a good working relationship with the Citizen Planning Teams. In reply to Mr. Parmele, Mr. Lasker advised items to consider for the work program are things such as special study requests, District Plan updates, etc.

Mr. Paddock inquired as to the meeting with the Chairmen of the various Districts along the east and west banks of the Arkansas. Mr. Lasker stated, as there was only one representative in attendance, the meeting was adjourned. Mr. Lasker informed INCOG is trying to get input from these Districts to see if everyone is comfortable with the Riverside Trafficway Study and, if so, Staff can proceed with amending the Plan. Staff did send out agendas and information on the Plan, but another meeting is to be scheduled in an attempt to get citizen input.

In regard to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Mr. Lasker stated the need to enhance the existing citizen participation in this City program. A committee, to be made up of three TMAPC members and two district representatives, has been suggested to work with City Development, INCOG and the Budget Department Staffs to revise the existing policies and to identify roles for both the TMAPC and the Citizen Planning Teams. The results would be forwarded to the City Commission for adoption. Chairman Parmele stated the Planning Commission would take this matter under advisement and inform INCOG of the committee designations.

Mr. Lasker also informed the Commission that the Board of Adjustment members have been invited to the February 19th TMAPC meeting to hear Stan Williams review the new Watershed Development Ordinance. Discussion followed among the Commission members regarding the questionnaire distributed by Stormwater Management to the TMAPC asking for input that would assist them with zoning matters.

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS OF THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA CREATING A PARKWAY AND SPECIAL TRAFFICWAY, AND INCREASING THE RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTHS FOR SECONDARY AND PRIMARY ARTERIALS STREET INTERSECTIONS.

Comments & Discussion:

Staff asked this item be stricken from the agenda to allow more time for preparing the final resolution.

SUBDIVISIONS:

FINAL APPROVAL & RELEASE:

Kingsridge Estates, Blk 5 (Am)(PUD 281)(183) SE/c E 64th & So 91st E Avenue

Chairman Parmele advised this request for final approval and release was to be stricken from the agenda.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #111-1: Lot 11, Block 8, Eastpark Addition

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment to Sideyard Setback

The subject tract is located at the southeast corner of East 29th Street and South 131st East Place. According to the survey, the existing single family residence faces East 29th Street and is 28.4' from the west property line. The building setback line on the west is 20' according to the plat. The relationship of the applicant's dwelling unit to the house to the south is side to front. Houses to the west front into the side of the applicant's house. The proposed addition will be a 20' x 20' attached garage which will be 8.4' from the west boundary and encroach 11.6' into the side yard building line. Considering the relationship of the proposed addition to the abutting residences which each respects the 20' building line, Staff is not supportive of the requested amendment.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the applicant's request to vary the sideyard building line on Lot 11, Block 8, Eastpark Addition from 20' to 8.4'. Notice of this request has been given to the abutting property owners on the south and east.

Comments & Discussion:

Staff advised they could be supportive of something less than the requested encroachment, and if the Commission is also supportive of this idea, Staff suggests discussion as to an appropriate figure. Chairman Parmele stated it looked as if the applicant was wanting to build a two car garage. Mr. Frank advised that, based on discussions with the applicant just prior to the meeting, she indicated she could be satisfied with a one car garage. This would vary the building line from 20 feet to 16 feet.

Applicant's Comments:

Ms. Kathy McCants, 13130 East 29th, stated agreement with being able to build a one car garage. Ms. McCants advised they presently have a two car garage and they are wanting to extend the living area into the garage and then add on for a new garage.

Mr. VanFossen stated that after discussion, he could now be in favor of the setback at 16 feet and moved for approval of the request with this modification.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Doherty, Draughton, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment to PUD #111-1**, with the modification of the west setback from 20' to 16' on Lot 11, Block 8, Eastpark Addition.

\* \* \* \* \*

PUD #208-2

SE/c of East 71st Street and South Yale

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment for Sign

Standards for ground signs in PUD 208 were established by the TMAPC in accordance with PUD 208-1 as follows:

1. The existing sign at the intersection would remain in its present configuration which is:
  - a) 16 feet tall;
  - b) display area 5' wide x 7' long or 35 square feet; and
  - c) the sign would continue to be ground lighted and non-flashing.
  
2. One additional ground sign would be permitted on East 71st and South Yale to be spaced a minimum distance of 100' from the existing sign with each sign allowed to be:
  - a) 8' tall maximum;
  - b) display area of 64 square feet maximum; and
  - c) ground lighted or internally lighted and non-flashing.

3. The two new signs shall be subject to the general terms and conditions of Section 1130.2(b) of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

The initial application for PUD 208-2 was for a pylon sign to be 19'5" tall with a sign face 5'7" tall x 10'7" wide (59.36 square feet). The proposed location of the sign was on East 71st Street in almost the exact location of the approved ground sign which would be 100' east of the pole sign at the intersection. The map shows how signage for PUD 208 and PUD 260-A (north of 71st) compares. The applicant has revised his request to use only the face of the pylon sign as a ground sign; however, requests that another location be approved 200' east of the existing pylon sign at the intersection. Staff recommends that no additional signage be approved until the signage locations and areas presently authorized have been built.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of PUD 208-2.

Comments & Discussion:

As the applicant was not present, Mr. Frank advised of a conversation with the applicant in which it was suggested the applicant use the signage that has already been approved for that location, prior to requesting additional signage. In reply to Mr. VanFossen, Staff advised the applicant does have the right to build one ground sign under the present PUD on East 71st Street.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Young, "absent") to **DENY** the **Minor Amendment for Sign to PUD #208-2**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Date Approved Feb. 26, 1986  
Maureen L. Wilson  
-Chairman

ATTEST:

R.B. Paddock  
Secretary

