

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1750  
Wednesday, **June 28, 1989**, 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>
Carnes, 2nd Vice Chairman	Coutant	Gardner	Linker, Legal
Doherty, Chairman	Randle	Matthews	Counsel
Draughon, Secretary	Wilson	Setters	
Kempe		Stump	
Paddock			
Parmele			
Selph			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, June 27, 1989 at 11:40 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

**MINUTES:**

**Approval of the Minutes of June 14, 1989, Meeting #1748:**

On **Motion** of **DRAUGHON**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Selph, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, "abstaining"; Coutant, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of June 14, 1989, Meeting #1748.**

**REPORTS:**

**Committee Reports:**

Mr. Carnes advised that the **Comprehensive Plan Committee** had met this date in regard to the Arterial Right of Way Study.

Mr. Gardner reviewed the latest revisions of the Utica Medical Corridor Study, which had been reviewed by the Comprehensive Plan Committee. He answered questions to clarify the recommendations of the study, and a discussion followed in regard to a possible traffic signal at 21st Street & Wheeling Avenue. Mr. Doherty advised, in the absence of the Committee chairman, that the Comprehensive Plan Committee, after review and discussion of the study, had recommended unanimously that the study be received and endorsed by the TMAPC.

REPORTS: Committee - Cont

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to Receive and Endorse the Utica Medical Corridor Study and its recommendations for consideration as future work program items.

Mr. Paddock advised the **Rules & Regulations Committee** would be meeting July 5th to continue discussion and review of the major/minor amendments to PUD's issue.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **CZ-175**                      Applicant: **INCOG**                      Present Zoning: **AG**  
Proposed Zonings & Locations:  
    Tract 1: **OL** - East of South Yale; North of 171st Street  
    Tract 2: **RS** - South of 181st Street; West of Memorial Drive  
    Tract 3: **RD, RS & RM-2, OL, CS** - SE/c of 131st Street & South Mingo Road  
Date of Hearing: **June 28, 1989**  
Presentation to TMAPC by: **Mr. Jay Stump, INCOG Staff**                      (584-7526)

Staff Recommendation:

According to the Zoning Matrix for the District 19 and 20 Comprehensive Plans, the requested zoning Districts are or may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** The subject tracts had the requested zoning under Tulsa County's jurisdiction. The City of Bixby annexed them into their city limits on March 13, 1989, by Ordinance #610 and on April 10, 1989, by Ordinance #613, deannexed the property from the City Limits of Bixby according to the Tulsa County Zoning Code, properties deannexed from a city automatically are zoned AG. Tulsa County is now considering rezoning these tracts to the same zoning district they were previous to Bixby annexation.

**Conclusion:** Staff can support the requested rezonings based on the previous approvals by Tulsa County. Staff believes the request is the only equitable solution to both property owners and Tulsa County,

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed **RS, RM-2, RD, OL** and **CS** designations as requested.

Comments & Discussion:

In response to a question from Mr. Draughon relating to Tract 3, Staff clarified that, regardless of zoning, no permits could be issued for areas in a designated floodplain (i.e. Frye Ditch).

Mr. David L. Martin (Box 683, Bixby) requested his property be deleted from the rezoning application in order to retain AG zoning. He indicated by lot and block where his property was located in Tract 2 and submitted a letter with the legal description. In reply to Commissioner Selph, Mr. Martin explained that he had talked with the INCOG Staff who had advised him to appear at this hearing with his request to keep the AG zoning.

Commissioner Selph commented that he was troubled that the affected property owners were not contacted in person in matters such as this, in that the rezoning was initiated by Staff due to the deannexation by Bixby, and was not done at the request of the property owners involved.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On MOTION of PARMELE, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Woodard "aye"; Coutant, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to APPROVE CZ-175 INCOG, as recommended by Staff, except for Lot 1, Block 1 and Lot 2 of Block 2 of Springview Estates Addition in Tract 2; i.e., that property owned by David L. Martin.

Legal Description:

**Tract 1 - OL:** Beginning at a point 660' east of the SW/c of Section 27, T-17-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma; thence north on a deflection angle to the left of 92°28' for a distance of 648.77'; thence easterly and parallel to the south line of said Section 27 for a distance of 235'; thence south on a deflection angle to the left of 92°28" for a distance of 648.77'; thence west 235' along the south line a distance of 235' to the POB, containing 3.5 acres more or less.

**Tract 2 - RS:** Lot 1 of Section 2, T-16-N, R-13-E, less the north 462', and LESS & EXCEPT Lot 1, Block 1 and Lot 2, Block 2, SPRINGVIEW ESTATES ADDITION.

**Tract 3 (various zoning categories):**

**OL:** The east 470' of the west 1,370' of the north 485' and the south 175' of the west 690' of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NW/4 of Section 7, T-17-N, R-14-E; and

**RS:** The east 505' of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NW/4 of Section 7, T-17-N, R-14-E; and

**RD:** The south 175' of the east 1,445' of the west 2,135' of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NW/4 of Section 7, T-17-N, R-14-E; and

**RM-2:** The north 485' of the east 765' of the west 2,135' of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NW/4 of Section 7, T-17-N, R-14-E; and

**CS:** The north 485' of the west 900' of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NW/4 of Section 7, T-17-N, R-14-E.

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: PUD 250-A Present Zoning: RS-3  
Applicant: Homesites, Inc. Proposed Zoning: Unchanged  
Location: NE & NW of East 81st Street & South 75th East Avenue  
Date of Hearing: June 28, 1989  
Continuance Requested to: July 12, 1989 (Requested by the INCOG Staff)

Comments & Discussion:

Staff advised that they did not receive the Outline Development Plan until yesterday and requested a continuance to July 12th in order to have time for review of this plan.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On MOTION of WOODARD, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **Continue Consideration of PUD 250-A Homesites, Inc.** until Wednesday, July 12, 1989 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Mr. Edwin L. Dooley (6320 South First Place, Broken Arrow) had signed as an interested party on this case to express some concerns. Chairman Doherty explained the continuance request and stated Mr. Dooley would be able to address his concerns at the continued hearing as the TMAPC had already voted to continue. (NOTE: Mr. Dooley arrived at the hearing after the TMAPC vote, but was given opportunity to speak.)

OTHER BUSINESS:

**PUD 179-R: Detail Site Plan - Area C**  
East of the SE/c of South 92nd East Avenue & Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation:

The Detail Site Plan for Area C of PUD 179-R is for mini-storage and a managers office/residence east of the southeast corner of South 92nd East Avenue and East Memorial Drive.

Staff finds the Plan to be in accordance with the requirements of PUD 179-R as amended by 179-R-1 if the changes listed below are made.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Site Plan for Area C of PUD 179-R subject to the staff changes listed below:

- 1) The gate at the emergency exit onto South 92nd East Avenue shall appear to be a masonry panel similar to the adjacent walls and shall remain closed at all time except to admit emergency vehicles.
- 2) The paved emergency drive shall be limited to 10' in width.

**PUD 179-R Wilson - Cont**

Comments & Discussion:

In response to Mr. Paddock, Staff reviewed the expected schedule of development.

Mr. Jerry Wilson (6520 South Lewis), applicant, assured they wished to complete the entire development "posthaste". Mr. Wilson stated agreement to the conditions as suggested by Staff.

Ms. Sharon Wilson (7209 South 92nd East Avenue), manager of the Chardonnay Apartments (and no relation to the applicant), advised that the applicant had presented the Site Plan and indicated he would also be reviewing the Landscape Plan with her. Therefore, she was satisfied at this point and had no objection to the request.

Mr. Joe Westervelt (2505 South Boston Place), representing QuikTrip Corporation, stated they also concur with the Detail Site Plan as presented.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Site Plan for Area C of PUD 179-R Wilson**, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PUD 360-1: Minor Amendment to Setback Requirements**  
NW/c of East 91st Street & South Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is proposing to reduce the building setback from the centerline of Memorial Drive from 200' to 150' (25% reduction) and from the centerline of 91st Street from 200' to 75' (63% reduction). After examining the original PUD Outline Development Plan and TMAPC's General Policies, Staff finds these proposed amendments will significantly change the character of the PUD and should therefore be classified as a Major Amendment to PUD 360 and should not be approved as a minor amendment.

Comments & Discussion:

After hearing the Staff recommendation, Mr. Parmele moved that this be considered as a major amendment.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **CONSIDER PUD 360-1 McCormick as A Major Amendment**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Date Approved 7/12/89  
James R. Dabot  
Chairman

ATTEST:  
Art Draughon  
Secretary