

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1345
Wednesday, February 11, 1981, 1:30 p.m.
Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Avey Gardner Holliday, Secretary Kempe, 2nd Vice Chairman Petty C. Young, Chairman T. Young	Eller Inhofe Parmele	Alberty Cox Gardner Howell	Jackere, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, February 10, 1981, at 10:40 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the TMAPC Offices.

Chairman Carl Young called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele, T. Young "absent") to approve the Minutes of January 28, 1981 (No. 1343).

On MOTION of GARDNER, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele, T. Young "absent") to approve the Minutes of February 4, 1981 (No. 1344).

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts and Deposits:

On MOTION of PETTY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele, T. Young "absent") to accept the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the Month ended January 31, 1981 (Exhibit "A-1").

Committee Reports:

Commissioner Kempe presented the following committee assignments for approval: Comprehensive Plan Committee

Scott Petty, Chairman
Marion Holliday
Cherry Kempe

Rules and Regulations Committee

Bob Parmele, Chairman
Betty Avey
Lee Eller

Committee Reports: (continued)

Budget and Staff Committee

Bill Gardner, Chairman
(new appointee)

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele, T. Young "absent") to approve the Committee assignments as presented.

Bob Gardner advised that the first meeting for the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee would be held Monday, February 16, 1981, 3:30 p.m., in the Conference Room of the INCOG Offices.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

PUD #247 Marshall Horn North and East of the NE corner of 58th Street and
58th East Avenue (AG)

The Staff advised that the zoning application for the subject tract had been continued at the City Commission and it was recommended the PUD be continued to March 4, 1981.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to continue PUD #247 to March 4, 1981, 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application PUD #251

Present Zoning: (RS-3)

Applicant: Warren G. Morris (Mabry)

Location: South and East of 35th Street and Oswego Avenue

Date of Application: November 25, 1980

Date of Hearing: February 11, 1981

Size of Tract: 2.06 Acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Warren G. Morris

Address: P. O. Box 45551

Phone: 627-4500

Staff Recommendation:

Planned Unit Development #251 is located on the south side of 35th Street at Oswego Avenue. The tract is slightly less than 2 acres in size and has a large single-family residence and a garage-type apartment on the tract. The zoning would permit the consideration of a maximum of 9 dwelling units on the property. The applicant has filed a total of three applications (zoning, Board of Adjustment, PUD) searching for a way to develop the property. The Staff recognizes that the property could reasonably be expected to develop with additional dwelling units; however, we are not satisfied that the PUD proposed is the best solution. The applicant has submitted several site plans showing single-family attached and single-family detached units. The final submittal shows two, four unit townhouses south of the existing development. The site plan is a sketch at best and does not illustrate sufficiently how the development maintains compatibility with existing development. Also the Staff does not believe the proposal integrates the existing development with the proposed development. For these reasons, the Staff recommends DENIAL of PUD #251.

Applicant's Comments:

Warren Morris presented pictures (Exhibit "B-1") of the area and pointed out the fences and outbuildings on the adjacent properties which back up to the subject tract. He noted that the City of Tulsa is faced with a problem of developing land in areas where sewers, streets and utilities are available and stated he felt it was a shame to waste land if it can be developed in an acceptable way. The applicant advised that he holds a contract to purchase the subject tract, subject to the approval of this application.

Mr. Morris advised that he had tried several approaches to the development of this property. Townhouse zoning on the tract would allow 18-20 units which the applicant felt would be too many units. The possibility of construction of single-family dwellings was discussed with the area residents; however, it was decided there would not be enough yard space available. Mr. Morris presented a development plan (Exhibit "B-2") and pointed out that there is an existing small, concrete block house adjacent to the subject tract. A large house, with approximately 5,000 sq. ft., is located on the subject tract. In order to protect these existing structures, Mr. Morris advised that he would leave a green belt in front of the houses and construct the street to the east side of the subject tract.

The applicant presented a townhouse floor plan (Exhibit "B-3") and advised that the proposed townhouses would be 37½ feet long by 20 feet wide - one building of four units would be 80 feet wide by 37½ feet long. Mr. Morris pointed out that the ground coverage of the building would allow more open space with the townhouse configuration than the single-family detached units.

Special Discussion for the Record:

Commissioner Petty questioned if the units were sold to one person who then rented them to other individuals, would this become a violation of the Zoning Ordinances. Alan Jackere, Assistant City Attorney, advised that the TMAPC would have no control as far as the alienation of property, therefore, one owner could own several of the structures and rent the units.

Bob Gardner also noted that one condition which could be imposed is that the subject tract be lotted whereby each individual unit would have a separate deed and would be a separate, distinct piece of property.

Commissioner T. Young, noting that the Staff has set forth in several instances, PUD conditions which would apply in the event that approval was granted, questioned if the Staff had thought of that in this case so that the Commission might get a feel for how townhouse development would fit in this area.

Mr. Gardner advised that the application has been continued several different times and several different approaches to the development had been submitted. He stated that if the Commission was inclined to be supportive of townhouse development, then a continuance might be in order so that some specific development criteria could be developed. However, the Staff, at this time, is recommending denial of the application.

In answer to Commissioner Petty's question, Mr. Gardner stated that the PUD could permit the townhouses in the RS-3 District. The RS-3 zoning would allow a total of nine units; under the PUD this would be the existing unit plus the proposed eight additional units.

Commissioner T. Young asked if in fact, under the present zoning, townhouses with a PUD approval could be permitted, could that be interpreted as an obligation to approve a PUD if it's within the permitted density of the zoning district. Mr. Gardner stated that it was not an obligation, that the Commission must be satisfied with the PUD proposal - that it meets the compatibility test. Townhouses can be permitted in a single-family area, but it depends upon the specific plan and how the plan deals with the compatibility issue of the neighborhood.

In regard to the protestant's comments concerning multifamily dwellings in the area, Mr. Morris pointed out that there is an apartment complex to the west of the subject tract. The applicant stated that the proposed townhouses would have to be one family, single ownership individual mortgages - there would be no way to finance a project such as this, with the costs involved, and sell it as an apartment project.

Mr. Morris advised that it would be possible to purchase a townhouse, be transferred out of Tulsa, and rent the property rather than sell it. He also surmised that there are a number of houses in the immediate area which are rental properties at this time.

Referring to the architectural design of the townhouses, Mr. Morris noted that the units would not be visible from 35th Street and he did not feel this would be of concern to the residents in the area.

PUD #251 (continued)

In way of rebuttal, Mr. Moffitt pointed out that the apartments which the applicant stated were west of the subject tract, are located at 35th and Harvard - these are the closest multifamily units in the area. The pro-
testant also advised that he was aware of only one house in the immediate vicinity which was a rental property. That house is located at the corner of 34th and Oswego and has been a rental property since it was built. Mr. Moffitt noted that the townhouses would be visible from the street if they are two-story structures.

Commissioner Avey, noting that several applications and site plans had been submitted previously, questioned why Mr. Morris had not been advised of what would be acceptable development on this property.

Mr. Gardner advised that the applicant had filed at least two of the applications on the same day and talked with different Staff members at that time. This item has been continued several times and the plan has changed each time. He pointed out that the large, existing house on the subject tract is very difficult to work with.

Commissioner T. Young pointed out that the existing house could be removed in the future and would eliminate the shield of the townhouse view from the street. Mr. Young also noted that the subject tract does not lend itself to townhouse use, particularly in the intensity that is proposed.

Commissioner Petty advised that there is a tendency to take the economic conditions under consideration; however, he felt there was a danger in basing zoning and PUD decisions on these conditions since they do change and can change rapidly.

Commissioner T. Young stated that he would agree that economic conditions should not be the sole or dominant consideration, but he felt it should be one of the multiple factors considered. Other Commissioners agreed with Mr. Young's statement.

Board Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be DENIED:

The North 150' of the East 200' of Lot 48; and the East 200' of Lot 33, LESS and EXCEPT: The North 114' of the West 70.5'; and the South 104' of the North 114' of the East 30' of the West 100.5' of said Lot 33, ALL in Albert Pike Subdivision, in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

PUD #252 Robert J. Nichols (Ira Crews) 55th Place, East of Lewis Avenue
(W/2 RM-T)
(E/2 RS-3)

Staff Recommendation:

Planned Unit Development #252 is located on the north side of 55th Place at Atlanta Place. This property is zoned RM-T and RS-3 and would permit a maximum of 22 dwelling units. The property is currently platted into 7 lots with dwellings on three of the lots. The existing structures will be razed and the property replatted into 22 townhouse lots.

The Staff had reviewed the applicant's site plan and text and find the proposal meets the stated purposes of the PUD Chapter. Therefore, the Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the PUD, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant's site plan and text be incorporated as a condition of approval.
- 2) That the maximum number of dwelling units be 22 townhouse dwellings, single-family attached.
- 3) That the setbacks be as follows:
 - a) Perimeter yard minimum (north, east and west-15 feet
 - b) From Atlanta Place----- 20 feet
 - c) From 55th Place----- 25 feet
 - d) Between buildings----- 20 feet
- 4) That the minimum off-street parking spaces be two per dwelling unit.
- 5) That the minimum livability space (open space) be 46,920 sq. ft.
- 6) That a detailed site plan showing location of buildings, parking, open space and existing trees to remain, be approved by the TMAPC prior to the request for a building permit.
- 7) That a subdivision plat incorporating within the restrictive covenants, the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants, and said plat be approved by TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office prior to the request for a building permit.

Applicant's Comments:

Robert Nichols advised that his intent was to gain approval of the PUD and then file for RD zoning on the E/2 of the subject tract and amend the PUD to include 5 additional units. This would allow the construction of 27 units.

Remarks:

Noting that the conditions of the PUD were recommended on the basis of 22 units, Commissioner T. Young questioned if an amended PUD would be required in the event of the extension of RM-T zoning to the full tract.

Bob Gardner advised that if the entire tract was zoned RM-T, a PUD would not be needed -- a subdivision plat would supersede the PUD.

PUD #252 (continued)

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of AVEY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to approve PUD #252, subject to the conditions set forth by the Staff Recommendation; on the following described property:

Lots 1 through 7, Block 1, The Vinyard, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Application PUD #209-A
Applicant: Jim Biffle (Lisa Adams Trust)
Location: 68th Street and South Memorial Drive

Present Zoning: (RS-3,OL,
CS & AG)

Date of Application: January 5, 1981
Date of Hearing: February 11, 1981
Size of Tract: 32.9 acres, plus or minus

Presentation to TMAPC by: Jim Biffle
Address: Philtower Building

Phone: 599-8104

Staff Recommendation:

Planned Unit Development #209-A is located on the west side of Memorial Drive, south of 66th Street. The original approval in 1978 was for 166,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor area and 112 residential dwelling units. The owner has filed an amendment to permit a change in the use configuration, with the commercial and office along the Memorial frontage and the residential on the western portion. The commercial and office square footage in the present proposal will exceed the 166,000 sq. ft. by 3,600 sq. ft., but is permitted under the CS and OL zoning. The residential dwelling units will be decreased from 112 to 88.

The Staff considers the amended application a better design than the original with the current design emphasis upon the integration of the uses (commercial, office and residential). The Staff has reviewed the applicant's text and site plan and recommend that the Planning Commission find the amendment consistent with the intent and purposes of the PUD Ordinance and the approved PUD #209. The Staff, therefore, recommends APPROVAL of PUD #209-A, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant's text and site plan be incorporated as a condition of approval.
- 2) Development Area "A" (commercial/office) Standards:
 - a. Net Site Area----- 15.36 acres
 - b. Permitted Uses: Those uses permitted by right in the CS District.
 - c. Maximum Floor Area----- 169,600 square feet
 - d. Maximum Building Height----- Two stories
 - e. Minimum Building Setback:
 - Centerline of Memorial--110 feet
 - North, South, East
 - Boundaries----- 10 feet
 - f. Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space (excludes any Development Area "D", but includes parking islands, courtyards, etc.). 20% of net site area.
 - g. Parking Ratio----- 4.5 spaces per
1,000 square feet of commercial
floor area.
3.5 spaces per
1,000 square feet of office floor
area.
 - h. Special attention will be given in the detail site plan review to the design of the buildings on the west side of the development area to insure that through design, location of windows and use of materials, compatibility with adjacent residences is maintained.

PUD #209-A (continued)

3) Development Area "B" (Townhouse) Standards:

- a. Net Site Area----- 8.67 acres
- b. Permitted Uses----- Attached dwelling units.
- c. Maximum Number of D.U.'S.---- 60
- d. Minimum Lot Width----- 20 feet
- e. Minimum Lot Size----- 1,600 square feet
- f. Maximum Height----- 26 feet
- g. Livability Space per D.U.--- 4,000 square feet (may be computed in the aggregate including Development Area "D").
- h. Yards---As required in RM-T District.
- i. Off-Street Parking----- 2 per dwelling unit.
- j. Streets----Private; minimum 20 feet in width to be privately maintained.

4) Development Area "C" (Patio Home) Standards:

- a. Net Site Area----- 4.77 acres
- b. Permitted Uses----- Detached dwelling units
- c. Maximum Number of Units----- 28
- d. Minimum Lot Width----- 50 feet
- e. Minimum Lot Size----- 5,000 square feet
- f. Livability Space Per D.U.--- 4,000 sq. ft. (may be computed in the aggregate including Development Area "D").
- g. Maximum Height----- 26 feet
- h. Yards
 Side: 0', Other: 10'
 Front: 20' & Rear: 20'
- i. Off-Street Parking----- 2 per D.U.
- j. Streets----Private; minimum 20 feet in width to be privately maintained.

5) Development Area "D" (Park and Open Space) Standards:

- a. Net Area----- 2.6 acres
- b. Permitted Uses----- Public park, storm water detention, landscaped areas.

6) Sign Standards:

- a. Ground Signs---(1) Maximum two signs to be located on Memorial frontage a minimum of 120-foot south of the north PUD boundary.
 (2) Maximum Display Surface Area: Per sign 200 sq. ft.
 (3) Maximum Height: (above street grade of Memorial) 14 feet.
- b. Directional Sign----- Internal directory signs intended to inform visitor as to location of tenants within center, shall not exceed 14 feet in height and 12 sq. ft. of display surface area per sign.
- c. Wall or Canopy Signs----- Aggregate display surface area shall not exceed 1½ sq. ft. per lineal foot of the building wall to which signs are attached.

PUD #209-A (continued)

- 7) That detailed site plans be approved for each of the development areas by the TMAPC prior to any building permit request.
- 8) That a subdivision plat be approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office prior to the issuance of any building permit incorporating within the restrictive covenants those conditions of PUD approval and the City of Tulsa be made beneficiary to said covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Jim Biffle advised that PUD #209-A integrates the residential portion of the development with the office and commercial areas encouraging pedestrian movements through open space linkages between the various land uses. The development creates the opportunity for a living/working environment in which a resident of the project has an opportunity to walk to shopping or his potential place of employment through carefully landscaped common areas. The entire project will be accomplished within a unified architectural style and landscaped site plan to provide a theme and sense of unity to the development.

Mr. Biffle stated that this will be one of the first mixed use developments (development with three or more uses designed to be compatible) that he was aware of in the Tulsa suburban area. The residential, office and commercial components work together to create an appropriate "market mix" within the planned environments of its various components. This development approach has the possibility of eliminating the necessity of some automobile trips. PUD #209-A proposes to utilize the pond and existing trees as a focal point in the design of one of the pedestrian plaza areas. The development concept of this PUD buffers the residential area from the commercial area by open space and careful architectural design of small scale, one-story office buildings, as well as landscaped berms and other plantings. A significant reduction in dwelling units from 112 to 88 units is proposed. In addition, the intensity of commercial development will also be decreased and probable traffic generation will be somewhat reduced. The entire development will be interrelated through a continuous pedestrian path system throughout the property.

Three points of ingress and egress are proposed to Memorial Drive. The major entry point will be a highly landscaped area directly across from one of the major entrances into Woodland Hills Mall. The internal circulation system will be developed and maintained as private streets. The residential street and cul-de-sacs will be privately owned and maintained by a homeowner's association. The internal circulation system has been carefully designed to provide separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Extensive plaza areas and pedestrianway paths link all areas of the development proposal and will encourage pedestrian movements throughout the development thus accomplishing a major objective of the mixed-use development proposal.

Mr. Biffle advised that, for the most part, the subject property is surrounded with commercial, office, multifamily development and duplex property. The present zoning and abutting land uses are supportive of the mixed-use development proposal concept.

PUD #209-A (continued)

Drainage on the subject property does not create any unusual problems. The applicant noted that the existing pond on the subject tract will be improved and pending detailed engineering determination may be used as a detention pond for the southerly portion of the development.

The existing utilities, water, sanitary sewer, gas and electric are available and of adequate size and capacity.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of PETTY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the following described property be approved, subject to the Staff Recommendation:

A tract of land, containing 32.9247 acres, in part of the E/2 of the SE/4 of Section 2, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit:
The north 1,420' of the south 2,395' of the East 1,010' of said E/2 of the SE/4 of Section 2.

Application No. Z-5492 Present Zoning: RD
Applicant: John R. Shelton (Guy T. Irvirie) Proposed Zoning: OL
Location: South of the SE corner of 71st Street and Peoria Avenue

Date of Application: December 31, 1980
Date of Hearing: February 11, 1981
Size of Tract: 1.25 acre

Presentation to TMAPC by: Larry Collins Phone: 749-0364
Address: P. O. Box 1671

Staff Recommendation:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Riverside Expressway.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the OL District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

The Staff recommends DENIAL of the requested OL zoning for the following reasons:

The subject property is located south and east of the SE corner of 71st Street and Peoria Avenue. The property is vacant, zoned RD residential duplex and the applicant is requesting OL to permit office use.

The subject property was part of an application for CS zoning in January 1980 (Z-5357). Commercial zoning was approved on the frontage and denied on the subject tract and the adjacent property. The reason for denial is still valid; interior tracts should remain residential in keeping with the zoning patterns established in the area and the location criteria set out by the Development Guidelines, a part of the Comprehensive Plan. The fact that the property is planned for expressway use does not effect the opinion of the Staff, the appropriate land use is residential and not nonresidential.

For these reasons, the Staff recommends DENIAL of OL zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Larry Collins, representing the applicant, advised that the back portion of the subject tract is zoned RD, while the front of the property is zoned CS. In order to develop the RD portion of the tract, it would be necessary to remove at least 1/3 of the CS zoned property to allow a road right-of-way to the area. OL zoning on the entire property would allow use of a common drive and parking area.

Mr. Collins noted that the subject tract is flat and he did not foresee any problems with water drainage in the area. He advised that the proposed office complex would be designed with a home-style atmosphere and park-like landscaping for eye appeal and compatibility with the surrounding area.

The Staff advised that a PUD request, to the east of the subject tract, was approved to allow office development on the front portion and a mini-storage development on the rear of the tract under a combined CS and RM-1 zoning. Mr. Gardner pointed out that the applicant would have the same opportunity for combined uses under a PUD.

Z-5492 (continued)

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to continue Z-5492 to March 18, 1981, 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center, to allow the applicant to file a PUD application on the subject property.

Application No. Z-5493 Present Zoning: RS-3
Applicant: W. Wayne Kendall Proposed Zoning: RM-1
Location: West of the NE corner of 26th Street and Jamestown Avenue

Date of Application: December 31, 1980
Date of Hearing: February 11, 1981
Size of Tract: .5 acre

Presentation to TMAPC by: Wayne Kendall
Address: 11632 South 75th East Avenue Phone: 369-2617
Bixby, Oklahoma

Staff Recommendation:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: The District 4 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low-Intensity -- Residential.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the RM-1 District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

The Staff recommends APPROVAL of RM-T and DENIAL of RM-1 for the following reasons:

The subject property is located at the end of 26th Street, west of Oswego Avenue. The property is zoned RS-3, contains two duplexes and the applicant is requesting RM-1 multifamily zoning.

The subject property merits consideration for an increased residential density for three reasons:

- 1) It abuts RM-2 zoning on the north;
- 2) it is adjacent to the Expressway; and
- 3) RM-1 zoning was approved on the tract to the south.

The development, however, to the south is townhouses and has a subdivision plat for 5 townhouse lots, and construction is underway. Based on the fact that single-family residences are to the east and that townhouse development is under construction to the south, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of RM-T Townhouse zoning and DENIAL of RM-1.

NOTE: If applicant desires only to retain existing duplexes, Commission could consider RD zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Wayne Kendall advised that he is the owner of the two duplexes on the subject tract. He stated that he has no immediate plans for development of the property; however, future plans are for removal of the duplexes and construction of a four-plex.

Protestants: Paul Wells Address: 3917 East 26th Street
Jane Carter 2556 South Oswego Avenue

Z-5493 (continued)

Protestant's Comments:

Paul Wells presented a protest petition (Exhibit "C-1") signed by 30 residents of the immediate area. Mr. Wells advised that the access to the subject property was a major objection. There is a heavy traffic load in the area at this time and it was felt that the additional traffic burden would be excessive for the area.

Jane Carter stated she was opposed to an increase in housing units in the area. She advised that she did not realize the applicant proposed the construction of only four units in the future. The protestant stated she would not be opposed to the Staff Recommendation for RM-T zoning.

Instruments Submitted: Protest Petition (Exhibit "C-1")

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of PETTY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RM-T, as per the Staff Recommendation:

That portion of Block 2, Kirkmoore Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the NE corner of said Block 2; thence South along the East line of said Block 2, a distance of 60.2'; thence West and parallel to the North line of said Block 2, a distance of 54.15'; thence in a Southwesterly direction a distance of 239.73' to a point of intersection with the Southerly right-of-way line of the Missouri, Kansas and Texas (Fairgrounds Spur); thence in a Northeasterly direction along said Southerly right-of-way line a distance of 265.47' to a point on the North line of said Block; thence East along said North line a distance of 54.15' to the point of beginning, and known as 2552-50 South Jamestown Avenue; and beginning at a point on the East line of said Block 2, said point being 60.2' South of the NE corner thereof; thence South along said East line a distance of 60.2'; thence West along a line parallel to and 120.4' South of the North line of said Block 2, a distance of 282.2'; thence in a Northeasterly direction a distance of 239.73' to a point, said point being 60.2' South and 54.17' West of the NE corner of said Block 2; thence East a distance of 54.17' to a point on the East line of said Block 2 and the point of beginning, and known as 2556-58 South Jamestown Avenue.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Crow-Dobbs Office Park (PUD #202) (283) 61st Street and South 76th East Ave.
(CS)

and

Baystone (3193) South side of 58th Street at Quincy Avenue (RM-2)

The Staff advised that not all letters have been submitted and recommended tabling these items.

The Chair, without objection, tabled Crow-Dobbs Office Park and Baystone.

Madison Wood Addition (2492) SW corner of 37th Street and South Madison Ave.
(RM-T)

All letters have been received and the Staff recommended final approval and release of Madison Wood Addition.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") for final approval and release of Madison Wood Addition.

Murphy-Gilbert Park (1894) 2400 Block South Garnett Road (RS-3 & OL)

Mr. Gardner advised that this plat would need to be tabled since not all letters have been received.

Without objection, the Chair tabled Murphy-Gilbert Park.

FOR WAIVER OF PLAT:

CZ-4 (Scottsdale Addition) (603) East 62nd Street North and North Wheeling
(RMH) (County)

Commissioner T. Young advised that this application was approved by the County Commission. The agreements on the roads in the area was fully understood by all parties and although there will be no closing of roads the problem will be satisfactorily handled.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to approve the waiver of plat on CZ-4 Scottsdale Addition.

PUD #187 Marlene VanHorn NE corner of 72nd East Avenue and 65th Street

Request for a Minor Amendment to permit a 15.5' rear yard per plot plan.

Mr. Albery advised that this is a corner lot in Shadow Mountain Addition. The owner and builder had submitted a plot plan which showed an encroachment into the rear yard. Due to the fact that this is a corner lot, there are two street setbacks imposed - one from the south and one from the west. The side yard is, in effect, the rear yard which has a requirement of 20'. In order to fit this particular house on the lot it would require a 4.5' encroachment into the 20' rear yard. A copy of this proposal was mailed to the owner of the abutting tract and a phone call was

PUD #187 (continued)

received from the owner who had no objection to the requested minor amendment. The house will align with the abutting resident's garage and enter on the same street. The Staff recommended approval of the minor amendment.

On MOTION of AVEY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Inhofe, Parmele "absent") to approve a minor amendment to permit a 15.5' rear yard, per plot plan, on Lot 15, Block 11, Shadow Mountain Addition, (PUD #187).

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:23 p.m.

Date Approved February 25, 1981

Robert J. Samuel
1st Vice-Chairman

ATTEST:

Marian E. Shelday
Secretary