

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
 MINUTES of Meeting No. 1426
 Wednesday, October 6, 1982, 1:30 p.m.
 Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall,
 Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Hennage, 2nd Vice- Chairman	Freeman	Chisum	Linker, Legal Department
Higgins	Gardner	Compton	
Hinkle	Kempe	Gardner	
Parmeale, Chairman	Inhofe	Wilmoth	
Petty, Secretary			
Rice			
Young			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, October 5, 1982, at 9:40 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG Offices.

Chairman Parmeale called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmeale, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minutes of September 15, 1982 (No. 1423).

SUBDIVISIONS:

Oxford Place Addition (383) South Sheridan Road at East 66th Street (OL)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by John Moody.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat of Oxford Place, subject to the conditions.

Mr. John Moody represented the owner and advised the Commission that an agreement has been reached with the neighborhood for the development of the property. One of the agreements was no overhead utility services permitted in the addition except on Sheridan Road. He is negotiating with PSO to make sure there will be no overhead service. This may be back before the Board if the agreement is not reached with PSO.

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmeale, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Preliminary Plat of Oxford Place Addition, subject to the following conditions:

1. Since this is not being processed as a PUD, the PUD #231 should be abandoned. The Board of Adjustment Case No. 11666 covers any waivers needed for lot coverage, etc. The Staff is reviewing the plat as an ordinary office zoned (OL) plat.

Oxford Place Addition (continued)

2. Show access points on the plat to coincide with the plot plan, subject to approval of the Traffic Engineer. Include access provisions in covenants.
3. Show 50' building line on Sheridan Road and 25' building line on Oxford Avenue. Also show "LNA" on Oxford. (Access to or using Oxford as another point of access had been discussed previously and due to slope no requirement for a tie was made.)
4. Update location map to show new subdivisions. Show 17½' perimeter easements as needed by the utilities.
5. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to, or related to property and/or lot lines.
6. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat. (Include language in covenants relating to the Water and Sewer Department.) (if required)
7. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat. (if required)
8. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by the City Commission.
9. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
10. A "letter of assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of the final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6 (5) of the Subdivision Regulations.)
11. All Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of the final plat.

Raintree II Addition (182) SW corner of East 66th Place South and South Peoria Avenue (RM-2)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant not represented.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat of Raintree II Addition, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Preliminary Plat of Raintree II Addition, subject to the following conditions:

1. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. (17½' on west) Existing easements should
- 10.6.82:1426(2)

Raintree II Addition (continued)

should be tied to, or related to property and/or lot lines.

2. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat. (Include language in covenants relating to Water and Sewer Department.) (if required)
3. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat. (if required)
4. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer. (if required)
5. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by the City Commission.
6. Access points shall be approved by the City and/or Traffic Engineer.
7. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
8. A "letter of assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of the final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6 (5) of the Subdivision Regulations.)
9. All Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of the final plat.

Park Plaza 7th Addition II - Amended (2693) East 46th Place and South 70th East Avenue (RS-3)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Bert Steinberg and Ken Miles.

This plat has a SKETCH PLAT approval, subject to conditions.

The applicant was reminded in the T.A.C. meeting to include the maintenance agreements, etc., in the covenants or file by separate instrument. It was suggested the applicant re-draft the written portion and submit a copy to utilities before release letters would be written.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat of Park Plaza 7th Addition II, Amended, subject to the conditions. The Staff advised the Planning Commission that all conditions have been met, all release letters have been received and recommended final approval and release.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plat for Park Plaza 7th Addition II Amended and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

Tulsa Jr. College, SE Campus (1884) South and East of East 81st Street and
South Mingo Road (AG)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant not represented.

NOTE: This plat has a SKETCH PLAT approval, subject to conditions. A copy of the Minutes of June 10, 1982, was provided with Staff comments as applicable.

The applicant also provided an updated copy of the conceptual site plan for the T.A.C.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat of Tulsa Jr. College, SE Campus, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Preliminary Plat for Tulsa Jr. College, SE Campus, subject to the following conditions:

1. Access should be approved by the Traffic Engineer. Include access control paragraph in the covenants.
2. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to, or related to property and/or lot lines.
3. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to the release of the final plat.
4. Pavement repair within restricted water line easements as a result of water line repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner of the lot(s).
5. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat.
6. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer, (if required).
7. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by the City Commission. (Detention pond maintained by owner. Include language in covenants.)
8. O.N.G. advises that there shall be no dirt removed over their lines without their permission.
9. Show adjacent land as "unplatted". Show all pipeline easements on the final plat. Show storm water detention on the final plat.
10. A Corporation Commission letter (or Certification of Nondevelopment) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on the plat on any wells not officially plugged.)

Tulsa Jr. College, SE Campus (continued)

11. Language in covenants shall be acceptable to utilities. (Check language for the Water and Sewer Department?)
12. A "letter of assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to the release of the final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6 (5) of the Subdivision Regulations.)
13. All Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of the final plat.

For Extension of Approval:

Eaglebrook Addition (183) SE corner of 61st Street and South Memorial Dr.
(CS)

Metro Addition (2603) SE corner of Gilcrease Expressway and North Sheridan Road
(IL)

The Staff advised that a one-year extension is requested for these plats, and recommended approval.

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve a one-year extension for Eaglebrook and Metro Additions.

For Waiver of Plat:

Z-5402 W. Raczkowski (293) East of the NE corner of East 10th Street and South Sheridan Road (CS and RM-1)

The Chair, without objection, tabled this item one week.

LOT-SPLITS:

L-15584 R. Rosencutter (1482) South and East of South Maybelle and West 84th Street South (AG)

This plat is a request to split an .87 acre from a 77-acre tract in an AG District. The applicant proposes a dedicated street 25' (West 84th Street.) for access. This would result in a lot with 200' of frontage, but far short of the 2-acre minimum in the AG District. The Staff notes that this is inside the City Limits of Tulsa, and it has been the policy NOT to accept 1/2-street dedications. As an alternate the Staff recommends that the applicant amend his request and provide access by an ownership "handle", which, if the use is reserved for ingress and egress, could be dedicated in the future as a street when the need for the street is justified. (Even if the full 50' was to be dedicated, it would be up to the City Engineering Department to accept the dedication. It simply may be premature at this time.) It appears that the owners have already split the original 80 acres resulting in three one-acre tracts, plus the .87 acre under this request. The applicant is reminded that only four lots can be created under one ownership before a subdivision plat must be filed instead of a lot-split. The Staff would have no objection to the size since there are other small lots in the area. It will require Board of Adjustment approval and Health Department

L-15584 (continued)

approval, regardless of the final lot configuration.

The Staff presented the request with the applicant not represented.

The T.A.C. was in agreement with the Staff and recommended the access by private ownership "handle" instead of a dedicated 1/2 street.

Therefore, the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommends approval of L-15584, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-15584, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Board of Adjustment approval of lot size and frontage,
- (b) Health Department approval of septic system; and,
- (c) access by an "ownership handle" to Maybelle Avenue.

L-15586 R. Friend (3612) 730 East 76th Street North (AG - County)

The Chair, without objection, tabled this item.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. Z-5747		Present Zoning:	RS-3
Applicant: Barnes		Proposed Zoning:	RD
Location: East of the SE corner of 15th Street and 77th East Avenue			

Date of Application: July 20, 1982
Date of Hearing: October 6, 1982
Size of Tract: 1-acre, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: John Moody
Address: Bank of Oklahoma Tower Phone: 588-2651

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 5 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 RD District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is 2.67 acres in size, vacant, except for a dwelling located on the southwest portion. It is located west and south of the southwest corner of 15th Street and 79th East Avenue. North and south of the subject tract are large lot single-family residences, zoned RS-3. West of the subject tract is a developed RS-3 neighborhood and to the east RS-3 zoned duplexes.

Presently, there is a definite boundary for multifamily and duplex zoning west of Memorial Drive and the western boundary for duplex zoning is 79th East Avenue. Duplex development is not inappropriate in this area, just the increased density permitted under RD zoning.

Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of the proposed RD zoning and recommended that the applicant go before the Board of Adjustment and apply for a special exception to allow duplexes in an RS-3 District.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. John Moody asked the Staff for their calculation as to density with the Board of Adjustment approval for duplexes in an RS-3 District and Mr. Compton explained that, with a PUD, up to 24 or 25 units would be allowed on the total tract under application. Mr. Moody did not think they could get that, because the applicant was not taking ownership to the total tract and the amount he would be allowed would make a difference in his presentation.

Mr. Moody represented David Barnes who is purchasing the subject property with the exception of the lot containing an existing house located on South 79th East Avenue and an access road which will go to 79th East Avenue. Mr. Barnes has developed quality homes in several areas. There is a necessity for a good transitional development between the existing multifamily on the east and the developed single-family on the west. Everyone realizes single-family will not develop due to economic conditions. This property is located on East 15th Street and will have access to South 79th East Avenue. Duplex zoning has been permitted north of 15th Street on the west side of South 79th East Avenue. He does not feel that the existing duplex and RM-1 zonings on South 79th East Avenue establish a firm boundary line and sees no reason for the establishment of an RS-3 line down South 79th East Avenue.

Z-5747 (continued)

The intent is for small, townhouse lot developments and for this to be economically feasible, the RD density is necessary to achieve the number of dwelling units on the property. The present owner desires to retain his house, but requested his property also be zoned duplex for future development. If the Staff Recommendation is approved, the project is proposed by Mr. Barnes could not be developed with 24 units without the lot containing the existing single-family structure. All new development in this area has been of a multifamily or duplex-type development. Mr. Moody feels this property is very desirable for zoning that would permit a higher density infill development. This property is within 2 blocks of Memorial Drive, which is a primary arterial and is within a reasonable range of existing facilities which would support the increased density requested. If the Commission would agree to RD zoning, Mr. Moody would not process the application to the City Commission until a hearing has been held for a PUD. Mr. Barnes does not want to go to the expense of hiring an architect until the zoning is decided. In Mr. Moody's opinion, there is no purpose in protecting the line of South 79th East Avenue. In the past, the traditional view of zoning would have established this as a reasonable line between single-family; however, the development policies have changed drastically and the public need is for housing. Duplex zoning has always been compatible with single-family development and has traditionally been used as a buffer.

Commissioner Petty asked the dimensions of the lot containing the existing structure and Mr. Moody explained the entire tract is 480' less 312', so it will be approximately 165' deep and the frontage would be approximately 135' on South 79th East Avenue.

Mr. Barnes explained that the density for 24 units computes just on the 312' east-west measurement that he is buying. A 30' access easement was not used in the computation. This will not be an access street for property owners. He would require 4,200 square feet of open space per lot in order to develop the property, which is the requirement for RD zoning.

Mr. Gardner advised that other property owners in the area could apply for RD zoning if this were approved and 79th East Avenue is a very small road that is not up to City standards. Apartment zoning has been denied twice on the property across the street. With RD zoning, 30 units could be put on the entire tract.

Mr. Moody suggested a continuation of this case for one week in order to discuss the density figures with the Staff.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of Z-5747 until October 13, 1982, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. PUD 236-A
Applicant: Johnsen (Basta)
Location: 7500 Block of South Memorial Drive

Present Zoning: (RS-3, OL)

Date of Application: April 7, 1982
Date of Hearing: October 6, 1982
Size of Tract: 20 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Roy Johnsen
Address: 324 Main Mall - 74103

Phone: 585-5641

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located on the west side of Memorial Drive at 76th Street South. It is 20 acres in size, zoned a combination of OL and RS-3, and the applicant is requesting to amend his Development Plan and Text.

The Staff has reviewed the history of the case and the applicant's Amended Outline Development Plan and find the following:

- 1) The applicant is proposing to expand the office use frontage on Memorial Drive from 370 feet to what will visually appear to be the total 660' east boundary of the subject tract. The Staff was opposed to the initial OL zoning intruding south of the subject tract's north boundary. We were opposed to an office use in the PUD that extended south 370' into the tract. We now oppose the proposed additional extension of office use further south because, as in the other cases, their proposal is clearly inconsistent with the Development Guidelines and the Comprehensive Plan. It is a prime example of the extension of a zoning buffer district (buffering a buffer) which we do not support.
- 2) As it is proposed, the use is surrounded on four sides by residential uses and cannot be considered anything more than "spot" zoning which cannot be supported.
- 3) If approved, it would be bypassing the established Zoning Code and intent of the PUD Chapter because it is not maintaining appropriate limitations on the character of the intruding office use.
- 4) Approval of this plat will make it extremely difficult to maintain the remainder of the undeveloped land south and east in a low intensity residential pattern. Some amount of residential use would have to be maintained south of the office use on the subject tract to establish a stopping point.
- 5) That as proposed, more nonresidential traffic would be forced onto the residential streets to the south and west of the subject tract.

Given the above cited factors, the Staff cannot support the request and recommends DENIAL of the Amended Outline Development Plan.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Johnsen explained that this property was before the Commission in early 1979 when the application was presented for approval of OL zoning on the entire 20 acres. The covenant agreement had been entered into and the neighborhood was in agreement. The Planning Commission recommended approval for OL use without a PUD and the City Commission turned the application down.

PUD #236-A (continued)

A new application was then filed requesting approximately 6 acres of OL and the balance of RS-3 combined under a PUD, depicting a combination of office park and residential development. The Planning Commission recommended approval, over the Staff Recommendation for denial. The City Commission also approved the plan. There has been neighborhood support in all of these applications. The PUD approved 104,000 square feet of office park and 35 residential dwelling units. The amendment today is for the same intensity with merely a difference in site plan configuration. There would be no change in the underlying zoning. Office zoning has already been approved.

Mr. Johnsen's clients, Swab-Fox Corporation and David Dillion Enterprises, are under contract to purchase the property. In studying the property, it is their feeling that the plan previously approved is not marketable and is not the best land use for the site. Under the approved plan, the residential development would extend to Memorial Drive and a developer in today's market would not attempt such a layout. The restrictive covenant filed of record on the property consisted of unworkable provisions. The contractual arrangements on purchasing the property were a new site plan with a more practical arrangement of the land uses and workable amendments to the recorded restrictive covenants. Representatives have met with the Southeast Tulsa Homeowner's Association, as well as the property owners immediately abutting the subject property, over a period of several months. The Homeowner's Association has executed a revised restrictive covenant agreement setting out a number of standards governing the development of this property, all consistent with the proposal submitted. All property owners immediately abutting the subject tract have been presented with a copy of the site plan and restrictive covenant document. No one has objected to the proposal although some have not actually signed the document.

Along the north boundary, roughly the west 3/4ths, is Leake Park. There are no existing or anticipated residential neighborhoods along this portion of the north boundary. To the east of the park and fronting Memorial, there is RM-1 zoned land developed for an elderly, two-story apartment. The extreme northeastern corner of the subject property is diagonally across from a tract zoned OL. There is single-family across Memorial to the east. Southeast of this development there is a proposed PSO Substation and behind that is a proposed nursing home that has been approved by the Board of Adjustment. Farther south the land is undeveloped. The subject property is generally highest along Memorial and slopes to the west and south.

Memorial Drive is a primary arterial with 120' of right-of-way and is scheduled for four lanes, divided by a median. This will be a major highway and principal thoroughfare. Mr. Johnsen did not feel this frontage would be acceptable for residential development and is a transitional piece of property which would be suited for OL zoning.

Mr. Johnsen said he has scaled off the drawings and the previous proposal for this office development area has 435 feet of frontage along Memorial. The new proposal would have 550 feet of frontage, making the extension of office use but not of the actual zoning, only 115 feet. He feels transitions are important, especially in relation to surrounding property, and, in this instance, it was felt that an adequate separation would be a landscaped, open space area, then the street, then the office.

The residential use would not vary in the amount of dwelling units. However, instead of having the residential extended into the office area, it

PUD #236-A (continued)

was put in a more uniform manner on the western portion of the tract. A loop street in the middle is proposed, with smaller lots looped around a common area. The perimeter would have standard lots for detached, single-family dwellings. The homes in the interior could be attached with offsetting open space immediately adjacent. All conditions of the PUD Chapter have been met or exceeded as per the submitted Plan Text.

Mr. Johnsen wished to advise the Staff that he will be seeking a break in the median for a left-turn movement for the southernmost street into the subject property. He was uncertain as to the statement made in the Staff Recommendation under Item 5). Mr. Gardner explained that all the office traffic would travel the residential collector streets because there was no left-hand turn movement on the drawing presented to the Staff. If a left-hand turn movement is approved, then Item 5) could be eliminated. Mr. Johnsen agreed there would be a problem with the traffic if the movement were not approved, but feels there is a solid basis for approval.

Mr. Johnsen felt that the Staff Recommendation was addressing a zoning question instead of a PUD. The Guidelines and the Commission encourage PUD's and the overall results of development are improved with a PUD. He requested the Commission consider the fact this is an in-between property, it is on a primary arterial, the underlying zoning exists, it is submitted as a PUD with typical and appropriate development standards and there is neighborhood support. Mr. Johnsen will submit a copy of the Amended Restrictive Covenants executed by the Southeast Tulsa Homeowner's Association, Inc.; a copy of a letter from the Southeast Tulsa Homeowner's Association to the area residents recommending support of the proposal; and, ratification and release signed by all area homeowners (signatures presently being secured) (Exhibits "A-1", "A-2" and "A-3", respectively).

Mr. Doug Fox is president of Swab-Fox Corporation, who is one of the proposed buyers of the property. It has been their policy on other projects to meet with neighborhoods to try to iron out any problems. In this case, the homeowners are in accord with the proposed plan and the letter from the Southeast Tulsa Homeowner's Association to the area residents reflects their approval. This proposal puts the offices in the front of the tract on the main thoroughfare with the residential development to the back so traffic will not be funneled into the residential neighborhood.

Protestants: None.

Instruments Submitted: Copy of Amended Restrictive Covenants executed by the Southeast Tulsa Homeowner's Association, Inc. (Exhibit "A-1")
Copy of a letter from the Southeast Tulsa Homeowner's Association to the area residents recommending support of the proposal. (Exhibit "A-2")
Ratification and release signed by all area homeowners. (Exhibit "A-3")

MOTION was made by YOUNG, second by HIGGINS, to approve the amendment to PUD #236.

PUD #236-A (continued)

- 7) That the northern access point be moved north to align with 75th Street South if a median cut and full access cannot be obtained at the 76th Street entry.
- 8) That one or more owner's association be created to maintain all common areas, including private drives and landscape areas, if dwelling units or offices are sold now or in the future.
- 9) That no building permit be issued until the property has been included within a subdivision plat, submitted to, and approved by the TMAPC, and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

Mr. Johnsen requested that the signs be on the ground and not exceed 4' in height or 8 square feet in surface area, rather than on the building. Mr. Gardner explained the Staff did not want any free-standing signs, but has no problem with monument-type signs. The change would delete the words "...on the face of each building..." under Condition #6.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the amendment to PUD #236 on the following described property, subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation including the amendment to Condition #6 as follows:

- "6) That two project identification signs shall be permitted for Development Area 1, each not exceeding 32 square feet of display surface area and 4 feet in height. One monument identification sign shall be permitted for each building within Development Area 1, not exceeding 8 square feet of display surface area and 4 feet in height."

The S/2, SE/4, NE/4 of Section 11, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #128-A Charles Norman South of 71st Street and Trenton Avenue

Mr. Compton explained that the Building Inspections Department is not issuing building permits on some of the lots in PUD #128 because the original PUD conditions required that the lot frontage was approved to be 80'. This area was platted initially to be duplex lots with 80' frontage, but when the Staff researched the problem, it was found that an amendment changing the conditions had a part of the final motion left out. This needs to be clarified. Mr. Norman had requested, by letter, to transfer dwelling units from Area D to Area C to increase the density of Area C from 104 to 132 with 60' frontages and lot areas of 7,200 square feet, instead of the 80' frontage required in the original PUD. The minutes of the meeting also show that this was a part of the discussion, but the Planning Commission action does not reflect these requested changes even though the density increase was approved, which indirectly would reduce lot frontage and area.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to clarify the minutes of August 20, 1980, by stating the motion as follows:

"On MOTION of GARDNER, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Gardner, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Avey, Eller, Inhofe, Keith, C. Young "absent") to approve a Minor Amendment for PUD #128 to transfer 31 units from Development Area "D" to Development Area "C", subject to the following conditions:

1. Development Area "C":
 - a. That the maximum number of dwelling units not exceed 132, and that the lot frontages not be less than 60' with an average of 7,200 square feet per lot.
2. Development Area "D"
 - a. That the maximum number of dwelling units not exceed 2,296."

PUD #179-I, Area "F" Paul Gunderson SW corner of 71st Street and 92nd East Avenue (Woodland Springs I)

Staff Recommendation — Detail Site Plan Review

The subject tract is located south of the southwest corner of East 71st Street and South 92nd East Avenue. It is 11.9 acres in size, vacant, and approved for multifamily or cluster home use.

The Staff had reviewed the approved PUD and the submitted Detail Site Plan and find the following:

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>APPROVED</u>	<u>SUBMITTED</u>
Net Area:	11.9 acres	11.9 acres
Permitted Uses:	Multifamily/Cluster Homes and Accessory Uses	Same
Maximum No. of Dwelling Units:	200 units	200 units
Maximum Building Height:	26 ft.	26 ft.
Livability Space per Dwelling Unit:	1,000 sq. ft.	1,200 sq. ft.
Minimum Setback (from 92nd E. Avenue):	25 ft.	25 ft.
(from exterior boundary):	20 ft.	20 ft.
(from building to building):	10 ft.	10 ft.
Minimum Parking: (RM-T)	320 spaces	320 spaces

In addition we find:

- 1) That the applicant proposes to retain the existing healthy mature trees on the tract.
- 2) That the construction of the building will be in accordance with the soils engineer's recommendation for foundation construction, which is based on his tests of the soil from the site.
- 3) That PFPI-2366 has been filed with the City Engineering Department insuring the construction of the bridge connecting to Woodland Hills South Addition.

Based on the above cited review, the Staff can support and does recommend the APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan for PUD #179-I, Area "F", subject to the plans and text submitted (Exhibit "B-1").

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan for PUD #179-I, subject to the plans and text submitted.

PUD #281-2 Wayne Alberty South of East 61st Street, West of South Mingo Road
(Gleneagles Addition)

The Chair, without objection, tabled this item.

Special Exceptions for Christmas Tree Sales (Use Unit 2)

Every year the Board of Adjustment (BOA) has several requests for Special Exceptions to allow temporary Christmas tree sales (Use Unit 2). In the past, most have received routine approval. However, this year, because of recent Zoning Code changes requiring that BOA approvals on Use Unit 2 applications be subject to the platting requirements of Section 260, we foresee a minor problem.

To solve this problem the Staff is recommending that the TMAPC grant a plat waiver to all BOA applications requesting a Special Exception to sell Christmas trees during November and December of 1982, subject to Staff approval.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Parmele, Petty, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Kempe, Inhofe, "absent") to grant a plat waiver to all BOA applications requesting a Special Exception to sell Christmas trees during November and December of 1982, subject to approval by the Staff.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Date Approved 10-20-82

Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

Marian Hennage
for Secretary

