

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1434
Wednesday, December 8, 1982, 1:30 p.m.
Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Hennage, 2nd Vice-Chairman Higgins Kempe, 1st Vice- Chairman Parmele, Chairman Petty Rice	Gardner Young Inhofe	Chisum Compton Gardner	Linker, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor at 9:43 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG Offices.

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

MINUTES:

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Higgins, Young, Inhofe "absent") to approve the minutes of November 24, 1982 (No. 1432).

REPORTS:

Rules and Regulations Committee

Chairman Parmele advised there will be a Rules and Regulations Committee meeting next Wednesday, December 15, immediately following the regular TMAPC meeting, in Room 213.

RESOLUTION

On MOTION of PETTY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Higgins, Young, Inhofe "absent") to approve the minutes of November 24, 1982 (No. 1432).

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, the TMAPC wishes to acknowledge the contribution made by former Commission members, and

WHEREAS, Mr. Lee Eller served on the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission from July, 1979, to January, 1982, and

WHEREAS, Lee has given freely of his time and ability toward the development of a better place in which to live.

NOW, THEREFORE, the members of the Board wish to express our appreciation for the service given by our former member, Lee Eller.

APPROVED and ADOPTED this 8th day of December, 1982.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Z-5773-SP-1 Newhart (Adamson, Crum) S of SE/c of 62nd and Mingo (Site Plan Review)

The Staff requested this item be continued one week. Mr. Hutson, representing the applicant, agreed to the continuance.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Higgins, Young, Inhofe "absent") to continue consideration of Z-5773, Site Plan Review, until December 15, 1982, at 1:30 p.m. in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. Z-5774 Present Zoning: RS-3
Applicant: King (P & J Investments) Proposed Zoning: RM-2
Location: Southwest corner of the Crosstown Expressway and Yale

Date of Application: October 18, 1982
Date of Hearing: December 8, 1982
Size of Tract: .8 acre, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Stephen King
Address: 2205 E. 22nd Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74129 Phone: 744-1404

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-2 District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located at the southwest corner of Yale Avenue and the Crosstown Expressway. The tract is .8 acre in size, contains one vacant single-family structure fronting Yale Avenue, is zoned RS-3, and the applicant is requesting RM-2 zoning. The tract is abutted on the north by a single-family dwelling and the Crosstown Expressway zoned RS-3, on the east by a single-family neighborhood zoned RS-3, and on the west by a church, zoned RD.

Since the subject tract is located where it would serve as a land use buffer for the neighborhood from the traffic on the Crosstown Expressway and Yale Avenue, the Staff feels that a higher residential density is appropriate. However, based on the comprehensive plan, the prominence of the surrounding low density single-family residential and the fact that the church property abutting the subject tract on the west is zoned RD, the Staff can support only a lower density, buffer-type zoning district.

Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of the requested RM-2 zoning and APPROVAL of RD zoning.

For the record, the RD zoning would accommodate approximately 10 dwelling units and PUD might also afford the owner some additional development flexibility.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Stephen King and Mr. Doug Shroud represented the land owner. Mr. King originally thought apartments would be the best use of the property, with RM-2 as the highest density. However, after the application had been filed, Mr. King received several phone calls from land owners in the area because of the difficult traffic situation and access problems. When he discussed the project with the Staff and found there were problems with apartment zoning, he suggested RD zoning to the land owner. A land plan was displayed, which was drawn up by the architect, depicting 10 duplex units. Therefore, Mr. King would agree with the Staff recommendation and feels such a use would utilize the land and might appease the neighborhood.

Z-5774 (continued)

<u>Protestants:</u>	Eugene Colleoni	Addresses:	1534 S. Delaware - 74104
	Mrs. Charles Drury		4606 E. 2nd Street
	Sylvester Chandler		4631 E. 4th Street
	H. G. Tracy		4607 E. 2nd Street
	Rev. H. R. Gabriel		7614 E. 21st Street
	Dan Curran		4707 E. 3rd Street

Protestants' Comments:

Mr. Eugene Colleoni is Chairman of District 4 and wished to emphasize that District 4 is composed of almost entirely RS-3, single-family homes. He does not want to break the zoning pattern. Across Yale is a RS-3 neighborhood and this requested rezoning would introduce a break in the zoning pattern east of Yale Avenue. He stated that with RS-3 zoning, duplexes at a lower density could be allowed by a Board of Adjustment Special Exception. The District wants to maintain a zoning pattern of RS-3 and recommends denial of this application.

Mrs. Charles Drury presented a petition containing 62 signatures in protest to this application (Exhibit "A-1"). The sewer will not handle more development because the area already floods when it rains. Vandalia dead-ends next to the expressway, causing an access problem. Parking for the church already causes congestion. Chairman Parmele asked if Mrs. Drury would also be opposed to the duplex zoning instead of the original request for RM-2 and she stated this would still not be acceptable.

Mr. Sylvester Chandler agreed with the statements made by Mrs. Drury. About five or six years ago, an application for apartments on this same tract was denied because of the sewer situation. In order to accommodate run off, the Water and Sewer Department would have to dig up the sewers and go under I-244. There is only one north-south street into the subject tract and that is Vandalia. At the time of the previous application, consensus of the neighborhood was that two or three duplexes would be alright. Anymore would cause too many problems with the sewer and traffic. Chairman Parmele explained that the City Hydrologist would have to approve the plans providing for run off, but Mr. Chandler still felt the quantity recommended by the Staff was too great.

Mr. H. G. Drury expanded on the flooding problems. Also, he does not want to have such high intensity close to his home.

Mr. H. R. Gabriel is pastor of the church across the street from the subject property. He is opposed to the application because of the traffic increase. The church already has problems with unauthorized parking in their lot.

Mr. Dan Curran was also concerned about the traffic situation and the drainage. Many of the residents wish to keep the area single-family.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. King had no further comments.

Instruments Submitted:

Petition containing 62 signatures in opposition (Exhibit "A-1").

Special Discussion for the Record:

Chairman Parmele asked if the Plot Plan showed an exit on Vandalia and Yale. Mr. Gardner stated that it did. Commissioner Petty wanted to know if this could be taken to the Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception, as mentioned by Mr. Colleoni. Mr. Gardner explained that the Staff had considered that possibility. The precedent for RD in the area has already been established, even though a church is built on that particular property. The Staff does not see that a distinction can be made on this tract or they would have recommended the zoning remain RS-3 with a Board of Adjustment Special Exception. Chairman Parmele agreed with the Staff's recommendation, especially with the access on Vandalia and Yale. The sewer and water problems will have to be handled in accordance with the City's specifications.

Mr. Gardner noted there have been several cases in this area prior to 1970 for higher density development, such as commercial or apartments. This area is a problem because it is underdeveloped. A land use needs to be established and duplexes would serve as a good buffer.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of PETTY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RD:

Lots Five (5) and Eight (8), Block Two, Stanford Heights, a Re-subdivision of Lots 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, Block 2, Rodgers Heights Subdivision to the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof.

Application No. Z-5775
Applicant: Moody (Jobe)

Present Zoning: RS-3
Proposed Zoning: OL/RM-1

Location: North of the Northeast corner of 66th and Mingo

Date of Application: October 22, 1982
Date of Hearing: December 8, 1982
Size of Tract: 2.0 acres, more or less.

Presentation to TMAPC by: John Moody
Address: Bank of Oklahoma Tower

Phone: 588-2651

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity -- No Specific Land Use, Potential Corridor District.

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

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located approximately 300 feet north of the north-east corner of South Mingo Road and 66th Street. It is 2 acres in size, contains one single-family dwelling, is zoned RS-3, and the applicant is requesting OL and/or RM-1 zoning. It is abutted on the north, east and south by similar large-lot, single-family dwellings zoned RS-3 and on the west by multi-family under construction, zoned RM-1(PUD).

Based on the potential of the area to transition to higher intensity uses in the future and the fact that it is abutted on the west by RM-1, the Staff can support the RM-1 request.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested RM-1 zoning.

Staff Comments:

Mr. Gardner has discussed this application with Mr. Moody, who stated the applicant prefers OL zoning. This was advertised so that both RM-1 and OL could be considered. The Staff feels the RM-1 is the more appropriate and the applicant could go to the Board of Adjustment for a Special Exception. The Staff has no objection to Light Office in the area through the review process. Once the zoning has been changed from residential, then there is pressure for commercial if the tract is not developed.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. John Moody represented Mr. Bill Jobe, of the Jobe Dental Properties, who intends to develop his dental facilities on this site by using the existing house. The request is for office purposes. At the time the application was filed, there was another application for corridor zoning immediately to the north of the subject tract and he was uncertain of the outcome. If the Planning Commission was inclined to consider this area as a transition area for multifamily use, the applicant could seek relief through the Board of Adjustment with an RM-1 approval. However, with CO approval on the tract to the north, corridor zoning would not be appropriate or necessary for the proposed use on this tract and would impose another public hearing to use the facility for office use. Additionally, there is

Z-5775 (continued)

commercial further to the north. It is not the applicant's intention or request to use this property for commercial, but rather as an office. He also feels that the Staff could inform any future owners to apply for Corridor Zoning instead of Commercial, which would require a site review.

All of this area is in a transition. The subject tract is located in an older addition and there are several legal, non-conforming commercial uses and home occupations. Therefore, Mr. Moody feels the use of the existing structure for office would not impair the control that the Commission would want to retain over this area as it goes through transition. The OL classification would be compatible with the RM-1 classification which is across the street from the subject property. Mr. Moody requests that the OL zoning be approved for the reason that it saves unnecessary expense and the applicant's lease on his existing facility expires shortly.

Protestants: None

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned OL:

Lot 11, Block 7, Union Gardens Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma according to the recorded plat thereof.

Application No. Z-5776
Applicant: McCormick (Hunnicut Homes)
Location: 10105 E. 61st Street

Present Zoning: RS-3
Proposed Zoning: IL

Date of Application: October 21, 1982
Date of Hearing: December 8, 1982
Size of Tract: 1.0 acre, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Joseph McCormick
Address: 1776 One Williams Center - 74172

Phone: 582-8815

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District I -- Industrial Development encouraged.

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

Staff Recommendations:

The subject tract is located at the northeast corner of 100th East Avenue and South 61st Street. It is 1 acre in size, contains a single-family structure which is in the process of being demolished, is zoned RS-3 and the applicant is requesting IL Industrial zoning. The tract is abutted on the north by large-lot, single-family zoned R-3; on the south by a school zoned RS-3; on the east by a single-family dwelling zoned IL; and, on the west by a school-associated gas facility zoned IL.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan designation and the surrounding land use and zoning patterns, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested IL zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Joe McCormick had no comments.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned IL:

A tract of land in the W/2 SW/4 SE/4 SW/4 of Section 31, T-19-N, R-14-E of the Indian Base and Meridian, according to the U. S. Survey thereof, described as follows: Beginning at the SW/c of the W/2 SW/4 SE/4 SW/4 of the above Section, Township and Range, for point of beginning; thence North along the West line of said tract a distance of 250 feet; thence East and parallel with the South line of said tract a distance of 210 feet to a point; thence South and parallel with the West line of said tract a distance of 250 feet to a point in the South line of said tract which is 210 feet from the SW/c of said tract; thence along the South line of said tract a distance of 210 feet to the point of beginning; commonly known as 10105 East 61st Street, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Application No: Z-5777 and PUD 303
Applicant: Pennant Development Company
(Coutant, Ward)

Present Zoning: RS-3
Proposed Zoning: RM-2

Location: East of Northeast corner of 60th and Peoria

Date of Application: October 28, 1982
Date of Hearing: December 8, 1982
Size of Tract: 1.0 acre, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Kevin Coutant
Address: 2916 E. 57th Street - 74105

Phone: 749-1751

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the west 40 feet of the property Medium Intensity -- Residential and the remaining 110 feet Low Intensity -- Residential.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning District", the RM-2 District is in accordance with the Plan Map on the west 40 feet and is not in accordance with the Plan Map on the east 110 feet.

Staff Recommendation: Z-5777

The subject tract is located approximately 600 feet east of the northeast corner of Peoria Avenue and East 60th Street. It is 1 acre in size, contains one single-family structure, is zoned RS-3 and the applicant is requesting RM-2 multifamily zoning. It is abutted on the north and east by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3; on the south by two single-family dwellings zoned RM-1; on the southwest by an apartment complex zoned RM-2; and, on the west by a single-family dwelling on a large lot, zoned RM-2.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan designation and the transitioning pattern set on the land to the south of the subject tract, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of RM-1 zoning on the entire tract.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #303

Planned Unit Development No. 303 is located on the north side of 60th Street, just east of Peoria Avenue. It is approximately one acre in size, contains a single-family dwelling, has a companion zoning case for RM-2 which the Staff can support as RM-1, and the applicant is proposing a PUD that would allow single-family ownership within duplex, triplex, fourplex, or five-plex multifamily type structures.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Outline Development Plan and find it to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, in harmony with the existing and expected development of the surrounding area, and a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the project tract.

Therefore, we would recommend APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

Z-5777 and PUD #303 (continued)

1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval, being representative of the character of the development.

2) Development Standards:

Net Area: 45,000 SF/1.03 acres

Permitted Uses: As per RM-1 District

Maximum Number of Dwelling Units: 16

Maximum Building Height: 35 feet

Off-Street Parking: As per Use Unit 8

Minimum Lot Width: 24 feet

Minimum Setbacks:

From 60th Street ROW: If Rear Yard - 20 feet

If Side Yard - 15 feet

From PUD Boundary: If Rear Yard - 15 feet

If Side Yard - 5 feet

*Interior:

If Front Yard - 15 feet**

If Side Yard - There shall be a ten (10) foot minimum separation of buildings provided that where two or more dwelling units are attached, such units shall be considered as a single building.

If Rear Yard - 10 feet

Minimum Livability Space: 12,000 SF

*(1.) Interior Yards are those not directly adjacent to the Perimeter Boundary of the PUD.

(2.) The yard requirements do not apply where lot lines are the common walls between units.

** (1.) Due to the unique design of Units 10,11,12, and 13, the front yard for these 4 lots shall be 5 feet, as shown on the site plan. However, the distance from the garage to the access drive shall be 18 feet and there will be additional livability space in the rear yards because of extra width.

(2.) There shall be a minimum of 18 feet from the garage to the access drive.

3) That there shall be one ground identification sign. This sign shall not exceed six feet in height or 10 feet in length. The lettering shall not exceed 30 square feet in area. And that signs accessory to initial offering of the property for sale shall be permitted.

4) That a Detail Site Plan, meeting the conditions of the PUD, be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to the request for any building permit.

Z-5777 and PUD #303 (continued)

- 5) That a Detail Landscape Plan be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy, including a 6 foot wood screening fence along the north and east property line.
- 6) That a Homeowner's Association be created to maintain all common areas including private drives and landscaped areas.
- 7) That a subdivision plat, incorporating the PUD conditions of approval within the restrictive covenants, be approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants, prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Kevin Coutant was present and was concerned about the minimum setback requirements for the setback from East 60th Street. A minimum setback of 15 feet was requested in the application from the right-of-way from East 60th Street. There is a 15-foot, rear yard setback on all other properties. The Staff is requesting a 20-foot setback. Mr. Coutant agrees with the Staff recommendation on all other points. After discussion with the engineer for the project and the Staff, Mr. Coutant stated they could live with a 19-foot setback. The Staff could agree with this because their concern was that the 20-foot rear yard in question was backing to a street.

Protestants: None.

Z-5777-TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RM-1:

Lot 13, Southlawn Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

PUD #303-TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for PUD, subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation with Minimum Setback from 60th Street ROW (if rear yard) being 19 feet:

Lot 13, Southlawn Addition, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.



Application No. Z-5778 and PUD 304
Applicant: J & K Development Co.
Location: Southeast corner of 71st and Trenton

Present Zoning: OL - CS
Proposed Zoning: OL

Date of Application: October 28, 1982
Date of Hearing: December 8, 1982
Size of Tract: 5.1 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Ken Klein
Address: 4641 S. Braden - 74135

Phone: 664-7082

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan (Z-5778):

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the OL District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map and the Proposed CS District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-5778:

The subject tract is located at the southeast corner of East 71st Street and South Trenton Avenue. It is 5.1 acres in size, vacant, zoned OL, and the applicant is requesting a combination of CS and OL zoning. It is abutted on the north by an apartment complex zoned RM-1; on the east by Joe Creek and then apartments zoned OM; on the south by a duplex and single-family neighborhood zoned RM-1 and PUD; and, on the west by apartments zone RM-1 and PUD.

The Staff can support a limited amount of commercial zoning on the subject tract based on the fact that most of the 71st Street frontage properties are zoned either medium intensity office or commercial between Peoria and Lewis Avenues. The encroachment of medium intensity along 71st Street has extended far beyond the Guideline nodes making a complete denial of CS on the tract inappropriate. However, an unrestricted CS zoning pattern would also be inappropriate given the existing conditions and established residential land uses in the area.

Therefore, the Staff recommends approval of CS zoning for only the interior portion, (the South 250 feet of the north 300 feet of the east 300 feet), and denial of the balance. We also recommend amending the Comprehensive Plan for District 18 to reflect this change.

Staff Recommendation (PUD #304):

Planned Unit Development No. 304 is located at the southwest corner of the Joe Creek Channel and 71st Street. It is slightly less than 5 acres in size, vacant, and the applicant is requesting PUD supplemental zoning for a light commercial/office development.

The application is accompanied by a companion zoning case (Z-5778) for CS zoning. The Staff recommended approval of a limited amount of CS zoning and reviewed the PUD application based upon the recommended zoning pattern.

Z-5778 and PUD 304 (continued)

The Staff has reviewed the applicants Outline Development Plan and find it to be consistent with the existing and expected development of the surrounding area and a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the project site. However, we find that the Commercial floor areas requested in the PUD Development Text are greater than those recommended by the Staff on the accompanying zoning application.

Therefore, the Staff can recommend APPROVAL, subject to the following Text modifications and conditions:

1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval as being representative of the character of the development.

2) Development Standards:

Land Area (Gross)	224,709.1 SF	5.159 AC
Land Area (Net)	186,523.0 SF	4.282 AC
Permitted Uses:	Those principle uses and related accessory uses permitted under Use Units 11, 12, 13, and 14.	
Maximum Floor Area:	90,100	SF
Office	53,050	SF
Retail Commercial	37,050	SF
Maximum Building Height:	35	Feet
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From Centerline of 71st St. So.	110	Feet
From Centerline of So. Trenton Ave.	65	Feet
From South Property Line	10	Feet
From East Property Line	In accordance with existing utility easements and in no instance less than 25 feet.	
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	One Space per 300 SF of office building floor area, and one space per 225 SF of Commercial building floor area.	
Minimum Landscaped Open Area and Plaza Area:	18,652	SF

3) Sign Standards:

- GROUND SIGNS:
- (1) If one ground sign is provided on 71st Street, the maximum display surface area shall not exceed 120 square feet.
 - (2) If two ground signs are provided on 71st Street, the maximum display surface area per ground sign shall not exceed 80 square feet.

Z-5778 and PUD 304 (continued)

- (3) Any ground sign shall be separated a minimum of 100 feet from any other ground sign and a minimum of 150 feet from any residential building.
- (4) Maximum ground sign height shall be 20 feet measured from the curb line of the lot upon which it is located.

- MONUMENT SIGNS:
- (1) Two monument signs may be provided along South Trenton Avenue at the entrance drives for the purpose of identifying the commercial/office complex and individual tenants therein.
 - (2) Maximum display surface area for a monument sign shall not exceed 32 square feet per monument sign.
 - (3) Maximum monument sign height shall be 4 feet, measured from the curb line of the lot upon which it is located.

WALL SIGNS: One wall sign per tenant shall be allowed and such sign shall not exceed 2 square feet per each lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign is affixed.

All ground and monument sign location and design shall be reviewed and approved by the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission prior to occupancy. No signs shall be flashing and illumination shall be by constant light.

- 4) That an Owner's Association be established to provide maintenance for all common areas, if the stores or offices are sold now or in the future.
- 5) That no building permit shall be issued until a Detail Site Plan has been submitted to and approved by the TMAPC.
- 6) That a Detail Landscape Plan be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy.
- 7) That no building permit shall 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.

Staff Comments:

Mr. Gardner explained that the Staff could make a distinction on the 71st Street properties on the west side of the channel as opposed to the east side. The east side includes quality office buildings and apartments with the larger shopping center at the intersection node. The Staff would not recommend commercial zoning up and down the street simply because some exists. A Site Plan Review is appropriate in this instance. Therefore,

Z-5778 and PUD 304 (continued)

the combination of the zoning and PUD influenced the Staff's decision.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Ken Klein, representing J & K Development Company, agreed with the Staff recommendation and the conditions set out in the PUD recommendation.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present. (Z-5778)

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS on the interior portion (the south 250 feet of the north 300 feet of the east 300 feet) and denial of the balance and that the Comprehensive Plan for District 18 be amended to reflect this change:

Legal Description per Notice:

All of Block 2, Kensington II, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof, Less and Except the following described portion, to wit: Beginning at the southeast corner of said Block 2; thence due West along the South line thereof a distance of 211.13 feet to the Southwest corner of said Block 2; thence along a curve to the left having an initial tangent bearing of N 0°03'58" W a radius of 1285.47 feet, a central angle of 5°29'32" for a distance of 123.22 feet; thence due East a distance of 274.78 feet to the East line of said Block 2; thence on a curve to the right having an initial tangent bearing of S 21°45'18" West a radius of 850.00 feet, a central angle of 5°12'40" for a distance of 77.31 feet; thence on a curve to the left having an initial tangent bearing of S 26°57'58" W a radius of 1550.00 feet, a central angle of 2°10'46" for a distance of 58.96 feet to the point of beginning.

Legal per Planning Commission Action:

A part of Block 2, Kensington II, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof, more particularly described as follows, to wit: Beginning at a point 50 feet South of the Northeast Corner on the East Boundary of said Block 2; thence West a distance of 300 feet; thence South a distance of 250 feet; thence East to a point on the East Boundary of said Block 2; thence North along the East Boundary of Block 2 to the point of beginning.

Z-5778 and PUD 304 (continued)

Staff Comments:

Mr. Gardner explained that the tract is platted but is not platted as a PUD. Satisfying condition (7) might be done with restrictive covenants, provided the T.A.C. or the City would need to satisfy this requirement.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present (PUD 304)

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for PUD, subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation.

All of Block 2, Kensington II, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma according to the recorded Plat thereof, Less and Except the following described portion, to wit: Beginning at the southeast corner of said Block 2; thence due west along the south line thereof a distance of 211.13 feet to the southwest corner of said Block 2; thence along a curve to the left having an initial tangent bearing of N 0⁰03'58" W a radius of 1285.47 feet, a central angle of 5⁰29'32" for a distance of 123.22 feet; thence due east a distance of 274.78 feet to the east line of said Block 2; thence on a curve to the right having an initial tangent bearing of S 21⁰45'18" W a radius of 850.00 feet, a central angle of 5⁰12' 40" for a distance of 77.31 feet; thence on a curve to the left having an initial tangent bearing of S 26⁰57'58" W a radius of 1550.00 feet, a central angle of 2⁰10'46" for a distance of 58.96 feet to the point of beginning.

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, Rice "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Young, Inhofe "absent") to approve early transmittal for Z-5778 and PUD 304.

SUBDIVISIONS:

For Final Approval and Release:

Mill Creek Bridge (PUD 294) (2283) 9500 Block of South Sheridan Road (RS-3)

The Staff advised the Commission that all release letters have been received and recommended final approval and release.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "absentions"; Gardner, Rice, Young, Inhofe "absent") to approve the final plat of Mill Creek Bridge Addition and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #271 Tony Dark South and West of the SW/c of 81st and Sheridan Road.

Staff Recommendation - Detail Site Plan Review (Phases 1 and 10)

Planned Unit Development No. 271 is located south and west of the southwest corner of East 81st Street and South Sheridan Road. It is approximately 20 acres in size and was approved for 202 dwelling units. The applicant has now divided his project into 10 phases and is requesting Detail Site Plan Approval on Phases 1 and 10.

The Staff has reviewed the original PUD Outline Development Plan and Conditions, the Amended Development Plan and Conditions, and the submitted Detail Plan for Phases 1 and 10 and find the following:

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>APPROVED</u>	<u>SUBMITTED</u>	<u>REMAINING</u>
Land Area (Net):	20.02 acres	2.33 acres	17.69 acres
Maximum Dwelling Units:	202 Units	34 Units	168 Units
Maximum Building Height:	26 feet	Same	Same
Permitted Uses:	Multi-Family Residential and accessory uses	Same	Same
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	Per Code	Per Code	Same
Minimum Building Setback:			
From perimeter boundary	20 feet	20 feet	20 feet
Between buildings	20 feet	20 feet	Same
Minimum Livability Space:	1755 SF/Unit Average or 8.14 acres	1.22 acres	6.92 acres
Signs:	Section 420.2 (d) (2)	Not Shown	NA

Based upon the above review, the Staff can recommend APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan for PUD #271, Phases 1 and 10, per plans submitted, subject to no sign permit being issued until a plan for the location and design has been submitted to and approved by the TMAPC.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Rice, Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan for PUD #271 as sub-

PUD #271 (continued)

mitted, subject to no sign permit being issued until a location and design has been submitted and approved.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Date Approved 12-22-82



Chairman

ATTEST:



Secretary

