

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1535
Wednesday, December 19, 1984, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center
(Moved from Langenheim)

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Connery Draughon Higgins, 2nd Vice- Chairman Kempe, Chairman Paddock, Secretary Rice VanFossen Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman Woodard Young	None	Frank Gardner Holwell Lasker Wilmoth	Linker, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, December 18, 1984, at 11:30 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, First Vice Chairman Marilyn Wilson called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-2 (Connery, Higgins, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Draughon, Paddock, "abstaining"; Kempe, Young, "absent") to approve the Minutes of December 5, 1984 (No. 1533).

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts and Deposits:

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Kempe, "abstaining"; Young, "absent") to approve the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the month ended November 30, 1984.

Committee Report:

Rules and Regulations Committee

Mr. Paddock informed the Rules and Regulations Committee met at noon today to continue updating TMAPC Rules and Procedures and will meet again on Wednesday, January 2, 1984 at 12:00 noon in Room 1131 of Tulsa City Hall.

Director's Report:

Mr. Lasker informed the Resolution pertaining to the Riverside Parkway which had been passed by the Planning Commission had been considered by the City and County and the following actions were taken: The word "minimum" was deleted from the 150' standard for the parkway. The area from Skelly Drive south to 96th Street was designated as a Parkway. The area south of 96th Street to 131st Street and on to Memorial Drive had not been properly advertised, thus another Public Hearing will be held on January 2 for additional discussion. The portion of roadway north of Skelly Drive to the Inner Dispersal Loop was left as an expressway and this item is being returned to the Planning Commission for Public Hearing on January 2. The Public Hearing is being readvertised to consider anything that could be utilized on this portion of the road -- a primary or secondary arterial, a secondary arterial alternate or a "drive". Standards will be available which call for 100' of right-of-way. It is expected the Public Hearing will be continued for at least one week to allow the Transportation Policy Committee to meet on January 10 and have a final recommendation available for the Planning Commission in regard to what the standards and classification should be on that portion of roadway north of Skelly Drive.

Mr. Draughon asked if there was a "State" (legal) definition of parkway and Mr. Lasker informed there is not a legal definition in that sense being used here. The standards being used for a parkway are locally derived and the parkway standard is now 150', not a minimum nor maximum, as approved by the City and County.

Mr. Paddock asked if the segment of Riverside Drive south from Denver to the footbridge was also being advertised and Mr. Lasker informed it was.

Ms. Wilson asked if the section of Riverside Drive north from Denver downtown would be 100' of right-of-way and if anything was being considered at the Public Hearing. Mr. Lasker informed it was decided to advertise to give the Planning Commission the widest opportunity to do whatever was desired, based on past experience. He informed the City Commission's action was that the Planning Commission should review the existing standards north of Skelly Drive and the existing standards vary from 50' to 87' to 110' and are not very well defined. This would allow the Commission to decide if it wanted 3 lanes, 4 lanes, 5 lanes, etc. on this portion of Riverside Drive.

12.19.84:1535(2)

Director's Report (Cont'd)

Mr. VanFossen asked if the Commission would have these existing conditions itemized for the January 2 meeting. Mr. Lasker informed there was a sketchy map with tangled legal descriptions which shows what the right-of-way is and advised the Riverside Committee might review this item in detail at its meeting that evening, but it would probably request that the City Engineer do a survey to define what the City now has. Mr. VanFossen informed he felt that would be of value to understand the conditions.

Mayor Young informed the important feature being discussed, particular with regard to that portion referred back to the Planning Commission, there are additional Hearings being advertised which would deal with portions of the Riverside roadway system to near Bixby but that portion north of Interstate 44 to downtown was returned, not for an immediate recommendation, but to satisfy the condition required. A month or two would be available if needed for review by the Planning Commission. The critical timeframe was on that portion between Interstate 44 and 96th Street for planning and design purposes of the extension of Riverside Drive as was provided for in the Bond issue of 1983. He advised he felt there was a need for some new survey information in the older portion of Riverside Drive so this item would not need to be returned to the City Commission in January.

12.19.84:1535(3)

SUBDIVISIONS

Final Approval and Release:

State Farm Service Center (2483) So. of SE/c 91st & So. Memorial (CO)

Mr. Wilmoth advised the Commission that all release letters had been received and that final approval and release were recommended.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions") to approve the Final Plat of State Farm Service Center and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

Sooner Acres (1694) NE/c East 31st St. & So. 129th E. Ave. (CS)

Mr. Wilmoth advised the Commission that all release letters had been received and that final approval and release were recommended.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions") to approve the Final Plat of Sooner Acres and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

Mingo Valley Trade Center (3194) 10203 E. 61st Street (IL)

Mr. Wilmoth advised the Commission that all release letters had been received and that final approval and release were recommended.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions") to APPROVE the Final Plat of Sooner Acres and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

EXTENSION OF APPROVAL:

Quail Ridge II (PUD 221-B)(2894) 44th St. & S. 135th E. Ave. (RM-1, RD, RS-3)

Mr. Wilmoth informed a letter had been received from the developer's engineer and the Staff recommends approval of a routine one-year extension.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions") to APPROVE the Staff Recommendation for a one-year extension of Quail Ridge II (PUD 221-B).

WAIVER OF PLAT

Z-3443 (unplatted)(3393) SE/c 21st & 92nd E. Ave.

(CS)

Mr. Wilmoth informed this is a request to waive plat on a parcel that is 190' x 242.55' in a CS District. This is a part of Z-3443, the majority of which was included in a plat titled "K&C ADDITION". A plat was processed and approved 5/6/70 titled "GRANTHAM ADDITION", but it expired and was never filed of record. Later, a lot-split was approved on 9/2/81, #15277, and the required dedications made for East 21st Street. The owner of this tract acquired his tract with lot split approval, so the area under application this date includes only his parcel. The remainder to the south and east still remain "subject to a plat" and would require separate applications for waiver. Staff had no objection to this request subject to the following:

- (a) Grading and drainage plan approval subject to City Engineer,
- (b) Access Limitation Agreement, subject to Traffic Engineer,
- (c) Utility easements if required.

Mr. Stan Ewing represented the applicant.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the waiver of plat on Z-3443, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Grading and drainage plan approval by City Engineer, including on-site detention or fee, and minimum floor elevation of 642',
- (b) Access agreement on East 21st Street.
- (c) Utility easements on south and east. (11' and 11' or 17 1/2')

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions" to APPROVE the Waiver of Plat on Z-3443, subject to the conditions stated above.

Z-6002 (unplatted (3393)) S/side E. 51st St., east of Marion Ave. (OL)

This is a request to waive plat on a small parcel of land 155' x 125'. Right-of-way for 51st Street has been previously dedicated and the old unused R/W on New Haven was vacated and closed. Due to its small size and noting that improvements are already in place on 51st Street, the Staff had no objection to the request, subject to the following:

- (a) Grading and drainage plan approval by City Engineer (on-site detention or 100 year storm sewer to Joe Creek).
- (b) Access control agreement approval by Traffic Engineer.
- (c) Utility easement required along south property line.

Traffic Engineer advised there may be some change needed in the driveway location, but had no objection to the waiver, subject to the access agreement.

12.19.84:1535(5)

Z-6002 (unplatted (3393) Cont'd)

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the waiver of plat on Z-6002.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions" to approve the Waiver of Plat on Z-6002, subject to the conditions stated above.

CHANGE OF ACCESS:

Peoria Plaza (683) E of SE/c 61st & So. Peoria

(RM-2)

Mr. Wilmoth informed this proposal is to vacate the two wider 40' accesses on 61st Street and replace them with one 20' access, one 24' access and one 30' access. Traffic Engineering Dept. approved this change and Staff recommended approval.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions" to approve the change of access for Peoria Plaza.

LOT SPLITS

Lot Splits for Waiver:

L-16323 Pete's Party Barn (1703) NW/c E. 36th St. N. & N. Atlanta

(CS)

Mr. Wilmoth informed this a request to split a 9-acre tract into two lots. The first lot is a 110' x 205' lot and has frontage on 36th Street North. The second lot is to be just under 9 acres and will have frontage on both North Lewis Avenue and 36th St. North. In order to permit this lot split, a variance will be required by the Board of Adjustment because of the insufficient frontage for the first lot on 36th St. North (150 feet required). Staff noted that there are several lots in the area that have less than the required minimum of 150'. Approval was recommended subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Board of Adjustment for waiver of lot frontage;
- (2) Health Department approval of septic system.

There was some discussion regarding R/W on 36th Street, but the additional amount needed has been dedicated. Also, the Health Department had already approved the request on 11/26/84.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommend approval subject to the following condition:

- (1) Board of Adjustment waiver of lot frontage.

12.19.84:1535(6)

L-16323 Pete's Party Barn (1703)(Cont'd)

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions") to APPROVE Lot Split #16323, subject to the Board of Adjustment waiver of lot frontage.

L-16324 Ralph Martin (724) W. of NW/c E. 166th St. N. & N. Garnett
(AG)

Mr. Wilmoth informed this is a request to split a 10-acre tract into three tracts. Each tract would contain a single family residence. Approval of the County Board of Adjustment will be required in order to permit this lot-split because the bulk & area requirements of the AG District will not be adequate in all respects. Tract "A" requires a waiver of lot-width from 200' to 160'. It is 4.66 acres so meets the minimum size. Tract "B" lacks sufficient width and area, so waiver is requested to permit the 160' lot width and 1.02 acre area. Tract "C" lacks the width and frontage, so waiver is requested to permit a 160' lot width and no frontage. Access will be by private easement over Tract "B". Note that Tracts "A" and "C" do not require lot-split approval since they are over 2 1/2 acres. They do require Board of Adjustment approval. Tract "B" is the only tract involved that needs lot-split approval, so this is a dual application, both to TMAPC for the lot-split and the BOA for zoning waivers. If approved, the following shall apply:

- (a) County Board of Adjustment approval of width and area,
- (b) City-County Health Department approval of septic systems,
- (c) Utility easements if necessary for service including access to Tract "C",
- (d) Documentation of private access to Tract "C" across Tract "B" which should also be a utility easement.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommend approval of lot-split L-16324.

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions") to APPROVE Lot Split #16324, subject to the conditions stated above.

For Ratification of Prior Approval:

L-16308 (1694) Fracorp	L-16337 (193) City of Tulsa (Aab)
L-16330 (2083) Gruppe Inc.	L-16339 (794) Murphy Property
L-16332 (3103) Betsy Bala	L-16335 (2892) Don Downing
L-16333 (1793) A. C. Jensen	L-16340 (192) Crane Co.
L-16334 (192) Okla. Ind.	

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-1 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; Wilson "abstaining") to RATIFY the approved Lot Splits listed above.

Lot Splits for Discussion:

L-16257 Jack Stern (683) West of NW/c 67th St. & Lewis Ave. (RM-1, RM-2)

Mr. Wilmoth informed in the opinion of the Staff this lot split meets the subdivision and zoning regulations, but since the lot(s) may be irregular in shape, notice has been given to the abutting owner(s) so that property owners in the area may be aware of the application. (Auth: PC Meeting #1505, page 1, 5/9/84.) Approval is recommended.

Applicant Comments:

Mr. Stern was present and advised that this is a two-phase project with Phase 1 as the existing phase of the project which he is developing and the balance (Tract "D") to be developed by a separate owner.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions") to APPROVE the lot-split L-16257 as recommended by Staff.

L-16338 Don Gibbons (1284) East of the NW/c of 177th E. Ave. & College Ave. (RS)

Mr. Wilmoth informed in the opinion of the Staff this lot split meets the subdivision and zoning regulations, but since the lot(s) may be irregular in shape, notice has been given to the abutting owner(s) so that property owners in the area may be aware of the application. (Auth: PC Meeting #1505, page 1; 5/9/84.) Approval is recommended. Mr. Wilmoth advised this item had been referred to the City of Broken Arrow and they had no recommendation or objection.

Mr. Wilmoth further advised that this tract is completely surrounded by Broken Arrow and if Tract "B" was developed later, it would probably be annexed to Broken Arrow and would probably be subdivided under its regulations. 50' would allow for a street to connect either with the east/west street and this would not block anything. It would only separate the existing house on the south.

Comments and Discussion

Mayor Young questioned if 50' was the standard for residential streets in Broken Arrow and Mr. Wilmoth informed it is the same as Tulsa's. He asked if this had been identified as the location of 13th Street and Mr. Wilmoth informed that was his understanding from the legal description and City maps.

12.19.84:1535(8)

L-16338 Don Gibbons (1284) (Cont'd)

Mr. Wilmoth asked Mike Taylor, representing Sisemore, Sack & Sisemore, if there were any plans for dividing this lot immediately. Mr. Taylor advised the street layouts, future development and water supply had been reviewed with Mr. Daroga of the Broken Arrow Planning Department, who had no objections. He also advised that Health Dept. approval had been obtained for the septic system and the larger tract. Mayor Young noted that if Broken Arrow was not going to require a street, a 50' strip is being left which would be too small to be a lot and advised he wanted to know if there was some general indication a street would be located on this 50'. Mr. Taylor informed this lot-split would fit into the overall traffic pattern and this was the intent of the 50' strip.

On MOTION of CONNERY, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions") to APPROVE the lot-split L-16338 as recommended by Staff.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 357-A Valley Bend Shopping Center

Mr. Frank informed this item was continued from the previous Planning Commission meeting.

Staff Recommendation - Detail Site Plan Review

The PUD is located south and east of the southeast corner of 71st Street and South Quincy Avenue. It is irregularly shaped, and has a gross area of 8.48 acres -- 5.55 acres dedicated to Shopping Area and 2.93 acres dedicated to Office Area. The subject tract has underlying zoning of CS on the north 350 feet, RM-1 on the balance, and PUD. The applicant has requested review of only the Shopping Area portion of this PUD at this time. It should be noted that buildings previously approved as Buildings "A" and "E" have now been combined into a new Building "A", and some changes have been made in building areas as noted below; however, total Shopping Area of the center remains unchanged at 51,735 sq. ft.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Detail Site Plan, underlying zoning, past PUD approvals, and find the proposal to be:

(1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; and (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan for the Shopping Area (Buildings "A - D"), subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That the applicant's Plans and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- (2) Development Standards:

SHOPPING AREA -- BUILDINGS "A, B, C and D"

Land Area (Gross):		5.55 acres
(Net):		5.03 acres
Permitted Uses:	<u>Approved/PUD</u> As permitted in a CS District	<u>Submitted</u> Same
Maximum Floor Area:	51,735 sq. ft.	51,735 sq. ft.
Buildings "A" & "E", New Building "A",	5,597 sq. ft.	6,616 sq. ft.
Building "B"/Restaurant	8,600 sq. ft.	8,600 sq. ft.
Building "C"	19,960 sq. ft.	19,960 sq. ft.

PUD 357-A Valley Bend Shopping Center (Cont'd)

	<u>Approved/PUD</u>	<u>Submitted</u>
Building "D"	17,578 sq. ft. 7,488 sq. ft. (Restaurant)	16,559 sq. ft. 7,485 sq. ft. (Restaurant)
Permitted Uses:	As permitted in a CS District	Same
Maximum Floor Area:	51,735 sq. ft.	51,735 sq. ft.
Buildings "A" & "E", New Building "A", Building "B"/Restaurant Building "C" Building "D"	5,597 sq. ft. 8,600 sq. ft. 19,960 sq. ft. 17,578 sq. ft. 7,488 sq. ft. (Restaurant)	6,616 sq. ft. 8,600 sq. ft. 19,960 sq. ft. 16,559 sq. ft. 7,485 sq. ft. (Restaurant)
Maximum Building Heights:	1-story	Not stated--1 story Maximum Permitted
Minimum Landscaped Open Space	15% of Net Area	Not stated--15% of Net Area Required.
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From Centerline 71st St.	125 feet	134 feet
From Centerline S. Quincy	60 feet	66 feet
From Other Boundaries	10 feet	11.5 feet minimum
Parking Ratio:	1 Space per 225 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area of Retail; and	Same
	1 Space per 100 sq. ft. of Gross Floor Area for Restaurant.	Same
Total Spaces:	319	327
Spaces by Size:*		
Standard Size	227	241
Handicapped	12	12
Compact	80	74
Spaces by Uses as Required:		
Shopping	158	158
Restaurant	161	161

PUD 357-A Valley Bend Shopping Center (Cont'd)

Loading Berths/Buildings:

"A" & "E" or New "A"	2	None Specified*
"B"	2	None Specified*
"C"	2	None Specified*
"D"	2	None Specified*

**Loading Berths shall be provided per the Zoning Ordinance.

Other Bulk and Area Requirements: As required with- Not Specified*
in a CS District.

*Minimum Parking Sapces sizes shall be as follows:

Standard Size = 9 feet wide x 20 feet long, and
Compact Size = 7½ feet wide x 15 feet long.

***Bulk and Area Rquirements shall be in accordance with the requirements of the CS District.

(3) Sign Standards:

Signs accessory to the shopping area uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Ground Signs:

Ground signs shall be limited to one ground sign identifying the project or tenants therein located at the 71st Street entrance to the project not exceeding 20 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 120 square feet, and one monument sign identifying the project at Quincy Street entrance not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 64 square feet.

Wall or Canopy Signs:

Wall or canopy signs shall be limited to 1 1/2 square feet or display surface area per lineal foot of the building wall to which affixed.

Signs accessory to the office area uses shall be limited to one monument sign identifying the project to the Quincy entrance not exceeding 4 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 32 square feet.

- (4) Trash storage areas and utility areas shall be screened from the public area.
- (5) That the architectural character of the east side of Buildings "B" and "C" in the shopping area be consistent with the fronts of said buildings.

PUD 357-A Valley Bend Shopping Center (Cont'd)

- (6) That a Detail Landscape Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy, including a screening fence shall be constructed along the exterior boundaries of the project where they abut any "R" District and along the Quincy frontage the required screening shall be a combination of screening fence, berms and landscaping.
- (7) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and 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.

Applicant Comments:

Randy Heckenkemper, representative of Poe & Associates, and Mr. Larry Johnson, project architect, advised some modifications had been made to the backs of the buildings as requested by the Planning Commission. The fronts of the buildings would have bronze-anodized glass and plants added. On the rear of the buildings, the walls would be the same height as the fronts, the guttering had been eliminated and the backs of the buildings would be the same color as the brick fronts.

Other Comments and Discussion

Mr. VanFossen advised he had discussed the proposal with the applicants and since this area is zoned CS and had been originally involved in a PUD, the applicants could do whatever they wanted with the architecture of the buildings. He further advised he would abstain from voting since he was not in agreement with the architecture of the backs of the buildings and had not been on the Commission when the PUD was approved.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. VanFossen if he was satisfied with the elevation and he advised that if he was hearing this item for the first time, he would probably encourage something different; however, the current proposal was in compliance with the PUD.

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; VanFossen "abstaining", Young "absent") for APPROVAL of PUD #357-A as recommended by Staff.

PUD #374-1:

Staff Recommendation -- Minor Amendment

The proposed development is presently under construction at the northeast corner of South Lewis and 21st Street and consists of an office tower of seven (7) stories on the corner with a two-story parking garage on the east. The public parking areas have access to 21st Street at two locations and a right turn only exit drive is located on South Atlanta. No changes are being requested in the points of access. The purpose of the request is to provide improved internal circulation within the parking area at the drive-in bank which is located at the northwest corner of South Atlanta and 21st Street. This can only be accomplished by shortening the length of the parking garage -- the adjusted number of parking spaces will still be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance when consideration is given to a non-public portion of the building which will generate no parking demand. Specifically, 5,000 sq. ft. is presently dedicated to mechanical equipment areas in the basement of the building. When this is considered, the determination of required parking can be reduced for office space by 17 spaces. This would indicate that the approved number of spaces under the PUD could be reduced from 300 to 283 and still be in compliance with the Code. The applicants have requested approval of 284 spaces under the minor amendment and Staff concurs. The benefits of shortening the parking garage will be the increased setback of this structure from 45 feet to 72 feet on the South Atlanta Avenue side. This will allow 27 feet of additional greenbelt along the east boundary of the project.

Therefore, Staff has reviewed this request for a minor amendment to the PUD and found it to be minor in nature and recommends APPROVAL of the revised parking requirement from 300 spaces to 284 spaces which will be accomplished by shortening the parking garage by 27 feet on the condition that gross leaseable space in the building be reduced from 90,000 sq. ft. to 85,000 sq. ft. recognizing that 5,000 sq. ft. is permanently dedicated to mechanical equipment areas.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions") for APPROVAL of a minor amendment to PUD #374-1, which revises the parking requirement from 300 spaces to 284 spaces and would be accomplished by shortening the parking garage by 27 feet on the condition that gross leaseable space in the building be reduced from 90,000 sq. ft. to 85,000 sq. ft. recognizing that 5,000 sq. ft. is permanently dedicated to mechanical equipment areas.

PUD #267-2

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment

The Valley South Shopping Center is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of South Sheridan and East 101st Street with a Texaco Service Station being located in the northwest corner of this

12.19.84:1535(14)

PUD #267-2 (Cont'd)

PUD at the street intersection. The service station includes gasoline sales, food sales and a car wash. The car wash was approved as part of the PUD as a recent minor amendment. PUD #267 was approved by the TMAPC on November 18, 1981 and by the City Commission on December 15, 1981. The applicant is requesting a 30-foot tall sign which will be located at the corner. The approved Detail Site Plan indicated one 8 foot x 10 foot ground sign to be proposed at this location. The "Sign Standards" approved for the PUD limit ground signs to two (2) in number on each arterial street with a maximum height of 16 ft. and a maximum area of 180 sq. ft. -- the proposed sign has a display area of 176 sq. ft. which complies with display standards. The PUD restricts the maximum height of buildings within the development to 26 feet for the south 300 feet of the west 400 feet, and 20 feet for the remainder of the site.

Directly across the intersection, at the northeast corner, PUD #339 was approved by the TMAPC on September 28, 1983. A condition of approval requested by that applicant and granted at the TMAPC meeting was approval for a 30-foot tall pole sign at the corner. However, recognizing the nature of the Valley South development, Staff cannot recommend approval of a sign that exceeds the maximum height of buildings within the center.

Therefore, Staff recommends DENIAL of the request as submitted, but APPROVAL of a sign that would not exceed 26 feet in height with a display area not greater than 176 square feet.

NOTE: The Staff notified the abutting property owners of this particular request, although, the basic nature of the request is confirmed to be minor by this review.

Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked if this Texaco station is located at 101st and Sheridan and Mr. Frank informed it is. She informed this Texaco station has already erected a sign that is 30' tall or taller. She questioned if Texaco was requesting another sign or if she was thinking of another location and Mr. Frank advised if the sign is there, approval is being requested after the fact. He informed Texaco had a representative present to answer these questions.

Ms. Higgins asked Mr. Gardner if there had been some previous discussion regarding a standard sign used by Texaco and he informed that he did not think the discussion had been on this particular piece of property, but Texaco had appeared before the Commission on other sites.

Mr. Gardner informed he was unsure if there had been a specific use designated for the corner when the PUD was approved; but Staff feels the height of the sign should be limited to the height of the buildings.

PUD #267-2 (Cont'd)

Mr. Howard Siegfried, a representative of Texaco Inc., informed the contractor had erected the sign and should not have. Mr. VanFossen asked if this was the only standard sign and Mr. Siegfried informed Texaco has a smaller sign but it does not have a message board. The System 2000 stations, which include a standard car wash and food mart, and the message board require approximately 22'. If a 30' standard sign was erected, it would be only 8' off the ground after subtracting the space required for the car wash, food mart and message board.

Ms. Wilson informed she was unsure how this sign had been erected since minor amendments are normally granted, then people proceed to do what is allowed by the amendment.

Mr. Paddock asked what Mr. Siegfried's position was with Texaco and Mr. Siegfried advised he is a Field Maintenance Supervisor.

Mr. Gardner informed the sign had obviously been erected with the permit still pending and Mr. Connery questioned why a 30' sign had been erected when the PUD allowed for two 16' signs.

Mayor Young asked what contractor had erected the sign and Mr. Siegfried informed it was Oklahoma Neon.

Ms. Higgins asked if lowering the sign to the desired height would pose a health hazard and Mr. Gardner informed he did not think it would pose a problem since it would probably not block the vision of drivers.

Mayor Young asked if the other sign, specified in the PUD, would be deleted and Mr. Gardner advised that anytime there is an assignment of signs, it reduces the total number available and there are normally only two signs allowed per major street frontage.

Ms. Kempe informed that Staff was now recommending this item be continued to the next hearing date of the Planning Commission to clarify the question of how many signs would be permitted.

Mr. Paddock informed he is in favor of the continuance, but noted he was unsure if this type of change constitutes a minor amendment and advised he did not think the Commission should legitimize the mistake of the company that erected the sign, assuming it erected it without the necessary permit.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Connery Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, Young, "aye"; no "nays" no "abstentions") to CONTINUE consideration of PUD #267-2, minor amendment, until Wednesday, January 2, 1985, 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

PUD #199-6

Staff Recommendation -- Minor Amendment

The area of request for the minor amendment is Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows, also known as 2904 South 121st East Place. According to the Protective Inspections Department, the permit was first issued for a 20-foot front building line and the present encroachment was discovered during construction. PUD #199-5 was approved by the TMAPC on December 12, 1984 changing the front building line from 20 feet to 15.5 feet; however, this did not allow for the rock which will be placed on the wall. Applicant is now requesting the front setback to be changed from 15.5 feet to 14 feet.

Due to the shape and location of the lot, the structure in its present location will not appear to be closer to the street than adjacent and abutting residences to the south. The subject tract is abutted by a large detention area on the north where no structures will be built.

Therefore, the Staff has reviewed this request and determined it to be minor in nature and recommends APPROVAL of the requested minor amendment to change the front building line from 15.5 feet to 14 feet for Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows Addition, also known as 2904 South 121st East Place.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 8-1-0 (Connery Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; Young, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Woodard, "absent") to APPROVE the minor amendment for the front building line, Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows.

PUD 363-2

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment

The subject PUD was approved by the TMAPC for the Mohawk Park Addition, which is located north and east of the northeast corner of 36th Street North and Yale Avenue. It is 25 acres in size with the west 15 acres being zoned RMH and the balance zoned RS-3. Mohawk Park is proposed as a single family subdivision for manufactured homes.

The applicant is requesting that the front building line be reduced from 25 feet to 20 feet in order to achieve improved siting and larger rear yards for the homes. "Typical Lot [Layouts]" were exhibited in the original PUD Text, although the front building line was established as 25 feet in the approved PUD. Rear yard requirements under the Zoning Ordinance for RMH is 10 feet and RS-3 is 20 feet. A part of this development will front onto adjacent development which lies north of 39th Street North, which is the northern boundary of Mohawk Park.

PUD 363-2 (Cont'd)

The minutes dated November 29, 1984, of the Technical Advisory Committee, indicated that the T.A.C. had no objection to the requested change. The Staff has reviewed this change and found it to be minor in nature.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #363-2, a minor amendment to reduce the front building line requirement from 25 feet to 20 feet for the Mohawk Park Addition.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 7-2-0 (Connery Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; Paddock, Young, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Woodard, "absent") to APPROVE the minor amendment, PUD #363-2, for the front building line, from 25' to 20' on Mohawk Park Addition.

PUD 131-C-2

Minor Amendment

The subject tract is located at the southwest corner of I-44 and South Garnett Road. The applicant has previously been given approval for PUD #131-C-1 which split off the south 113 feet of the subject lot. The proposed two (2) lots of 160 feet each (more or less) which will result from the requested lot split will meet the minimum frontage requirement for lots in a CS zoning district per the Zoning Ordinance.

Review of the plat and proposed split indicates that although the request is minor in nature, mutual access easements and parking agreements for future uses are valid considerations and should be conditions of approval. No new access points have been requested in this minor amendment, nor would the Staff recommend any additional points of access.

Detail Site Plan approval is required for each lot prior to Building Permits being issued. The Staff can support this application for further splitting of Lot 2 (being Parcel 2 under PUD #131-C-1) only if the office on Parcel 1 is constructed in such a way as to be more than an office at the end of a shopping center (more than the last space in a shopping center being used as an office). The only purpose of lot splitting Parcel 2/Lot 2 is understood to be for phased development of the center based on discussions with the applicant. The office should also be residential in architectural character as has been previously approved to be consistent with PUD #131-C-1 to function as a buffer between the proposed commercial and adjacent residential uses.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested minor amendment to subdivide the north 320 feet (more or less) into two (2) parcels of 160 feet each (more or less), subject to the granting of mutual access easements and the granting of mutual parking agreements as necessary, and subject to no additional curb cuts along Garnett Road.

PUD 131-C-2 (Cont'd)

Mayor Young questioned if the phrase "to be more than an office at the end of a shopping center" was clear enough and Mr. Gardner advised the Staff wanted language in the recommendation that reiterated that one of the original conditions of approval was that the buildings could be connected, but an office would be required to be erected on the end of each part of the shopping center on the west and south sides and must be architecturally residential in character, etc. He further informed this was a reminder that is still applicable no matter how many times the property is split. Mayor Young requested this explanation be included in the Minutes as the reason for the Staff Recommendation.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Connery Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Woodard, "ABSENT") to approve PUD #131-C-2, minor amendment for a lot split.

OTHER COMMENTS:

Mayor Young informed this would be Commissioner Rice's last meeting since the County would have a new Chairman at the beginning of the year. Commissioner Rice informed John Selph would be designated as an alternate for Lewis Harris, the new Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Date Approved January 2, 1985

Chairman Cherry Kempe

ATTEST:

AB Paddock
Secretary

12.19.84:1535(19)

