

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
 MINUTES of Meeting No. 1541
 Wednesday, February 6, 1985, 1:30 p.m.
 City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes Connery Draughon Higgins, 2nd Vice- Chairman Kempe, Chairman Paddock, Secretary VanFossen Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman Woodard	Harris Young	Compton Frank Gardner Holwell Matthews	Linker, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Monday, February 4, 1985, at 11:53 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Cherry Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Higgins, Young "absent") to approve the Minutes of January 16, 1985 (No. 1538).

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-1 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, "abstaining"; Harris, Higgins, Young "absent") to approve the Minutes of January 23, 1985 (No. 1539), as amended. On page 11, the last sentence of the motions for cases Z-6022 and PUD #386, should allow "1-story, 3-story and 7-story buildings" instead of "a 1-story building, a 3-story building and a 7-story building".

CONSIDER ADOPTION OF THE REVISED RULES AND REGULATIONS AND CODE OF ETHICS:

Mr. Paddock informed there had been no comments in regard to the revised "Rules and Regulations and Code of Ethics" and recommended they be approved. Mr. Gardner informed all requirements had been met and Staff recommended adoption. He also noted the Commission has the right to make changes in the future.

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Higgins, Young "absent") to adopt the revised "Rules and Regulations and Code of Ethics" of the TMAPC.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Comprehensive Plan Committee

Mr. VanFossen informed that the Comprehensive Plan Committee met at 12:30 p.m. today to review the Turkey Mountain Special Study and would make its presentation at the appropriate time during the Public Hearing on the issue.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Final Approval and Release:

Mohawk Park Addition (PUD #365)(1503) E. 38th St. N. & N. Fulton Ave.
(RMH, RS-3)

Staff informed all release letters have been received and approval is recommended.

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to APPROVE the Final Plat of Mohawk Park Addition and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

Waiver of Plat:

Z-5895 (Albert Pike Sub) (2193) 3720 E. 31st St. (OM, OL, P, RS-3)

Staff informed this is a request to waive plat on parts of Lots 3 and 4 of the above named subdivision. There are actually three zoning applications and one PUD application involved. First, Z-2641 zoned a portion of "OM". This was prior to 1970 and that part is not subject to a plat. Z-5157 and Z-5895 were later filed and are subject to platting. Also, a companion PUD #345 has been filed and a Detailed Site Plan submitted to the TMAPC. Applicant proposes to meet Section 260 of the Zoning Code by filing a separate deed of dedication with the PUD requirements since it is already platted.

Access to the project was approved by the City Commission during the PUD Process. If plat requirement is waived, an access agreement may be required by Traffic Engineering.

Staff notes that there is only 30' of right-of-way on most of the 31st Street frontage. (One area has 35'). 50' from centerline is required by the Major Street and Highway Plan and should be dedicated. The setbacks of the buildings and parking will clear any required right-of-way and are controlled by the PUD Site Plan Review.

The applicant was represented by Fred Chadsey. The TAC and Staff recommended APPROVAL of the waiver of plat on Z-5157, Z-5895 and PUD #345, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff.

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to APPROVE the waiver of plat on Z-5157, Z-5895 and PUD #345, subject to the conditions below:

Z-5895 (cont'd)

- (a) Dedication of R/W on 31st Street to meet the Street Plan requirements.
- (b) Grading and drainage plan approval by the City Engineer. (PFPI required, on-site detention)
- (c) Access control agreement as recommended by Traffic Engineer.

Lot Split for Waiver:

L-16354 Johnnie Stephens (2290) E. of NE/c of 41st St & 225th W. Ave.
(AG)

This is a request to split a 5+ acre tract into three lots. Lot A is to be 150' x 463' and will contain 1.5 acres, and lots B & C are to be 187' x 463', and will contain 1.8 acres each. The agent for the owner has indicated that the additional right-of-way needed in order to bring the dedication for West 41st Street up to standards will be dedicated. Also, a variance will be required from the Board of Adjustment because of the substandard lot width, lot area and land area for the proposed lots. Approval of this request was recommended because there are several comparable lots in the area.

Staff advised TAC that Indian Electric had requested utility easements at 10' each side of the north-south lot lines and 20' easement parallel to West 41st Street (the north 20' of the south 70' measured for the centerline).

The Staff and Technical Advisory Committee recommended APPROVAL of L-16354 subject to the conditions outlined by Staff, including the easements required.

Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked if dedication of the right-of-way should be made a condition of approval of this lot-split and Mr. Wilmoth informed it could not be made a condition of approval.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to APPROVE lot split L-16354, subject to the conditions below:

- (a) Board of Adjustment approval of above-mentioned variances.
- (b) City-County Health Dept. for percolation test approval.
- (c) Sand Springs Water Dept. for water service approval.

L-16354 (cont'd)

- (d) Any utility easements that may be required for development.

L-16356 Jackson Ent. Inc. (2393) SW/c of Broken Arrow Expressway & Memorial Drive (IL)

This is a request to split a 2.49 acre tract into a 1.44 acre tract on the south (Tract I) and a 1.04 acre tract on the north (Tract II). Tract II has only 114 ft. of frontage on Memorial, and 150' is required. This deficiency will require a variance from the Board of Adjustment. Since the request was to split two existing buildings, Staff recommended approval, subject to the Board of Adjustment approval of the frontage.

Comments and Discussion:

Applicant was present. Mr. Johnsen, attorney for the applicant, informed this lot-split was being requested in order to establish an ownership line.

Mr. Draughon asked if the Planning Commission was putting pressure on the Board of Adjustment by its condition that approval of the lot-split be made subject to approval of the BOA. Mr. Gardner informed that the Planning Commission has been asked to hear cases pertaining to land and zoning codes first and they be then submitted to the Board of Adjustment.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to waive plat on L-16356 Jackson Ent. Inc. (2393) subject to the Board of Adjustment approval of the frontage.

L-16343 Ralph Ford (892) SE/c Charles Page Blvd. & S. 51st W. Ave. (CS)

This is a request to split a 150' x 200' tract into two lots, the west 101', and the east 49', both lots having 200' of depth. A variance will be required from the Board of Adjustment because of the 150' minimum frontage requirement in the CS district when abutting Charles Page Blvd. The applicant is also requesting a waiver of the Major Street and Highway Plan because of the location of an existing grocery store on the western lot. The Staff recognizes that there are several similar-sized lots in the area and recommended approval of this request subject to the Board of Adjustment approval of the above-mentioned variance, a waiver of the Major Street and Highway Plan on the west lot, and any utility easements that may be required for development.

The applicant was not present. TAC had noted it is not generally the policy to recommend waiver of the Subdivision Regulations requiring conformance with the Street Plan. However, in this case, existing buildings would be in dedicated right-of-way if the Street Plan requirement is met.

L-16343 (cont'd)

Applicant has been advised to furnish a measurement from the centerline of Charles Page Blvd. to the front of the existing building to determine the amount of encroachment into the Major Street and Highway Plan. Mr. Wilmoth informed a survey indicates this measurement is about 26' from the centerline and noted that Staff and TAC are recommending approval of L-16343 subject to two conditions.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 8-1-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Paddock "nay"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to APPROVE L-16343, subject to the conditions below:

- (a) Waiver of Subdivision Regulations requiring conformance with the Major Street and Highway Plan.
- (b) Board of Adjustment approval of minimum frontage waiver.

LOT SPLIT FOR DISCUSSION:

L-16361 Royce Jones (1083) 76th & South Joplin Ave.

(RS-3)

This is a request to split the common area in "The Hill" to separate the private roadway and the clubhouse area. Since this is a part of PUD #190 and there are restrictions that apply to the clubhouse and maintenance of the private roadways and open spaces, Staff recommends one of the following:

- (a) A document (either in the deed or a separate instrument) should be filed indicating the PUD restrictions on the clubhouse. This should clearly state that the clubhouse (now a private residence) will be used only in connection with the private homeowners' association which will maintain all the open space and clubhouse. It shall not be a facility that would be open to the public.
- (b) Or as an alternate, if condition (a) above cannot be done, a minor amendment to the PUD would be necessary to separate the roadway and open spaces from the clubhouse area.

The Staff has discussed this with the applicant and alternate (a) appears to be the most efficient way to accomplish this. Staff recommended approval subject to the above condition(s).

NOTE: No additional easements, etc. would be required since this is all included in the plat.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to APPROVE L-16361, subject to Staff's recommended condition (a).

L-16361 (cont'd)

- (a) A document (either in the deed or a separate instrument) should be filed indicating the PUD restrictions on the clubhouse. This should clearly state that the clubhouse (now a private residence) will be used only in connection with the private homeowners' association which will maintain all the open space and clubhouse. It shall not be a facility that would be open to the public.

L-16178 Robert Pitcock (Mahoney) (3293) E. 57th St. between Atlanta & Birmingham (RS-2)

This lot-split has been previously approved for three tracts by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Adjustment (Case #13162). Applicant attempted to rezone tract to RS-3 and was denied. The present zoning is RS-2. The applicant has requested that the split be reviewed again as four tracts instead of three. All four tracts will meet the minimum area of 9,000 sq. ft. for the RS-2 District. The Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission waived the frontage requirements in the previous reviews. The TAC had no objection to the new configuration, but would advise Staff of any particular requirements such as easements, drainage, etc. Staff is concerned that even though the lots contain over 9,000 sq. ft., they would be difficult on which to site a house because of the existing easements, storm drains and setbacks. Applicant should be prepared to actually show the Planning Commission and the Board of Adjustment that he can site a single-family house on each of these lots without any waiver other than the frontage requirement which was previously waived. This site plan should show all existing easements, utility easements and any easement, and/or right-of-way, retained in the closure of 57th Street.

Mr. Wilmoth informed applicant was not present and recommended a continuance since Mr. Mahoney was going to provide material to support and explain his request. He noted Staff has questions on the ability to erect four houses on these sites, because of the size and shape of the lots, subject to a waiver from the BOA.

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to CONTINUE consideration of L-16178 to Wednesday, February 20, 1985, City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Other Discussion:

Staff informed that Mr. Mahoney, applicant for L-16178, was now present and it was requested that the Commission consider his case.

L-16178 (cont'd)

Mr. Paddock asked if it would be necessary for the Commission make a motion to reconsider the earlier motion for continuance and Ms. Wilson, First Vice-Chairman, informed it was necessary to have a motion.

Mr. Paddock made a motion to reconsider the previous vote for continuance of L-16178 and Mr. Connery seconded the motion.

Mr. Wilmoth was asked if the applicant had all information necessary to present the case and he informed that Mr. Mahoney had some information to present, but Staff had not had an opportunity to review it.

Mr. Connery advised he was withdrawing his second to the motion and the Chairman informed that a motion dies for lack of a second to the motion. She then informed Mr. Mahoney that this case would be heard on February 20, per the previous vote.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-16357 (3293) Albert Equip. Co.	L-16363 (1683) David Boyd
L-16358 (2203) J.O. Braswell	L-16362 (3194) Mingo Valley T.C.
L-16364 (3293) Snyder, et al	L-16365 (793) John Walton

Mr. Wilmoth informed all of the above lot splits are in order and Staff recommended approval.

On MOTION of CONNERY, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to RATIFY the above lot splits.

Z-6021 (cont'd)

is developed as residential apartments. Removal of the OL buffer would adversely effect the residential value of the homes to the north.

Based on the above information and Comprehensive Plan, the Staff recommends DENIAL of the requested CS zoning.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Paddock asked if all fees had been paid and Mr. Frank informed they had been and noted that Mr. Levy's personal check had been returned to him.

Mr. Gardner reiterated that Staff's Recommendation was for DENIAL and noted that if the Commission approves this application, the property would be fronting single-family residences.

Mr. Paddock asked what would be required to change the underlying zoning in that PUD and Mr. Gardner informed the only way is to down zone it since the majority of land use is other than commercial and an office buffer is needed.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-2 (Connery, Draughon, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Carnes, Higgins, "abstaining"; Harris, Kempe, Young "absent") to DENY CS zoning on the following described property as recommended by Staff:

Legal Description:

Lot 2, Block 3, The Falls Addition of the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

2.06.85:1541(10)

PUBLIC HEARING:

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC OF A HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING THE MAJOR STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN CONCERNING THE RIVERSIDE CORRIDOR

- (a) Delete the expressway classification on that portion of Riverside from the southeast corner of the Inner Dispersal Loop extending south along the Midland Valley Railroad right-of-way to the east bank of the Arkansas River, then south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to Skelly Drive, at approximately 51st Street;
- (b) designate Riverside Drive from its intersection with Denver Avenue south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to Skelly Drive, at approximately 51st Street, either Primary Arterial, Secondary Arterial, Secondary Arterial Alternate, or Drive, and adopt standards for Drive and/or Secondary Arterial Alternate, if appropriate; and
- (c) designate Riverside as a Parkway from the proposed Creek Expressway at approximately 96th Street south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to 131st Street, then east along 131st Street to South Memorial Drive.

Comments and Discussion:

Chairman Kempe informed that interested parties would only be discussing item (c) of the Public Hearing on Riverside Drive as items (a) and (b) would be continued to the hearing to be held on April 17.

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to CONTINUE consideration of items 16 (a) and 16 (b) of the agenda, to 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 17, 1985, City Commission Room, Tulsa City Hall.

Other Comments and Discussion: Agenda Item 16(c)

Mr. Compton informed that the Policy Committee and Staff have recommended that the parkway designation terminate at 121st Street instead of at 131st Street as earlier recommended. Mr. Carnes asked why the recommendation was to terminate the designation at 121st Street instead of 131st Street and Memorial Drive and Mr. Compton informed that since 121st Street is a primary arterial, it would allow the same type of traffic flow as Memorial Drive. In addition, 121st Street has a proposed river crossing to the west which allows for better traffic circulation.

Mr. Paddock informed the adopted Parkway Standards are to apply to this segment as well as to the segment south of 51st Street and I-44 and that reference should be made that this segment would also be built in accordance with the adopted Parkway Standards.

Riverside Corridor Public Hearing (cont'd)

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to APPROVE item 6(c) of the Agenda, designating Riverside Drive as a Parkway from the proposed Creek Expressway at approximately 96th Street and South Delaware Avenue along the east bank of the Arkansas River to 121st Street.

Comments:

Chairman Kempe requested that Staff prepare a resolution tying this portion of the designated Riverside Parkway from 96th Street South along the east bank of the Arkansas River to 121st Street to the Major Street and Highway Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING:

CONSIDER AMENDING THE DISTRICT 8 PLAN BY ADDING THERETO THE TURKEY MOUNTAIN SPECIAL DISTRICT STUDY.

Staff Presentation:

Ms. Dane Matthews, INCOG Staff, gave a background of the Special District Study and informed the TMAPC of comments and recommendations which had been received from the District 8 Planning Team. Discussions had also been conducted with the Tulsa Airport Authority, the Joint Airport Zoning Board, the TMAPC Comprehensive Plan Committee and with interested citizens of District 8.

Ms. Matthews advised the Commission the following criteria was considered in the study:

- (a) Features of the areas. Areas were identified as to which would be relatively easy to develop and some that would be less easily developed. Notations were made as to the potential impact of development.
- (b) Soil factors. The south central part of the area was considered the most suitable because of its lesser potential for shrink/swell, erosion, corrosion, and the shallow depth to bedrock.
- (c) Slopes. Most of the Special District is surrounded by slopes of 11% or greater; thus making development difficult, but not impossible.
- (d) Drainage. There are two basins, Mooser Creek on the north and Hager Creek on the south, which are associated with floodplains and drainage basins.
- (e) Transportation. The internal portion of the District is currently unserved by a transportation network. The District is surrounded by expressways on the north and west, primary arterial streets on the south and an undeveloped secondary street through the center.
- (f) Water & Sewer. There are no municipal utility lines in the interior of the District; existing development uses rural facilities.
- (g) Vegetation. Most of the Special District is heavily wooded; existing policies call for preservation of as much vegetation as possible.
- (h) Old oil and gas wells. Many may not be plugged yet and data indicates there are approximately 193 wells in the Study Area.

Turkey Mountain Public Hearing (cont'd)

- (i) Existing Zoning. Most zoning is currently AG. There is some IL at the northeast corner, some RS-3 in the northwest corner and south central part of the District and CS & OL at 61st and Beeline.
- (j) Airport Obstruction. At some points, Turkey Mountain is greater than 920' MSL, which is an obstruction without any development and the study area penetrates Jones Airport's horizontal surface of 775 MSL.
- (k) Existing Land Use. Most of the land is open space, but there are some residences scattered in the south central portion of the area. Public areas are located on the northeast corner and southeast corner on Turkey Mountain.

Ms. Matthews noted that, under the existing District 8 Plan, most of the area is designated Low Intensity - some Development Sensitive, some Low Intensity-Residential in the south; Corridor along the west and Public Area at Turkey Mountain and on the north and south parts of the District. She informed that Staff recommends the following amendments to the District 8 Plan:

Map Amendments:

Land Use -- Intensities are indicated on the map. "Consideration Area 1" includes an area of frontage south of 71st Street. She noted that 71st Street was not really a buffer and these uses should be compatible on both sides of 71st Street.

- (a) Medium Intensity -- Nodes at 71st & Elwood, 71st & Beeline, northeast corner and northwest corner of the study area. The node at the northeast corner was cut back to reflect only area reasonably expected to develop due to topography.
- (b) Low Intensity -- Low Intensity-Residential as it currently exists and Development Sensitive as it also currently exists and on the balance of the Study area.
- (c) Development Concerns Areas -- Outside Development Sensitive, but have 5 or more considerations.
- (d) Corridor -- This designation may allow higher intensities and requires a PUD as designated along the Okmulgee Beeline.
- (f) Public -- As currently owned by the City of Tulsa or other public entity.

Ms. Matthews noted the following articles of the text of the Study had been amended after discussions with the Comprehensive Plan Committee and other interested parties.

Turkey Mountain Public Hearing (cont'd)

- 3.3.3.5 Notify the Tulsa Airport Authority and the Joint Airport Zoning Board of proposed new subdivisions and other developments under the approaches to Jones Airport to protect the public health, safety and well-being, and also to ensure the continued safe operation of Jones Airport.
- 4.5.3.3 The area indicated on the Plan map as Low Intensity-No Specific Land Use, but zoned IL, should be restricted to industrial areas unless accompanied by a PUD.

Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Paddock asked what is meant by "considerations" and Ms. Matthews informed the "considerations" are factors of an area the developer should consider before he begins a development.

Interested Parties:

Mr. John Ferris, Chairman of District 8
Mr. Roy Johnsen, Attorney

Mr. Ferris expressed his appreciation for the hard work of Staff in preparing the Study and thanked the area citizens for their input. He noted he felt this was a fine study and that he supported the Staff Recommendations.

Mr. Johnsen informed his interest in the study relates to the 71st Street frontage east of Elwood (article 3.6.3) and noted the Planning Commission had recommended approval of a PUD and companion IR & IL zoning on this tract, but the City Commission, by a 2/2 vote, referred it back to the Planning Commission for rehearing. He noted the recommendation for this consideration area is Low Intensity/No Specific Land Use and suggested the Commission encourage a PUD. He suggested that if an application was submitted as a PUD, this area could be then considered for Medium Intensity uses.

Ms. Matthews informed that Staff had been concerned that this area not be developed piecemeal and noted the Commission could consider medium intensity under a PUD. She noted that a project could be considered in this location with a PUD.

Mr. VanFossen asked for Staff's comments and Mr. Gardner informed the wording "up to" could be inserted and that would be appropriate. He also informed that if an area is unique, a development could be approved under a PUD which could not be approved under normal zoning. He reiterated that the Commission should be satisfied that an area is unique. He further noted the protestants did not want industrial zoning on the 71st Street frontages and informed the CS zoning and PUD could accommodate what Mr. Johnsen wanted.

Turkey Mountain Public Hearing (cont'd)

Mr. VanFossen asked if the project could be considered under this amended wording and Mr. Gardner informed it would be a "may be found" and the Comprehensive Plan would have to be amended.

Chairman Kempe informed she felt that inserting the wording "up to" is more desirable than zoning developments piecemeal and perhaps developing higher intensity.

Mr. Gardner informed the wording should be "up to and including" so that medium intensity could be considered under Consideration Area 1.

Mr. Carnes made a motion that the language "up to and including" be incorporated in the recommendations for Consideration Area 1 of the Turkey Mountain Special Study.

Mr. VanFossen informed that the Comprehensive Plan Committee recommended adoption of the Turkey Mountain Special Study with the amended verbiage on article 3.6.3 as follows:

3.6.3 In the Low Intensity area east of Elwood, proposals for up to and including Medium Intensity developments may be considered if accompanied by a PUD.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") for ADOPTION of the Turkey Mountain Special Study with the amended language in article 3.3.3.5—"Notify the Tulsa Airport Authority and the Joint Airport Zoning Board of proposed new subdivisions and other developments under the approaches to Jones Airport to protect the public health, safety and well-being, and also to ensure the continued safe operation of Jones Airport."; article 3.6.3—"In the Low Intensity designated area east of Elwood, proposals for up to and including Medium Intensity developments may be considered if accompanied by a PUD."; and article 4.5.3.3—"The area indicated on the Plan map as Low Intensity-No Specific Land Use, but zoned IL, should be restricted to industrial areas unless accompanied by a PUD".

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Young "absent") to direct Staff to amend the District 8 Plan as recommended.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #304-1 Chadsey SE/c of 71st & Trenton (Bridge Pointe Office Center)

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Increase Sign

The Bridge Pointe Office Center is located at the southeast corner of East 71st Street and Trenton Avenue. Two signs have been approved by the TMAPC for location on east 71st Street: (1) a 120 square foot sign to be located at the southeast corner of Trenton and East 71st Street, and (2) a sign of approximately 40 square feet located approximately 125 feet east of the first location.

The sign referred to in "(1)" above has not been installed; however, the "(2)" sign has been installed. The applicant is now requesting that the "(1)" sign be increased in area from 120 square feet to 127.5 square feet. The proposed sign is to be 15 feet tall which is under the approved maximum of 20 feet by 5 feet.

Review of this request indicates that although the application exceeds the original PUD, it is in accordance with the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance which provides that if more than one ground sign is erected, .5 square feet of display surface area per each lineal foot of arterial street frontage is allowed. The arterial street frontage for East 71st Street is 356 lineal feet. Staff has reviewed the request and finds it to be minor in nature and also finds that the applicant has now used up the allotted two ground sign locations for the East 71st Street frontage. Only locations for monument signs remain to be utilized for Trenton Avenue in accordance with the approved PUD.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested minor amendment to increase the area of the previously approved ground sign at the southeast corner of Trenton and East 71st Street from 120 square feet to 127.5 square feet and subject to the condition that no additional signs be placed on the East 71st Street frontage.

Comments and Discussion:

Staff informed that the applicant was not present but informed he was in agreement with the Staff Recommendation.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Kempe, Young "absent") to APPROVE the Staff Recommendation for minor amendment PUD #304-1.

Staff Recommendation -- Detail Site Plan Review Area "A" Phase I

The subject tract is located at approximately the 7700 block of South Memorial Drive on the east side of the street. The proposed use is a one-story medical clinic of 3,160 square feet which is situated in the northwest corner of Area "A", and will be referred to as Phase I of Area "A". The tract has a frontage on South Memorial of approximately 116 feet and a net site area of 44,280 square feet. Total net area of Area "A" is 120,324 square feet, which is being platted as Lot 1, Block 1, Mayfair Courts Addition. All of Area "A" is planned for office uses per the approved PUD. A total of 28 parking spaces is shown, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement by 7 spaces. Internal traffic circulation is good and the parking lot design indicates a "patient drop-off" on the west side of the building. An ambulance drop-off is shown on the north side of the building with employee parking on the building's west side. A building expansion area for 2,000 square feet of added floor space is shown on the building's south side. Access to the proposed building is from a private drive which runs along the north boundary of the PUD and from a frontage road along Memorial. No direct access is indicated to South Memorial Drive at this stage. The frontage road will provide two points of indirect access to Memorial at this time.

Given the above review, the Staff finds the proposed Detail Site Plan for Phase I, Area "A" 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.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the proposed Detail Site Plan for Phase I, Area "A" of PUD #359, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That the Detail Site Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- (2) Development Standards for Phase I, Area "A":

Land Area:

(Gross Area "A"):	166,915 square feet
(Net Area "A"):	120,324 square feet
(Gross Area "A"/Phase I):	50,580 square feet
(Net Area "A"/Phase I):	44,280 square feet
(Gross Area "A" less Phase I):	116,335 square feet
(Net Area "A" less Phase I):	76,044 square feet

PUD #359 (cont'd)

Maximum Building Floor Area:

All of Area "A"	66,750 square feet
Area "A"/Phase I	3,160 square feet
Area "A" less Phase I	63,590 square feet

Floor Area Ratio:

All of Area "A"	39.99
Area "A"/Phase I	6.25

	<u>Approved/PUD</u>	<u>Submitted</u>
Permitted Uses:	Principal and Access- ory uses as a matter or right in an OL District.	Medical/Office

Minimum Building Setbacks:

From Centerline of South Memorial	180 feet	180 feet
From North Boundary Line of Area "A"	70 feet	70 feet
From South Boundary Line of Area "A"	10 feet	N/A
From South Boundary of Phase I	N/A	10 feet
From East Boundary of Area "A"	25 feet	N/A
Minimum Off-Street Parking Spaces:	21 spaces	28 spaces
Maximum Building Height:	3 stories	1-story
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	10% of Net Area*	10% of Net Area*

* Landscaped area may include landscaped parking islands, plazas, and courtyards, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.

- (3) Trash and utility areas shall be screened from public view.
- (4) That signs shall comply with Section 1130.2(b) of the Zoning Code.

PUD #359 (cont'd)

- (5) That a Detail Landscape Plan and Sign Plan shall be approved by the TMAPC prior to granting of an Occupancy Permit.
- (6) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied 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. Included in the Covenants shall be a mutual access easement granting this development a south outlet and inlet to a planned private drive to be constructed in the future.

Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked if the drainage problem on this site had been corrected and Mr. Wilmoth informed that he had met with the Engineering Department after the Commission meeting of January 16 regarding the Commission's concerns on this issue. He advised that this site is subject to a plat and the drainage question must be cleared up prior to release of the plat.

Roy Johnsen, representing the applicant, informed that the Staff Recommendations in regard to the drainage are acceptable. He also advised that his client is in agreement with Staff's conditions except the setback on the north boundary is actually approximately 40' instead of the 70' listed in the Staff Recommendation. Mr. Gardner informed this setback on the north boundary could be better described as "70 feet from the south property line of PSO" and Mr. Johnsen agreed to this change.

Mr. Frank also informed that the last sentence under item (6) of the Staff Recommendation, "Included in the Covenants shall be a mutual access easement granting this development a south outlet and inlet to a planned private drive to be constructed in the future.", should be deleted since this question had been resolved prior to the TMAPC hearing on this date.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-1 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Carnes, "abstaining"; Harris, Kempe, Young "absent") to APPROVE the Staff Recommendation for the Detail Site Plan on PUD #359, per the Staff conditions, but amending the minimum building setback on the north boundary line of Area "A" to "70 feet from the south property line of PSO" and deleting the last sentence of item (6).

Staff Recommendation -- Detail Site Plan

The subject tracts are a total of +/- 12.49 gross acres in size and located east of the southeast corner of 91st Street South and Sheridan Road. Both tracts are zoned RM-1 with the exception of a small triangular shaped portion on the east side which is zoned RS-3. The tracts are abutted to the east and south by a single-family subdivision and to the west by a commercial development. The applicant is now requesting Detail Site Plan approval for both tracts which have been incorporated into one project. Access to the projects include one main entrance on E. 91st Street and two curb cuts on S. 69th Street. The most southerly access point provides the common drive between the two (2) PUD's, and a mutual access easement should be granted during the platting process to preserve access from PUD #336 to PUD #166-B and S. 69th Street.

After review of the submitted plot plans and elevations, and comparison on an individual basis, Staff finds the proposed Detail Site Plan 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, Staff recommends APPROVAL of the proposed Detail Site Plans for PUD #166-B and PUD #336, subject to the following:

- (1) That the proposed Detail Site Plans be made a condition of approval unless modified herein.
- (2) Development Standards:

PUD #166-B

Gross Land Area:		6.69 acres
Permitted Uses:	<u>Approved</u> Multifamily and accessory uses. It is intended, though not required, that condominium development within the individual ownership of units shall be permitted.	<u>Submitted</u> Same
Maximum Number of Units:	168	160
Minimum Livability Per Unit:	550 sq. ft.	727 sq. ft.

PUD #166-B & 336 (cont'd)

	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Submitted</u>
Maximum Building Height:	2 stories	2 stories
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
Between buildings:	10 feet	Exceeds
From centerline of abutting arterial street:	75 feet	75 feet
From centerline of abutting non-arterial street:	40 feet	40 feet
From other boundaries	15 feet	22 feet
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	244 spaces	266 spaces

PUD #336

Gross Land Area:		5.8 acres
	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Submitted</u>
Permitted Uses:	Multifamily and accessory uses. It is intended, though not required, that condominium development within individual ownership of units shall be permitted.	Same
Maximum Number of Units:	112	112
Minimum Livability Space:	1,000 sq. ft.	1,158 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Height:	35 feet	Not Specified*
Maximum Number of Stories	2 stories	2 stories
Minimum Setbacks:		
Between Buildings	10 feet	Exceeds
From East Boundary	70 feet	97 feet
From South Boundary	55 feet	55 feet
From Other Boundaries	20 feet	22 feet
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	212 spaces	212 spaces

* Cannot exceed 35 feet.

2.06 .85:1541 (22)

PUD #166-B & 336 (cont'd)

- (3) If the units are sold as condominium individual ownerships, an association must be created to maintain all common areas and facilities.
- (4) That all trash and utility areas be screened from public view.
- (5) That a mutual access easement be granted during the platting process to protect access between PUD #166-B and PUD #336 and to assure PUD #336 access to South 69th Street.
- (6) That a Sign Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to granting an occupancy permit and that all signs shall be in accordance with Section 1130.2 (b) of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance and that the identification of the project will be achieved by a monument sign located along E. 91st Street in accordance with PUD 166-B, being 6 feet tall and 72 square feet in display area.
- (7) That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to granting an occupancy permit showing the location of screening fences on the south and east boundaries.
- (8) That parking lot and exterior lighting shall be constructed so as to direct light downward and away from adjacent residential areas.
- (9) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied 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:

The applicant, Mr. Paul Gunderson, 8209 E. 63rd Place, was present and informed he was in accord with the Staff Recommendation.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present.

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; Harris, Kempe, Young "absent") to APPROVE the Staff Recommendations for the Detail Site Plan on PUD #166-B & #336, subject to the conditions of Staff as stated above.

There being no further business, First Vice-Chairman Wilson declared the meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.

DATE APPROVED 2-20-85

Marilyn A. Wilson
1st Vice Chairman

ATTEST:

R. B. Padlock
Secretary

2.06.85:1541 (24)