

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1587
Wednesday, January 15, 1986, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes Connery Doherty Draughon Kempe, Chairman Paddock, Secretary Selph VanFossen Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman Woodard	Young	Frank Gardner Setters	Northcutt, Legal Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, January 14, 1986 at 12:35 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts and Deposits:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **10-0-0** (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Report of Receipts and Deposits for the month ended December 31, 1985**, as recommended by Staff.

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Kempe introduced County Commissioner John Selph as the newly designated Chairman for the County Commission. As such, he will be attending the TMAPC meetings during 1986.

Chairman Kempe announced of a joint committee meeting of the Rules and Regulations Committee and the Comprehensive Plan Committee to be held on Wednesday, January 22nd at 11:00 in the City Commission Room. The topic for discussion will be the Special Housing Needs Recommendations, with emphasis on definitions.

Committee Reports:

Mr. Paddock advised the **Rules and Regulation Committee** had met this date to formulate a definition of the six month ruling on rehearing zoning applications. Their findings will be presented at the TMAPC meeting on January 22nd. As to the definition of a major amendment to a PUD, no conclusion was reached and this item will be continued.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **Z-6096**

Applicant: **Barnes**

Location: 4100 North Harvard

Size of Tract: 40 ± acres

Present Zoning: RS-3

Proposed Zoning: RMH

Date of Hearing: January 15, 1986 (Continuance requested for 1/22/86)

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 16 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 requested RMH as a **may be found** in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 40 acres in size and is located at the southeast corner of Harvard Avenue and Mohawk Park Road. It is partially wooded, rolling, contains several storage buildings and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by the City of Tulsa Water Treatment Plant and vacant property zoned RS-3; on the east by a PSO substation and vacant property zoned RS-3 and AG; on the south by the Tulsa County District #1 Garage Facilities and large lot single-family dwellings zoned CG, CS and RS-3; on the west by scattered single-family dwellings and vacant property zoned RS-3; and to the southeast are quality single-family dwellings.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: None.

Conclusion: The subject tract is situated among uses ranging from industrial to large lot single-family residential. The zoning pattern and existing land use would not support a transition to an intense residential or Industrial use at this time. Mobile home usage could be acceptable in this area, but not for the entire tract, and not at RMH intensities. Adjacent single-family areas located to the southeast of the subject tract are developed at approximately 1.17 dwelling units per acre. Consideration should be given for developing the southeast portion of the subject tract at RS standards and for conventional single-family uses. On the western portions of the subject tract and the northern most portion (as far south as the south boundary of the Water Treatment Plant), mobile home park use at reduced densities would be acceptable due to the Harvard frontage commercial zoning, under the control of a PUD with no access permitted between the RS-3 and RMH areas.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of RMH zoning on the west 350' and denial on the balance of the subject tract (approximately ten acres), restricting mobile home development to the Harvard frontage, next to the County Garage. This would allow a maximum of 80 mobile homes in the RMH area. NOTE: If the Commission is inclined to increase that number, 15 acres (west 495') of RMH or 120 mobile homes with a PUD could be spread over the west 600' of the north 650'. The southeast (approximately 11 acres) would remain RS-3 single-family.

Comments & Discussion:

Chairman Kempe asked if there were any interested parties in attendance. Mr. Vernon Hobbs, 3631 East 36th Street North, requested the case be heard this date. Mr. Charles Norman advised there had not been a chance to properly analyze the application, due to the advertising deadline, and neither the applicant nor the interested parties have had time to review the Staff recommendation.

Mr. VanFossen made a motion to continue this case and Chairman Kempe asked Mr. Hobbs which date (January 22nd or January 29th) would be the most convenient. Mr. Hobbs stated a preference for January 29th.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **10-0-0** (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6096 Barnes** until Wednesday, **January 29, 1986** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6095

Present Zoning: RS-3

(Companion Items PUD #411, Z-5842-SP & SP-1)

Applicant: Norman (101st & Memorial Land Co.)

Proposed Zoning: RM-2

Location: North of the NE/c of 101st & Memorial

Size of Tract: 27 ± acres

Date of Hearing: January 15, 1986

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-6095

(Companion Items PUD #411, Z-5842-SP & SP-1)

The subject property is located between District 18 and District 26. The Comprehensive Plan designates the land as planned freeway right-of-way. The proposed RM-2 zoning is **not** consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 27 acres in size and located along the east side of Memorial extending east for 2,640 feet at approximately 96th Street. It is partially wooded, gently sloping, vacant and zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property zoned CO, on the east by both vacant property zoned AG and residential single-family areas zoned RS-3; on the south by mostly vacant property with one single-family dwelling zoned CO and on the west by vacant property zoned AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Portions of the Corridor Zoning abutting the subject tract to the north have been approved for and developed at medium residential intensities.

Conclusion: The subject tract, for which RM-2 zoning has been requested, corresponds to the 96th Street alignment of the Creek Freeway as designated on the Major Street and Highway Plan. The TMAPC voted to delete this alignment from the Plan on November 20, 1985; however, this deletion has not received final approval from the City Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Until there is final action by the governing bodies, Staff believes that this alignment should be protected to the extent possible under the law (no higher zoning than RS-3).

If the Commission, however, is supportive of rezoning this tract from RS-3, a basis for this decision should be the existing zoning patterns and the Development Guidelines, a part of the Comprehensive Plan. The tract is situated between CO zoning on the north and south. The Plan designates property to the north for Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use and Corridor, and to the south for Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use, a Consideration Area and Development Sensitive. Although CO zoning extends

to a depth greater than 1,320' on the north and south, east of Memorial, Staff would suggest that the absence of the expressway and recommendations pending to delete same, the physical facts and the Comprehensive Plan would support an RM-1 intensity to a depth no greater than 1,320'. Further, Staff would suggest that the present RS-3 classification remain on the balance.

In summary, Staff recommends DENIAL of RM-2 on this entire tract, and suggests an alternative pattern of RM-1 on the west 1,320' and RS-3 on the balance if the zoning is to be changed.

Staff Recommendation - Z-5842-SP & PUD #411

(Companion Item Z-5842-SP-1)

The subject tract has an area of 185.55 acres and is located at the northeast corner of East 101st Street and South Memorial Drive -- the total area includes approximately 27 acres that is designated for the Creek Freeway along the 96th Street alignment. On November 20, 1985, the TMAPC unanimously expressed nonsupport of this alignment and removed it from the Major Street and Highway Plan designating East 91st as a six-lane Parkway, subject to approval of the City Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

East 101st and South Memorial are classified as Primary Arterials; thus, creating a Type III 15-acre Node at the intersection of 101st and Memorial. The land use pattern proposed under the PUD and SP would spread the commercial uses (including a Special Exception use for auto sales in a CS District) for one-half mile along Memorial Drive which is significantly different than an earlier proposal at the southwest corner of 91st and Memorial. In the earlier proposal, the auto sales area was basically restricted to nodal-type development. The Staff cannot support the CO Site Plan and PUD in its present form with the knowledge that the Planning Commission has taken action to delete the Creek Freeway at 96th thereby modifying the Corridor Concept as outlined in the Development Guidelines. Specifically, the plan proposes to spread the more intensive auto sales uses one-half mile beyond the Type III Node and the plan should be redesigned to overcome this feature. It is also noted that the residential intensities for those development areas along the east and northeast boundaries of the plan are excessive.

The proposed intensities are summarized as "Appendix A" to this Staff Recommendation with "Appendix B" being "Suggested" guidelines if the proposal is supported by the Commission. Exhibit "A" attached is a map of the 21 Development Areas and Exhibit "B" shows how the suggested reduced intensities have been determined. The reduced intensities are suggested to make the downward transition in residential intensities more uniform as they begin decreasing moving east of Memorial toward the existing single-family development. The internal street system proposed under the Plan provides a strong network of collector streets and logical boundaries for the development areas. The Staff is, however, concerned about the east/west street proposed along the freeway alignment in that it could, if

extended from Memorial to Mingo provide a straight shot through this square mile which would not be desirable. It is possible that this could be readdressed under PUD #369 (land to the east) which the Staff understands is now inactive. The Technical Advisory Committee will not review this application until after it is presented to the TMAPC due to Holiday conflicts.

In summary, the Staff is not supportive of the proposed layout of Z-5842-SP and PUD #411 based on TMAPC action of November 20, 1985 to remove the 96th Street alignment of the Creek Expressway from the Major Street and Highway Plan. Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of Z-5842-SP and PUD #411 as proposed and approval of these applications subject to the following modifications:

1. That the auto and truck sales areas be redesigned, located all south of the collector street (99th Street) and wrapping around and contiguous with the proposed shopping center at 101st and Memorial.
2. That residential densities for Development Areas ~~15, 16, 18, and 19,~~ ^{and 20} be reduced by 155 dwelling units per Appendix B -- total dwelling units reduced from 1,605 to 1,450.
3. That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
4. Development Standards: See attached Development Standards (Exhibit C), Appendix B, and recommended conditions from Staff. (NOTE: The Staff suggests the adopted standards as recommended by Staff, or if adopted and revised by the Commission, be made an official "Exhibit" to be of record for the purposes of official minutes and future reference.)
5. That portions zoned CO be approved for SP Site Plan as submitted, or as modified herein and that all remaining portions under conventional zoning and supplemental PUD be approved as submitted in the Outline Development Plan, or as modified herein.
6. That all sign standards be as outlined in the Development Standards and subject to Detail Sign Plan review and approval by the TMAPC prior to installation.
7. That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval and installed prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit.
8. Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
9. That all trash, utility and equipment areas shall be screened from public view.
10. That all CO and PUD supplementally zoned development areas require Detail Site Plan approval by TMAPC, consistent with the approved SP Corridor Site Plans and PUD Outline Development Plans, prior to issuance of Building Permits.

As corrected
by the TMAPC
2-26-86

11. That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 and Section 850.5 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 and CO conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.
12. That the Staff's calculations of maximum intensity and density be recognized as Exhibit "A" and "B" and Appendix A and B.

With these modifications the PUD and CO Site Plan will meet the purposes and findings sections of the Zoning Code. The recommended intensities and proposed land uses can be accommodated by 15 acres of CS zoning at the node and a combination of RM-1, RD and RS-3 (all low intensity zoning categories) on the balance of the proposal (Exhibit B). No change in underlying zoning would occur under this action, except for RM-1 zoning on the west 1320 feet of the freeway right of way portion per Z-6095. However, these proposed intensities as modified would meet the Development Guidelines for NODE and Subdistrict development given the existing zoning and development patterns in the area.

Staff Recommendation - Z-5842-SP-1
(Companion Items Z-5842-SP and PUD #411)

The subject tract has a net area of 3.78 acres and underlying zoning of CO. It is included in Development Area 3 of Z-5842-SP which is pending Commission approval for auto and light truck sales. The southwest corner of this Development Area and first phase construction is 1660' north of the intersection of 101st and Memorial. Land use west of Memorial is mostly vacant and acreage-type single-family residential.

The Development Standards proposed for the planned automobile dealership, together with a location map, are attached to this Staff Recommendation. The proposed auto display standards are not as restrictive as those adopted under a similar plan at 91st and Memorial, however, are reasonable and serve to restrict the display of autos and restricts the location of a body shop to the principal building. The Site Plan does not appear to segregate automobile sales areas (new or used) and does not designate the areas on the Plan where these areas are to be located as did the plan at 91st and Memorial. The proposed standards do include strict signage controls, the building exteriors are restricted to concrete or masonry, and landscaped areas are to be provided on the perimeter. A portion of the tract to the north of the automobile dealership is proposed for a common area of .95 acres to be developed as a boulevard-type main entrance from Memorial to be shared with similar development to the north. The proposed building is 21,477 square feet with 258 parking spaces. One parking space would be required for each 600 square feet of building floor area (36 spaces), plus one space for each 1,000 square feet of open air display area. A 10-foot landscaped area is provided along the south and southeast perimeter.

The site plan has merit; however, the Staff is not supportive of Z-5842-SP-1 because of location and because we are not supportive of the submitted SP and PUD as expressed in a companion recommendation. Elimination of the Creek Freeway at this location is a significant factor when considering location of commercial uses.

Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of Z-5842-SP-1 as it would permit the most intensive uses under the proposed plan to be developed outside and away from the intersection node.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman, representing owners Mike Dorn and Doug Fox, first reviewed Z-6095 requesting the zoning change, since the proposed Creek Expressway designation has been removed. In response to Mr. VanFossen regarding the Creek Expressway, Staff advised that the Planning Commission action has been transmitted to the City Commission in the form of a resolution, but as yet City has not placed the resolution on their agenda for approval.

Mr. Norman gave a lengthy review of all three applications and the surrounding areas. Mr. Norman advised the applicant was prepared to accept Staff's recommendations with the exception as to type of unit in Area 18, and asked that it be modified back to 8.7 units per acre and allow multi-family. In Area 20, Mr. Norman hoped to plat patio lots for single-family homes. Mr. Norman stated the development standards presented have been based on the standards approved for the 91st and Memorial area, and added that he differed with Staff on the redesign of the Memorial frontage in regard to the auto park. He next reviewed the landscaping plan and the concept plan for the entire area.

In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Norman clarified that the owners were the 101st and Memorial Land Company. Mr. Paddock inquired as to the auto park floor area ratio (FAR) and asked if that included Areas 2 and 3. Mr. Norman informed that the FAR included Areas 2 through 5. Mr. VanFossen stated concerns as to the concept for Area 4 and 5, and felt the landscaping area was low. He also inquired as to the land use in the area across from the proposed auto park on Memorial and Staff advised that this land was developed for very large lot residential and was mostly vacant.

Ms. Wilson questioned if the Commission should proceed with a decision on the zoning application since the City has not yet put the Creek Expressway on their agenda, and asked Mr. Norman if it was necessary to take action this date on the RM-2 tract in order to proceed with the auto park area. Mr. Norman replied if the City Commission should not go with the TMAPC recommendation on the Creek Resolution, he would ask them to approve the plan south of this section and continue the zoning application for a specific period of time.

Mr. Doherty, referring to Appendix B for Area 18 with the restriction to duplex and single-family on the east 150', asked Mr. Norman if he would be agreeable to this. Mr. Norman stated he had recently discussed this with Staff and accepts this recommendation. He was also able to accept the note as to Area 20, which allows conventional or patio lots.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock asked Staff if the TMAPC could approve and attach a condition in regard to the 96th Corridor pending City/County action on the property having the Creek Expressway deletion. Mr. Gardner advised that, as a recommending body, the Commission could make any recommendation they felt appropriate. Mr. Gardner continued by stating the applicant has accepted RM-1 on the zoning application (Z-6095), as recommended by Staff, and RM-2 is not even needed. The issue appears to be the location of the auto dealerships.

Mr. Carnes agreed with Mr. VanFossen as to concerns about spacing for the display of autos on Memorial and additional landscaping, but stated he would not have that much trouble with the car agencies on Memorial if the "park-like atmosphere" was created. Mr. Draughon stated he felt the car dealerships would want to be on Memorial for maximum exposure. Mr. VanFossen proposed a motion to approve the zoning application (Z-6095), modified as recommended by Staff, subject to approval of the City Commission as to the deletion of the Creek Expressway. Mr. Gardner clarified for Mr. Draughon that this motion was for zoning, and had nothing to do with the placement of the auto dealerships.

TMAPC ACTION: 10 members present

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Young, "absent") to APPROVE Z-6095 Norman (101st & Memorial Land Company) for RM-1 on the west 1,320' and RS-3 on the balance of the tract, as suggested by Staff.

Legal Description:

RM-1: THE WEST 1,320' OF: A tract of land containing 27.5149 acres that is part of the NW Quarter of Section 24, T-18-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting at the SW corner of the NW Quarter of said Section 24; thence N 89°37'22" E, for 50.00' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land; thence sue North and parallel to the Westerly line of Section 24 for 660.00'; thence S 79°03'11" E, along an extension of and and along the southerly line of "Sunchase", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, for 1,069.43'; thence S 86°39'33" East, along the southerly line and along an extension of the southerly line of "Sunchase", for 1,542.04' to a point on the Easterly line of the NW Quarter of Section 24; thence S 0°01'40" E for 350.01' to the SE corner of the NW Quarter of Section 24; thence S 89°37'22" W along the southerly line of the NW Quarter for 2,589.63' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land.

RS-3: All of the following tract, LESS THE WEST 1,320': A tract of land containing 27.5149 acres that is part of the NW Quarter of Section 24, T-18-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting at the SW corner of the NW Quarter of said Section 24; thence N 89°37'22" E, for 50.00' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land; thence due North and parallel to the Westerly line of Section 24 for 660.00'; thence S 79°03'11" E, along an extension of and along the southerly line of "Sunchase", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, for 1,069.43'; thence S 86°39'33" East, along the southerly line and along an extension of the southerly line of "Sunchase", for 1,542.04' to a point on the Easterly line of the NW Quarter of Section 24; thence S 0°01'40" E for 350.01' to the SE corner of the NW Quarter of Section 24; thence S 89°37'22" W along the southerly line of the NW Quarter for 2,589.63' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land.

Additional Comments & Discussion:

Mr. VanFossen then moved to approve the concept plans of the zoning and PUD, subject to the Staff recommendation under Appendix B (attached), and the deletion of condition #1, thereby leaving the auto sales area as is.

TMAPC ACTION: 10 members present

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 8-1-1 (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Connery, "nay"; Draughon, "abstaining"; (Young, "absent") to APPROVE the Concept Plans for Z-5842-SP, PUD #411 and Z-5842-SP-1 Norman (101st & Memorial Land Company), subject to the Staff recommendation under Appendix B (attached), and delete condition #1 requiring the auto and truck sales areas be redesigned.

For further modification of Z-5842-SP, PUD #411 and Z-5842-SP-1, Mr. VanFossen asked questions to clarify sign standards and the vehicle display area. Mr. VanFossen also stated that building height should be limited to two stories on the east 120' of Areas 14 and 15 and the landscaping should be increased to 15% minimum. Mr. Norman explained that the 7% landscaping is on the net land area, not the gross. Mr. VanFossen stated he would go with 15% of the gross land area, but it still seemed low. Mr. Gardner explained it did seem low, but that it should be considered a minimum. In actuality, the Commission would be approving the final landscaping plan and it would more than likely be increased.

Based on the above discussion, Mr. VanFossen made a motion for approval of adding conditional items relating to an increased landscape area of 15% minimum of the gross area in all nonresidential areas, and restrict the building height to two stories on the east 120' of development Areas 14 and 15.

TMAPC ACTION: 10 members present

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-1 (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, "abstaining"; (Young, "absent") to APPROVE adding conditional items for Z-5842-SP, PUD #411 and Z-5842-SP-1 Norman (101st & Memorial Land Company), increasing the landscaping to 15% minimum of the gross area of all nonresidential areas, and restrict the building height to two stories on the east 120' of development Areas 14 and 15.

Legal Description:

Z-5842-SP, PUD #411: A tract of land, containing 181.1999 acres, that is part of the W 1/2 of Section 24, T-18-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa county, Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting at the SW corner of said Section 24; thence N 89°37'01" E along the Southerly line of Section 24 for 515.80' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land; thence due north and parallel to the Westerly line of Section 24 for 24.75'; thence N 84°38'13" West for 402.02'; thence N 49°13'17" W for 86.54'; thence due North, parallel to and 50.00' Easterly of the Westerly line of Section 24 for 3,182.46'; thence S 79°03'11" E, along an extension of and along the southerly line of "Sunchase, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, for 1,069.43'; thence S 86°38'33" E, along the southerly line and along an extension of the Southerly line of "Sunchase: for 1,542.04' to a point on the Easterly line of the West 1/2 of Section 24; thence S 0°01'40" E along said Easterly line for 2,554.15'; thence S 89°37'01" W for 297.00'; thence S 0°01'40" E for 440.00' to a point on the southerly line of Section 24; thence S 89°37'01" W along said southerly line for 1,828.12' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land.

Z-5842-SP-1: A tract of land containing 3.7820 acres that is part of the SW Quarter of Section 24, T-18-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting the NW corner of the SW Quarter of said Section 24; thence N 89°27'22" E along the northerly line of the SW Quarter for 50.00'; thence due South and parallel to the Westerly line of Section 24 for 655.33' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land; thence due East for 420.00'; thence S 45°00'00" E for 251.02'; thence S 45°00'00" W for 135.25' to a point of curve; thence Southwesterly and Westerly along a curve to the right, with a central angle of 45°00'00", and a radius of 160.00', for 125.66' to a point of tangency; thence due West along said tangency for 388.73'; thence due North and parallel to the Westerly line of Section 24 for 320.00' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land.

APPENDIX B

Summary of
Suggested Development Standards

AREA	SIZE/ACRES	DWELLING UNITS OR FLOOR AREA/FAR	PROPOSED USE	COMMENTS
1	19.4692	150,600 sq. ft./ .18	Retail	35' Max. Height
2,3,4, & 5	39.3068	176,100 sq. ft./ .12	Auto & Light Truck	35' Max. Height
6,7,8,9, 10, 11, and 12	52.6024	1,002,100 sq. ft./ .50	Office	52' Max. Height
13	6.8739	36/Acre	Apartments and Duplexes	248 Units 3-Story
14	6.4143	30/Acre	Apartments and Duplexes	192 Units 3-Story
15	9.6491	25/Acre	Apartments and Duplexes	242 Units 3-Story
16	14.7620	30/Acre	Apartments and Duplexes	441 Units 3-Story
17	9.2542	15/Acre	Apartments and Duplexes	138 Units 3-Story
18	14.2589	8.7 Acre	Duplex & Single- family *	123 Units 2-Story
19	3.3919	5.2 Acre	Apartments and Duplexes	18 Units 2-Story
20	7.4518	5.2 Acre	Single-family**	39 Units 2-Story
21	2.1169	9 Units	Single-family	9 Units 2-Story
<hr/>				
Total Acres:	185.5514			
Total Floor Area:		1,328,700 sq. ft.	Commercial & Office	
Total Area-- Commercial:	58.776	326,700 sq. ft.		.1276 F.A.R.
Total Area-- Office:	52.6024	1,002,100 sq. ft.		.4373 F.A.R.
Total Units:	74.173 Ac.	19.5 Units/Acre Average		1450 Units

*Restricted to duplex and single-family on the east 150'. Apartment uses permitted on the balance.

**Duplex north of collector street only. Conventional or patio home lots permitted subject to Detail Site Plan review.

* * * * *

Application No.: Z-6093
Applicant: INCOG (Mitchell)
Location: West & South of the SW/c of Peoria & I-44
Size of Tract: 1.9 acres

Present Zoning: RM-2
Proposed Zoning: CS

Date of Hearing: January 15, 1986
Presentation to TMAPC by: INCOG Staff (Map Correction)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity - Residential.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is 1.9 acres in size and located west of the southwest corner of Peoria Avenue and I-44 Skelly Drive. It is non-wooded, flat and contains an unoccupied two-story motel and is zoned RM-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by a converted service station for boat sales zoned CS, on the east by a motel which appears to be unoccupied zoned CH, on the south by a developed single-family subdivision zoned RS-3, on the west by an apartment complex zoned RM-2.

= **Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Board of Adjustment action has approved medium intensity commercial use (boat sales) abutting the subject tract to the north.

Conclusion: Prior to 1970, the official zoning maps designated the subject tract U-3C (CS by today's designation). When the new zoning classifications were established, the subject tract was erroneously given an RM-2 classification. INCOG is now correcting the map error and recommends **APPROVAL** of CS zoning. Staff would also recommend an amendment to the District 18 Comprehensive Plan to reflect the correction.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Carnes inquired as to the applicant's name being INCOG (Mitchell). Mr. Frank advised this was a map correction and, as such, INCOG is the applicant.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Woodard, Young, "absent") to APPROVE the Map Correction for Z-6093 INCOG (Mitchell) for CS, as recommended by Staff, and does include an amendment to the District 18 Comprehensive Plan.

Legal Description:

A part of the NE quarter, Section 36, T-19-N, R-12-E, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, described as follows: Beginning 505' West and 257.02' South of the NE corner of said Section; thence South 477.34'; thence West 180'; thence North 477.34'; thence East 180' to the Point of Beginning.

* * * * *

Application No.: Z-6094
Applicant: Ruckman
Location: NW/c of 40th Street and South Yale
Size of Tract: .2 acres (approximate)

Present Zoning: RS-3
Proposed Zoning: OL

Date of Hearing: January 15, 1985
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Steve Schuller, 610 South Main (584-1600)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 6 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 requested OL District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .2 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of Yale Avenue and 40th Street. It is partially wooded, gently sloping and contains a single-family dwelling, and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north and west by similar single-family dwellings zoned RS-3, on the east by a shopping mall zoned CH, and on the south by a shopping center zoned CS. The subject house fronts south into the commercial zoning and development rather than fronting the neighboring homes.

Conclusion: Staff cannot support the requested OL zoning based on the Comprehensive Plan and the clear-cut encroachment into a developed single-family subdivision. The request could also be considered spot zoning. Staff recommends DENIAL of the requested OL zoning for Z-6094.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Steve Schuller reviewed the subject area and request comparing this site to others in the City with similar circumstances, and asked for approval of this application. In response to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Schuller identified the curb cut into the CS shopping center across from the subject tract. Mr. Gardner confirmed for Ms. Wilson that 40th was a minor residential street. Mr. Paddock inquired as to the property across Winston Avenue in regard to access and asked Mr. Schuller if he thought a domino effect might occur if this request were approved. Mr. Schuller commented he did not think a domino effect would occur as this property faces south away from the others in the area. Ms. Wilson asked if the applicant had a client or a contract on the subject property. Mr. Schuller stated there was no contract, but some interest had been indicated by an architect. Mr. Schuller requested the Commission, should they be considering a denial of this application, consider a continuance to allow more time for his client to possibly prepare a PUD.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. VanFossen advised he would be abstaining as there is too much involvement on this case with some of his own property. Mr. Connery and Ms. Wilson indicated they would be supporting the Staff recommendation for denial. Mr. Doherty made a motion for a continuance. Mr. Paddock advised he would be voting against the request, even with a PUD, due to the small size of the tract. There being no second to Mr. Doherty's motion, Ms. Wilson moved for denial of the request. Mr. Draughon mentioned Mr. Schuller and his client should be given time to confer. Commissioner Selph stated he felt this was a clear cut case of encroachment and would be voting against the request. Mr. Carnes stated he, too, would vote against the request. Chairman Kempe allowed a short recess for Mr. Schuller to discuss with the applicant any alternatives, after which Mr. Schuller advised he would like an opportunity to see the feasibility of a PUD and again requested a continuance. The consensus of the Commission still appeared to be for denial based on the size and location of the tract.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On MOTION of CARNES, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; VanFossen, "abstaining"; (Woodard, Young, "absent") to DENY Z-6094 Ruckman for OL, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Application No.: Z-6097
Applicant: Norman (True)
Location: East of Riverside Drive at 68th Street
Size of Tract: 2 acres (approximate)

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

Date of Hearing: January 15, 1986
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

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

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested RM-2 District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 2 acres in size and located some 700 feet west of Peoria Avenue, south of 66th Place. It is nonwooded, flat and contains two storage buildings, and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north, south and west by vacant property zoned RS-3, and on the east by an existing apartment complex zoned RM-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: RM-2 zoning has been approved and medium intensity has been developed abutting the subject tract to the east.

Conclusion: The subject tract is located in an RS-3 strip between existing RM-2 zoning and the Riverside Drive. It is expected that the area along Riverside Drive will develop at some intensity greater than residential single-family.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing development patterns, Staff can support RM-2 zoning and recommends APPROVAL of Z-6097 as requested.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On MOTION of CARNES, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Woodard, Young, "absent") to APPROVE Z-6097 Norman (True) for RM-2, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

A tract of land in Lot 7, Section 1, Township 18 North, Range 12 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows: Beginning 1,485' North and 760' West of the Southeast corner of Section 1; thence West 300'; thence NW 382' to a point; thence East and parallel to the South line of Section 1, 422'; thence South 362' to the point of beginning, containing three acres, more or less; LESS THE FOLLOWING TRACT CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF TULSA AS FOLLOWS: A piece or parcel of land located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 1, Township 18 North, Range 12 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, which is more particularly described as follows, to-wit: Beginning at the SE corner of "The Keys" subdivision, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma; thence North 19°35'09" West along the Easterly boundary thereof a distance of 382.00'; thence South 89°57'27" East parallel to the South line of said Section 1 a distance of 159.25'; thence South 19°35'09" East a distance of 301.57'; thence South 23°07'05" East a distance of 82.39'; thence North 89°57'35" West a distance of 164.64' to the point of beginning, containing 1.3201 acres, more or less.

SUBDIVISIONS:

FINAL APPROVAL & RELEASE:

Family Worship Center (1094) N/side E. 21st, East of So. 152nd East Ave.

Midtown Plaza Annex (193) East of SE/c East 21st & South Lewis

In response to Chairman Kempe, Mr. Gardner advised all was in order on the above Subdivision Plats.

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Woodard, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Final and Release of Plat for Family Worship Center and Midtown Plaza Annex**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Quail Ridge Amended (PUD221)(2894) East 44th Street & South 131st E. Ave.

8800 Quebec Extended (1683) 87th and South Pittsburg

Chairman Kempe stated that Staff had advised these items were to be stricken from the agenda.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #166-A-1

South & East of the SE/c of East 91st & South Sheridan

Staff advised this application has been readvertised as PUD #166-D to be heard January 29, 1986.

* * * * *

PUD 208-1

SE/c of South Yale Avenue & East 71st Street

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment for Pylon Sign

December 18, 1985: The subject tract has been developed for a retail/office shopping center and is permitted CS development in accordance with an order of the District Court. Subsequent to the Court ordering CS restrictions, PUD #208 was approved by the City and affirmed by the Court. The sign requirements in this PUD limit ground signs along the arterials to not more than one ground sign to be a maximum of 5' tall. PUD sign restrictions in effect at the time of approval of PUD #208 would have allowed one sign within the building setback line to be a maximum of 25' tall and a display surface area of 1 square foot for each lineal foot of arterial frontage. The frontage of this property along 71st and Yale is 775'; the proposed sign display area is 180 square feet. The applicant is requesting a pylon sign which would be 30' in height with the existing 5' sign at the top and "reader boards" with the names of the tenants from the ground level to the base of the logo sign. The character of signage at this intersection is such that a pylon sign, such as this, would not be consistent--no other business at this intersection presently has a pylon sign. PUD #260-A was recently approved at the northeast corner of this intersection and signage was restricted to 2 ground monument signs not exceeding 8' in height with a maximum display area of 64 square feet. Wall and canopy signage on the building should be adequate to identify the existing business; therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of the request for a minor amendment to PUD #208 to allow one 30' pylon sign with an area of 180 square feet. If the TMAPC is supportive of this request, the Staff suggests the height be limited to a maximum of 25' to be consistent with the PUD restrictions in effect at the time of approval for PUD #208.

January 22, 1986: Staff discussions with the applicant, since the December 18, 1985 meeting, have indicated that the sign plan could be revised as follows:

- 1) The existing sign would remain at the intersection of 71st and Yale in its present configuration which is (a) 16' tall; (b) display area of 5' wide x 7' long or 35 square feet; and (c) the sign would continue to be ground lighted and non-flashing.

- 2) One additional ground sign would be permitted on East 71st and South Yale to be spaced a minimum distance of 100' from the existing sign with each sign allowed to be (a) 8' tall maximum; (b) display area of 64 square feet maximum; and (c) ground lighted or internally lighted and non-flashing.
- 3) The two new signs shall be subject to the general terms and conditions of Section 1130.2(b) of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD 208-1 subject to conditions number 1, 2, and 3 as stated above.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock stated concerns were expressed December 18th as to the height of the ground signs at the four corners of the intersection and asked Staff if the 8' maximum was consistent with the treatment given others at that intersection. Mr. Frank advised the standards adopted for the northeast corner were standards volunteered by the applicant, and a minor amendment is scheduled for an upcoming meeting requesting that these sign standards be somewhat relaxed.

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Connery, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Woodard, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment for Signs for PUD 208-1**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Chairman Kempe read a letter from Ms. Ellen Hartman, Senior Administrative Assistant for Governor Nigh thanking the TMAPC for their efforts at the public hearing of January 8th on Special Housing Needs.

As this was the last TMAPC meeting for Mr. Connery, Chairman Kempe extended thanks and appreciation to Mr. Connery for his dedication and participation as a Commissioner.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Date Approved January 29, 1986
Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

AS Paddock
Secretary