

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1620
Wednesday, September 17, 1986, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes	Kempe	Frank	Linker, Legal
Doherty, 2nd Vice-Chairman	Crawford	Gardner	Counsel
Draughon		Lasker	Jackere, Legal
Paddock, Secretary		Matthews	
Parmeale, Chairman		Setters	
Selph		Wilmoth	
VanFossen			
Wilson, 1st Vice-Chairman			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, September 16, 1986 at 10:30 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

MINUTES:

Approval of Minutes of September 3, 1986, Meeting #1618:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Parmeale, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doherty, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of September 3, 1986, Meeting #1618.**

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts & Deposits for the Month Ended August 31, 1986:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Parmeale, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doherty, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Report of Receipts & Deposits for the Month Ended August 31, 1986.**

Director's Report:

- a) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVING A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE TULSA CITY/COUNTY MAJOR STREET & HIGHWAY PLAN, A PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN FOR THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA, BY ESTABLISHING A ROUTE FOR THE CREEK EXPRESSWAY, DOWNGRADING EAST 91st STREET FROM A PARKWAY TO A SECONDARY ARTERIAL STREET AND RELATED ITEMS

Mr. Lasker presented Resolution 1618:627 in regard to the Creek Expressway and related items, as adopted at the September 3, 1986 TMAPC meeting. Ms. Wilson asked when this would be transmitted to the City Commission for approval. Mr. Lasker advised it should be transmitted tomorrow and the City was being asked to schedule this for their September 30th meeting. In his discussions with the Transportation Commission, Mr. Lasker stated he learned that City Commission approval is the primary action needed before they can proceed. Once approved by the City, the Transportation Commission would like to hear this at their meeting of October 6th, and then the resolution would be transmitted to the County Commission. Mr. Lasker added that Staff now has a map showing the various subdivisions along the expressway route.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doherty, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE Resolution 1618:627 as relates to the Creek Expressway, Downgrading of 91st Street from a Parkway to a Secondary Arterial, and Related Items (attached as an exhibit to these minutes).

* * * * *

- b) CONSIDERATION OF APPROVING THE RESOLUTION FINDING THE AMENDMENT TO THE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE DOWNTOWN NORTHWEST URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT (OKLA R-7) IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE CITY OF TULSA.

Ms. Dane Matthews of the INCOG Staff, presented and reviewed the above mentioned resolution on behalf of the Tulsa Development Authority (formerly the Tulsa Urban Renewal Authority).

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE the Resolution finding the amendment to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Downtown Northwest Urban Renewal Project (OKLA R-7) is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Tulsa.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT - Cont'd

- c) RECEIVE REPORT FROM THE CITY/COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT AND SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE REGARDING DEVELOPMENT OF SUBDIVISIONS IN AN AREA BOUNDED BY 101st STREET, 121st STREET, MEMORIAL DRIVE AND THE ARKANSAS RIVER.

Mr. Wilmoth clarified that no TMAPC action was being requested this date, but the City/County Health Department wanted the TMAPC to be in receipt of this report, which lists recommendations for subdivisions being developed in an area bound by 101st Street, 121st Street, Memorial Drive and the Arkansas River, as follows:

- 1) Those subdivisions already platted be allowed to continue as is.
- 2) Those subdivisions in the final stages of platting be required to install a sewer collection system prior to the releasing of the plat. These subdivisions could build and develop on the recently performed soil percolation tests and connect to sewer when it is accessible.
- 3) New subdivisions be required to provide a sewer collection system and some intermediary treatment, such as a package plant, lagoon, etc., until such time as it can be connected to the municipal system.
- 4) Lot splits shall be subject to the same requirements as subdivisions.
- 5) Extra emphasis be placed on the importance of extending the sanitary sewer to the additions adjacent to Fry Creek, i.e. Forest Trails, Sheridan Park, Bridal Trails, Burgundy Estates.

Mr. Wilmoth stated there have been no plats or subdivision items recently submitted in this area for TMAPC review, and he felt this issue would probably raise more questions than answers at this point. Mr. Wilmoth and the Planning Commissioners discussed this matter, but as reiterated by Chairman Parmele, no TMAPC action or vote was being requested and he stated that the record would show receipt of the report by the TMAPC. The Commission indicated this item would be the topic of discussion at a future Rules and Regulations Committee meeting.

SUBDIVISIONS:

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL AND RELEASE:

Kennebunkport (PUD 414) (1993)

2121 East 36th Street

(RS-2)

Mr. Wilmoth commented the PUD had a 20 foot rear yard requirement and there were three lots in the far south portion that would probably be presented with a plot plan for a minor amendment for TMAPC review. Mr. Gardner advised that, in regard to the southernmost lot, Staff had stated in the PUD that the applicant would need to file a specific plan that would meet setback requirements that were appropriate.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Final Plat and Release of Kennebunkport (PUD 414)**, as recommended by Staff.

CHANGE OF ACCESS:

Witt Center (2793)

5810 East Skelly Drive

(CH)

Mr. Wilmoth advised the change of access was requested to change a single 40 foot access point to two 20' access points with a 15 foot median for two-way access. Traffic Engineering and Staff both recommend approval.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Change of Access for Witt Center**, as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLITS:

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-16737 Earnest (963)

North of the NW/c of 201st Street & South Yale

(AG)

This is a request to split a five acre tract into two 2-1/2 acre lots. These lots will have only 165 feet of lot width, so a variance will be required from the County Board of Adjustment. Staff notes that there are at least five other lots in the immediate area that are similar to this request.

L-16737 Earnest - Cont'd

Staff recommends approval of this request subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Approval from the County Board of Adjustment for a variance of the lot width from 200 feet to 165 feet.
- (2) A right-of-way easement will be required on the East 50 feet of the five acre subject tract, to meet the Major Street Plan.
- (3) Approval from the City County Health Department for a passing percolation test in order to allow septic systems on both lots.
NOTE: Already approved 8/13/86 by virtue of Percolation Test 70-758 and 73-163.
- (4) Approval from the Okmulgee County Rural Water District #6 that water service is available to both lots.

The TAC voted to recommend **approval** of L-16737, subject to conditions 1, 2 and 4 as outlined by Staff.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Lot Split Waiver for L-16737 Earnest**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

L-16750 Latch (194) South of the SW/c Admiral Place & South 193rd East Ave.

This is a request to split a 140' x 117.7' vacant lot from an irregularly shaped 4.7 acre tract that contains a shopping center. A variance of the lot frontage will be required by the City Board of Adjustment because the minimum allowed when abutting a major street is 150 feet and 117.7 feet is all that is being provided. (An adjacent lot to the south has less than the required 150 feet.)

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The approval of the City Board of Adjustment for a variance of the lot frontage from 150 feet to 117.7 feet in order to permit the lot split.
- (2) Any utility easements that may be necessary for development as per TAC committee.
- (3) In order to be consistent with the Major Street and Highway Plan, a additional 10 feet of right-of-way needs to be dedicated to the City of Tulsa for South 193rd East Avenue.

L-16750 Latch - Cont'd

In discussion it was noted that there is an existing 30 foot (private) access easement along the south side of the split. PSO needed the north 10 feet of the south 30 feet, and a sewer was along the south 10 feet (approximate). TAC recommended a 30 foot access and utility easement. This was agreeable with the applicant. (No structure should be allowed to encroach into the 30 foot easement.)

The TAC voted to recommend **approval** of L-16750, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Board of Adjustment approval of lot frontages
- (b) Additional right-of-way to meet Major Street Plan (10 feet).
- (c) Provide a 30 foot utility easement consistent with an existing 30 foot access easement.
- (d) Stormwater Class "B" permit required.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Lot Split Waiver for L-16750 Latch**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR DISCUSSION:

L-16758 Tulsa Retail Association (183) SE/c of 61st Street and Memorial Drive

In the opinion of the Staff, the lot split meets the Subdivision and Zoning Regulations, but since the lot is irregular in shape, notice has been given to the abutting owner(s). Approval is recommended.

Mr. Wilmoth stated this was a commercial lot and not a part of a PUD, and asked the TMAPC to consider rewording their policy requirement, for clarification, as to limiting notification to **residential** lot splits. Mr. Paddock commented he, too, would like to see this modification and instructed Staff to draft a rewrite of the existing policy to incorporate this suggestion and present for TMAPC review.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Lot Split for L-16758 Tulsa Retail Association**, as recommended by Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING:

TO CONSIDER AMENDING THE CITY OF TULSA AND TULSA COUNTY ZONING CODES, AS RELATES TO TITLE 42, SECTION 750.2, SEXUALLY-ORIENTED BUSINESSES AND PERSONS WHO EXERCISE SUPERVISORY CONTROL, MANAGE OR OPERATE SUCH BUSINESSES

Mr. Alan Jackere, City Legal Department, reviewed his letter to the TMAPC requesting this public hearing, and advised this was to set regulations as to day-to-day operations in addition to the establishment of the sexually-oriented business. Mr. Jackere stated this was a "housekeeping" change and would assist with enforcement.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Amendment to Section 750.2 of the City of Tulsa and Tulsa County Zoning Codes, as relates to Sexually-Oriented Businesses and Persons who Exercise Supervisory Control, Manage or Operate such businesses, as recommended by Legal Counsel:**

"Section 750.2 PROHIBITION

No person shall **exercise supervisory control, manage, operate,** cause the establishment or permit the establishment of any of the sexually-oriented businesses as defined in Section 750.1, in an areas zoned other an CS, CG, CH and CBD. In addition, no person shall **exercise supervisory control, manage, operate,** cause the establishment or permit the establishment of any of the sexually-oriented businesses as defined in Section 750.1, within 1,000 feet of any other sexually-oriented businesses, or

OTHER BUSINESS:

Z-5444-SP-1: SE/c of South 109th East Avenue & East 41st Street South

Staff Recommendation: Amended Detail Sign Plan

The subject tract is located at the southeast corner of South 109th East Avenue and East 41st Street and is the site of the Marriott Hotel. The applicant is requesting that an amended Detail Sign Plan be approved to allow a monument type sign east of the main entrance from East 41st Street (the new sign would replace a sign previously approved as an element of the Corridor Site Plan). The new sign is 11' wide x 10' tall and has a three line reader board below the hotel logo.

The proposed sign is in compliance with the CO District provisions of the Zoning Code for signs. Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Amended Detail Sign Plan as submitted.

Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked what was to be gained by this amended sign plan, since it is only a replacement of a previously approved sign. Mr. Frank advised the new sign is larger and contains a reader board, which the old sign did not have.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE the Amended Detail Sign Plan for Z-5444-SP-1, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 202-B-2: East of East 63rd Street South & East 63rd Place South,
being Lots 3 and 4, Block 2 Shadow Mountain II Addition

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment for a Sign

The subject tract is located east of the intersection of East 63rd Street and East 63rd Place South and is the site of a 5-story office building. Similar office development 8-stories tall is presently existing on the abutting tract to the east. The office building for which the applicant has requested an additional sign is referred to as "One Memorial Place" and is located on Lots 3 and 4, of the Shadow Mountain II Addition. The applicant is requesting approval for an internally lighted 6-sided sign to be located in the parking lot south of the building. The proposed sign is 31' tall and the two sign faces upon which the letters will be located have an area of 232.5 square feet. The underlying zoning for PUD 202 is OM, which conventionally would permit signs to be a maximum of 20' tall with a total maximum display area of 150 square feet.

PUD 202 has been developed as a unit, and although the architectural styles of the office buildings in this area differ, signage has been uniformly restricted to ground type monument signs. Monument signs exist throughout this general area in the Triad Center and Red Man Plaza developments and a monument sign is currently in place on the subject tract adjacent to the building's southwest face. Staff is not supportive of the type of sign that is proposed as it is almost a pylon type sign with an anodized aluminum body which would exceed both the maximum height and display area that would be permitted in a conventionally developed OM District. Discussions with the applicant indicate his client is attempting to achieve recognition from Memorial which is more than 500'.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the minor amendment PUD 202-B-2 for a sign as requested.

NOTE: The conditions of approval for PUD 202 requires that a Detail Sign Plan be approved by the TMAPC, and established a date of September 28, 1977 as the PUD standard for signs. This standard requires that signs be spaced 150' from abutting R Districts, limited to 25' maximum height (40' if located behind the building setback line), 100' separation between signs, and permits 1 square foot of sign area per lineal foot of arterial street frontage for one sign or .5 square feet of display area if more than one sign.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Al Twedt of Amax Signs, 9520 East 55th Place South, advised of the materials proposed for the sign (an aluminum composite) and presented a sample for Commission review. Mr. Twedt commented that, because of the layout of the buildings in this office complex, there was no continuity and it was very difficult to identify which of the three buildings was One, Two or Three Memorial. He advised the sign would not be visible from One Memorial Place (closest to Memorial), and has reviewed this with residents in the condominiums and housing development in this area and has had no objections to the sign.

Mr. Carnes commented that it appeared the sun reflecting off this material might present a problem, and asked if the residents were aware of the type of sign materials to be used. Mr. Twedt stated he has shown the residents sketches and material samples, and advised the material was not of a reflective nature and the applicant was not opposed to painting the sign if needed. Mr. Twedt added the applicant was attempting to make the sign more of a marker type structure rather than an advertising display. Mr. Parmele confirmed that it was confusing trying to identify these three office buildings.

In response to Mr. VanFossen, Mr. Twedt reviewed the Detail Site Plan to indicate how far back the sign would be placed. Mr. Frank confirmed the sign would be setting in a parking lot median. Mr. Twedt commented that, due to the construction of the buildings (sharp angles, etc.) the sign was designed to be compatible with the design of the buildings. Mr. VanFossen

stated he thought this had been designed more as a pylon or monument type sign, and he thought it was far more attractive than some signs in this area. To clarify for Mr. VanFossen, Mr. Twedt explained the lighting of the sign. Mr. VanFossen stated that, on the basis that this sign was more a piece of sculpture, he could approve this and moved for approval.

Mr. Frank reminded that the motion for approval would have to be subject to BOA approval due to the adjustment from 20 feet to 31 feet, and Mr. VanFossen amended his motion to include this condition. Mr. Twedt remarked that his client was willing, if necessary, to move the sign down. Mr. VanFossen commented that as distant as the sign was from the street, he did not have a problem with this. Chairman Parmele agreed.

Interested Parties:

Ms. Marcie Lloyd, 6450 South Lewis, representing Merrill, Lynch, Hubbard stated that, as owners of Two and Three Memorial Place, they were not in agreement with the proposed sign and they supported the Staff recommendation.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Carnes stated support of the Staff recommendation as he felt there were too many items that were not clear and he suggested the applicant get together with Staff. Mr. VanFossen stated he was withdrawing his motion for approval, due to the significance of the protest from Merrill, Lynch, Hubbard.

Ms. Wilson inquired as to who Mr. Twedt was representing that was housed in Redman Plaza (One Memorial Place). Mr. Twedt advised his client was Balcor, and they were requesting the sign, not the tenants. Mr. Twedt advised he originally became involved in this when Merrill, Lynch, Hubbard managed One Memorial Plaza and they requested him to design a sign and he actually designed this sign for Ms. Lloyd's company and when the building changed hands to Balcor, Balcor asked that this sign be constructed as quickly as possible. Ms. Wilson then inquired as to how the height of the sign was determined. Mr. Twedt stated that it was due to the type of materials being used, the expense involved, and he felt that due to the nature of the surroundings and buildings, 30 feet would not appear to be a large structure. Ms. Wilson stated she did not think a 31 foot sign was needed and that 20 feet or 25 feet would suffice. Mr. Twedt advised the design was due to the fact that the material comes in 16 foot lengths.

Mr. Draughon stated he liked the cleanness and design of the sign but he was uncomfortable with the height. Mr. Twedt stated the PUD allowed a 40 foot maximum if the sign was behind the building setback, and his client was not opposed to lowering the sign, but was wanting to avoid extra expense of waste material.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Gardner advised that, as he recalled, the north half of the PUD was zoned commercial, and the south half was zoned office. What might be done in a commercial zoned area versus what might be done in an area zoned and developed office (southern portion) was different; therefore, each sign must be presented for review. Chairman Parmele inquired if the original PUD approved a 25 foot maximum or a 40 foot maximum if located behind the building setback line. Mr. Gardner stated that the PUD language was general in nature and refers to a 40 foot maximum height, which was applicable to the CS zoned portion. As the TMAPC cannot grant variances of sign height (as set out in the Zoning Code), the application would be subject to BOA review for a variance and the applicant would have to prove a hardship. On the north half of the PUD (CS commercial) the Ordinance permits up to 50 feet, but on the south half (OM office), the Ordinance only permits a 20 foot maximum height.

Commissioner Selph commented he understood the applicant's need for a marker, however, if forced to vote on the request today, he would be in support of Staff's recommendation for denial, and suggested that action be deferred to allow the applicant, the protestant and Staff time to review this application. Chairman Parmele stated agreement and Mr. Doherty moved for a continuance of two weeks.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 202-B-2 Minor Amendment for a Sign until Wednesday, October 1, 1986 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.**

* * * * *

Z-5636-SP: North of the NW/c of the Broken Arrow Expressway & Garnett Road
4500 South Garnett

Staff Recommendation: Amended Detail Sign Plan Review

The subject tract, Lot 1, Block 2, Towne Centre Addition is part of an approximate 20 acre tract that was rezoned to Corridor in 1982. It is located 500 feet north of the Broken Arrow Expressway on Garnett Road and contains a multi-story office building. The subject tract is abutted to the north by an apartment complex and to the south by a multi-story office building. Other abutting land east and west of the subject tract is vacant. The applicant is now requesting Detail Sign Plan approval which includes two existing signs and one proposed sign. The new sign will include the building logo and a time message face.

Review of the applicant's information and Zoning Code indicate a maximum of three signs are permitted based on the 563 feet of arterial frontage (1 sign per each 150 lineal feet), with a maximum of 563 square feet of display surface area. The plot plans show the two existing signs to total 229 square feet in size, leaving a balance of 341 square feet for the tract. The proposed sign has a display surface area of 174 square feet (12' tall x 14.5' wide) which is within the total display area permitted by the Code, and is 48 feet tall overall. One of the existing signs is 36 feet tall. The existing signage on the tract to the south consists of two monument type signs located at the Garnett Road entrance, neither of which is taller than 10 feet. The proposed sign is approximately 300 feet from the centerline of Garnett Road which would mean that it could be as tall as 50 feet based on setbacks and the CO District sign regulations of the Zoning Code (Section 1221.3 and 1221.4). To permit a sign of even 48 feet tall would be to allow a sign as tall or taller than a portion of the building on the lot on which the sign is to be built. The building was constructed on the subject tract and this tract was later rezoned from CS to CO. Staff believes the proposed sign should not be permitted to exceed the height of the tallest existing sign on the subject tract which is 36 feet.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the requested sign which is 48 feet tall and **APPROVAL** of a sign which is consistent with the submitted sign plans and a maximum of 36 feet tall and also **APPROVAL** of the two existing signs.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Al Twedt of Amax Signs, 9520 East 55th Place South, advised that the Ordinance stated a sign can go up an extra foot for every foot set back and that was how he determined the 48 foot height. Mr. Twedt stated they built two mock displays (one at 42 feet and one at 48 feet) and his client preferred the 48 foot sign. Chairman Parmele confirmed with the applicant that he took the existing Sign Code and fitted the sign to the Code. Mr. Twedt stated he intentionally kept the sign under 50 feet (which the Code would allow), but he was coming before the TMAPC due to the CO zoning. Mr. Gardner advised if the property were zoned CS, there would be no requirement for site plan approval. But in a CO District or under a PUD, site plan approval is required. Discussion followed as to sign design, visibility, placement and the CO District.

Chairman Parmele stated it appeared the applicant was working within the provisions of the Zoning Code. Mr. Paddock, in agreement with Mr. VanFossen, remarked that if the Commission should decide to approve this application, based on the particular facts of the case, it would have to be well documented that the approval was based on this type of a setback, the relationship to the buildings in existence, etc., so as not to imply setting a precedent.

Mr. Doherty, also agreed with Mr. VanFossen as to placement of signs along expressways, but he had a problem with limiting the sign height at this location and allowing it a few hundred feet to the north when developed. Because of this, Mr. Doherty moved for approval of the applicant's request for a 48 foot height; Mr. VanFossen seconded the motion. Ms. Wilson stated support of the Staff recommendation for denial of the 48 foot height (approval of a 36 foot height). Chairman Parmele commented he thought the applicant should be complimented for his efforts to work within the Code. Mr. Paddock pointed out the Staff recommendation also included two existing signs and asked Mr. Doherty if his motion included these two signs. Mr. Doherty replied he would like to confine his motion to the applicant's request.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **5-4-0** (Doherty, Parmele, Paddock, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; Carnes, Draughon, Selph, Wilson, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Amended Detail Sign Plan for Z-5653-SP at 48 foot height**, as requested by the applicant.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Two Existing Signs of the Amended Detail Sign Plan for Z-5653-SP**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 387: NE/c of South Lewis and East 67th Street South.

Staff Recommendation: Detail Landscape Plan

The subject tract has been approved for office development and a multi-story office building is now in the final stages of construction. The applicant's Detail Landscape Plan meets the minimum area requirement of 25% and several large trees which were existing on the site have been preserved during construction. The north boundary will be lined with trees and shrubbery will be placed along a screening fence on the east boundary. The Plan features heavily landscaped areas adjacent to the building and also a line of trees along South Lewis and East 67th Street. The Plan includes the detailed location of trees, shrubbery, and planted/sodded areas plus specifies the size and type of the various materials. It is noted that some of the proposed trees are as large as 7-1/2" caliper.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan for PUD 387 as submitted.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Landscape Plan for PUD 387**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Chairman Parmele advised receipt of a letter from the Oklahoma Department of Transportation stating their review of the plat of Woodside Village II (PUD 306) indicates this plat will conflict with the proposed Creek Expressway. Mr. Gardner stated Staff was aware of this, however, the new alignment will not go through this plat.

Chairman Parmele stated he had requested the Recording Secretary to mail out the information on the upcoming Zoning Institute Conference to be held November 9 - 11, 1986 in Orlando, Florida. Ms. Wilson suggested the Commission members keep in mind the airfare rate and early reservations.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Date Approved October 1, 1986
Marilyn S. Driscoll
1st vice Chairman

ATTEST:

RBPaddock
Secretary

**A RESOLUTION AMENDING
THE MAJOR STREET & HIGHWAY PLAN,
A PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
FOR THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA**

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Title 19, OSA, Section 863.7, the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did, by Resolution on the 29th day of June 1960, adopt a "Comprehensive Plan, of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area", which Plan was subsequently approved by the Mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma, and by the Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and was filed of record in the Office of the County Clerk, Tulsa, Oklahoma, all according to law; and

WHEREAS, the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is required to prepare, adopt and amend, as needed, in whole or in part, an Official Master Plan to guide the physical development of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, on the 28th day of February, 1968, this Commission, by Resolution No. 696:289 did adopt the Major Street and Highway Plan Map as a part of the Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, which was subsequently approved by the Mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma, and by the Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County, Oklahoma; and

WHEREAS, this Commission did call a Public Hearing on the 23rd day of July 1986 for the purpose of considering amendments to the Tulsa City/County Major Street and Highway Plan and Public Notice of such meeting was duly given as required by law; and

WHEREAS, A Public Hearing was held on the 13th day of August 1986 and the TMAPC did continue their decision in review session to the 3rd day of September 1986, and after due study and deliberation, this Commission deems it advisable and in keeping with the purpose of this Commission, as set forth in Title 19, OSA, Section 863.1, to modify its previously adopted Tulsa City/County Major Street and Highway Plan Text and Map, as listed below and depicted on the attached map (Exhibit A):

- 1) Establish and relocate the Creek Expressway (Freeway), placing the same within the 96th Street Corridor beginning at the termination of the Mingo Valley Expressway at East 91st Street South (between Mingo Road and Garnett Road), extending west to intersect with Riverside Parkway, and extending west across the Arkansas River south of the original townsite of the City of Jenks, Oklahoma at approximately 104th Street South, extending west to intersect with State Highway 75 and extending west to the Creek County Line, as shown on Exhibit A attached hereto;
- 2) Downgrade East 91st Street South from a six lane Parkway to a four lane Secondary Arterial Street, as shown on Exhibit A attached hereto;



- 3) Upgrade South Yale Avenue, between 91st Street and the Creek Expressway (Freeway), from a Secondary Arterial to a Primary Arterial street, as shown on Exhibit A attached hereto; and
- 4) Approve and reconfirm the following amendments approved by the TMAPC January 8, 1986 by Resolution No. 1581:613, as listed below and as depicted on the attached map (Exhibit A):
 - a) Delete the Secondary Arterial classification for South Harvard Avenue from East 91st Street to the Creek Expressway (Freeway), and designate this portion of South Harvard Avenue as a Residential Collector Street;
 - b) Designate North 49th West Avenue from Edison Street to 86th Street North as a Secondary Arterial Street;
 - c) Designate 86th Street North from Cincinnati Avenue, west to the Osage Expressway north of Delaware Creek as a Primary Arterial Street; and
 - d) Designate 101st East Avenue from 21st Street South to 31st Street South as a Secondary Arterial Street.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION, that the amendments to the Tulsa City/County Major Street and Highway Plan Text and Map, as above set out and attached hereto as Exhibit A, be and the same are hereby adopted as part of the Tulsa City/County Major Street and Highway Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) submit the functional plans, upon completion, to the TMAPC for approval, as required by state law.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT upon approval and adoption hereof by the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, this Resolution be certified to the Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma, and to the Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County, Oklahoma, for approval and thereafter, that it be filed of record in the Office of the County Clerk, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT it is the intent of the Commission that the following policies should be considered by agencies and state and local governments involved in the plan implementation process, specifically relating to the Creek Expressway (Freeway):

- A) The State Transportation Commission proceed with all due haste in funding the necessary functional plans and Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Creek Expressway (Freeway), and that ODOT provide progress reports to the TMAPC and INCOG Board at least once every six months once state action is taken to program the expressway. If continuing progress is not made on the required steps necessary leading to the funding and construction of the Creek Expressway (Freeway), the TMAPC may wish to consider, at some future date, any actions deemed appropriate at that time.

- B) That ODOT select an out-of-state nationally recognized consulting firm with substantial experience in controversial expressway projects to do the Environmental Impact Statement.
- C) The original approved alignment for the Creek Expressway (Freeway) (formerly known as Riverside Extended) as shown on the functional plan approved by TMAPC in 1961 be used by ODOT in preparation of final functional plans where applicable, in lieu of the latest alignment prepared by W.R. Holway & Associates, in order to minimize negative impacts to adjacent residential areas.
- D) ODOT should consider a redesign and realignment of the expressway interchange at Sheridan Road to a similar design as used in the W.R. Holway Plan, in lieu of the full-diamond design as originally planned, in order to minimize displacement and disruption of homes in the area.
- E) ODOT should give full consideration to developing a linear park along the Creek Expressway (Freeway) in the 96th Street Corridor between existing homes and the expressway, to replace park land acquired for the construction of the expressway and to provide additional buffering. (This linear park could include trail systems connecting with the future extension of the River Parks system.)
- F) The District 18 Plan should be updated by the TMAPC, the INCOG Staff and the District 18 Citizen Planning Team to eliminate the Corridor District designation along the Creek Expressway (Freeway) where it is no longer appropriate in view of existing residential developments.
- G) The INCOG Staff be instructed that during the zoning and subdivision process, every effort be made to preclude any additional development in the proposed alignment of the Creek Expressway (Freeway).
- H) The INCOG Board of Directors should investigate the possibility of publication of the Regional Long Range Transportation Plan Map in the phone books of the various jurisdictions in the Tulsa Metropolitan Area to better inform the public about the Creek Expressway (Freeway) and transportation plans, in general, throughout the INCOG region.
- I) The TMAPC should formally notify the Metropolitan Tulsa Board of Realtors (MTBR) of the status of the Creek Expressway (Freeway), and ask that MTBR communicate this information to its membership so that the buying public can be fully aware of the proposed location and status of the Creek Expressway (Freeway).

APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 17 DAY OF SEPT, 1986.

Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
By Rant J. Runkle
Chairman

ATTEST:

RR Padlock
Secretary

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF TULSA,
OKLAHOMA THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 1986.

By _____
Mayor

ATTEST:

City Auditor

APPROVED AS TO FORM: _____
City Attorney

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF THE COUNTY OF TULSA,
OKLAHOMA, THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 1986.

By _____
Chairman

ATTEST:

County Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM: _____
Assistant District Attorney

