

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1625  
Wednesday, October 22, 1986, 1:30 p.m.  
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	<b>MEMBERS ABSENT</b>	<b>STAFF PRESENT</b>	<b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>
Doherty, 2nd Vice-Chairman	Crawford	Frank	Linker, Legal Counsel
Draughon	Carnes	Gardner	
Paddock, Secretary	Kempe	Setters	
Parmeale, Chairman			
Selph			
VanFossen			
Wilson, 1st Vice-Chairman			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, October 21, 1986 at 9:30 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 1:36 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**Approval of Minutes of October 8, 1986, Meeting #1623:**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-1** (Draughon, Parmeale, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, "abstaining"; Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of October 8, 1986, Meeting #1623**.

**Approval of Amended Minutes of October 1, 1986, Meeting #1622 (pg 27):**

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-1** (Paddock, Parmeale, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Draughon, "abstaining"; Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Amended Minutes of October 1, 1986, Meeting #1622**, page 27, amending the Side Yard Setbacks to five feet (PUD 306-3).

REPORTS:

Committee Reports: Consideration of a recommendation to revise and adopt a general policy related to TMAPC approval of three-sided lot splits.

Mr. Paddock advised the **Rules & Regulations Committee** voted 4-0-0 at their October 1st meeting to recommend approval of the requested language for lot splits and adoption of same as a General Policy.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Adoption of the following as a General Policy:

"All residential lot split applications which contain a lot having more than three side lot lines cannot be processed as Prior Approval Lot Splits. Such lot splits shall require a five day written notice to abutting property owners. Deeds for such lot splits shall not be stamped or released until the TMAPC has approved said lot split in a public meeting."

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **CZ-153** Present Zoning: RS  
Applicant: **Doss** Proposed Zoning: CG  
Location: North of the NW/c of 4th Street & 113th West Avenue  
Size of Tract: .2 acres, approximately  
Date of Hearing: October 22, 1986  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Richard Doss, 302 Industrial, Sand Springs

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 23 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area does not cover the subject tract. The Sand Springs Comprehensive Plan designates the subject tract as Low Intensity - Residential.

The proposed CG district would not be in accordance with the Sand Springs Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately .2 acres in size and located north of the northwest corner of 4th Street and 113th West Avenue (an Industrial street in Sand Springs). It is partially wooded, gently sloping, contains a vacant storage building and is zoned RS.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north and west by single-family residences zoned RS, on the east by single-family dwellings (Sand Springs city limits) zoned RS-3, and on the south by vacant property zoned RS.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Rezoning activity in the area has been confined to areas around the Keystone Expressway. No recent rezoning activity has occurred in the immediate area.

**Conclusion:** The requested rezoning is not in accordance with the Sand Springs Comprehensive Plan; therefore, it would be "spot zoning". Residential single-family zoning abuts the subject tract on all sides. Based on the Sand Springs Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning patterns, Staff cannot support the requested CG or CS zoning on the subject tract.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of CZ-153 as CG or CS. Sand Springs **APPROVED** CG at their 10/21/86 meeting (6:0:1).

For the record, Staff would suggest that some relief may be possible through the Tulsa County Board of Adjustment since the existing building appears to have been used for non-residential purposes in the past.

Comments & Discussion:

Commissioners Paddock, Selph and Wilson opened discussion with questions as to the recommendation by the Sand Springs Commission for approval of the requested CG zoning. Mr. Gardner stated that he thought Sand Springs was indicating, by their vote for approval, that their Comprehensive Plan might need to be reviewed. Further, that their action appeared to be a statement that this area should be commercial.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Richard Doss submitted a petition with signatures of the area residents in support of the request for commercial zoning, and advised that he talked with all of the residents between 3rd and 6th Streets on Industrial Avenue. Mr. Doss pointed out the property was bounded on the back (west side) by the river and on the south by a vacant lot, and advised the existing structure has been used as commercial property since the 1950's (a welding shop since 1980).

In reply to Mr. VanFossen, Mr. Doss remarked that 113th West Avenue, as shown on the map, was also known as Industrial Avenue. Mr. Paddock asked why CG was being requested, rather than CS. Mr. Doss stated that, as he understood, CG would cover the present use as well as commercial shopping. Ms. Wilson inquired as to discussion with residents, and if the conversations were geared toward a laundromat being on the property, or the zoning category change. Mr. Doss stated he discussed two ideas for use of the property: 1) its present use as a welding shop; or (2) a laundromat, which is an idea he felt would have merit for Sand Springs. Mr. Doss added the laundromat idea was one he had for future use, but the immediate use would be the welding shop.

In response to Mr. Draughon, Mr. Gardner reviewed the uses permitted under CG zoning. Mr. Doss, commented in reply to Mr. Draughon, the building size was not appropriate for a manufacturing type use and economics did not justify any rebuilding. Therefore, a manufacturing use was not an option he would consider.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

Commissioner Selph stated it was not often that he went against the Staff's recommendation, but in light of the recommendation from the Sand Springs Commission, he moved for approval of the requested CG.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of SELPH, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE CZ-153 Doss for CG, as recommended by the Sand Springs Commission.

Legal Description:

Lot 7, Block 18, CHARLES PAGE HOME ACRES NO. 2, an addition to Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: Z-6130 Present Zoning: RS-1  
Applicant: Norman (Farmer) Proposed Zoning: OL  
Location: SE/c of 24th Street South & South Sheridan Road  
Size of Tract: 1 acre, approximate  
Date of Hearing: October 22, 1986  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 5 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - Residential. (Plan map to be amended to Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use, based on Z-6115).

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 in its present form, but may be found in accordance when amended.

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately one acre in size and located on the southeast corner of 24th Street South and South Sheridan Road. It is nonwooded, flat, vacant and contains single-family dwelling units zoned RS-1.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north by office uses zoned OM, on the east by single-family residential units zoned RS-1, on the south by a landscaping business and residence zoned OL, and on the west by single-family residential units zoned RS-3.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Recent actions by the TMAPC and City Commission approved OL Office Light zoning south of the subject tract. The OM office use and zoning to the north of the subject tract was the result of a District Court action.

**Conclusion:** Although the requested OL zoning is not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, the existing zoning patterns would support the OL request. The request does not encroach into the existing neighborhood to the east, fronts into an OM district on the north, and does not extend past the defined OL zoning line already existing to the south and east. It is also noted that the subject tract is separated from residential uses to the west of Sheridan by a frontage road.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the OL zoning as requested. Mr. Gardner notes for the record that a Class B Watershed Development Permit would be required according to comments from the Department of Stormwater Management.

**Note:** Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is pending the annual update.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Norman advised the applicant has lived on the subject property since 1951. Mr. Norman reminded the Commission that the Mims property (just south of the subject tract) was recently heard by the TMAPC and City Commission, both of which approved the requested OL zoning. Mr. Norman reviewed the history of the area and the office zoning along Sheridan in relation to the residential uses. Mr. Norman commented he felt the traffic conditions along Sheridan and the actions on the Mims property justified approval of this application.

Interested Parties:

Address:

Mr. Dan Butchee	6520 East 24th Street
Mr. Jerry Meadows	6540 East 24th Street
Mr. Ray McCollum	3135 South 76th East Avenue

Mr. Butchee, residing just east of the subject tract, stated opposition due the additional traffic and parking that could be generated, as well as the additional paving which could add to drainage problems. Mr. Butchee commented there were no plans submitted for the use of the property, and

submitted a list of "Restrictions Requested: (1) Minimum 6' privacy wood fence to be maintained by the business owners; (2) no outside light to shine toward residences at night; (3) no entrances to property from 24th Street; (4) retention wall required to direct water run-off away from residences; (5) sewer facilities no larger than current homeowner size; (6) business to be minimal traffic producing type; (7) buildings will retain current residential look; (8) buildings to be maximum one story in height; (9) sidewalks to be maintained for children approaching to and from school crosswalk; and (10) developer to move Johansen Acres Gate Post to adjacent residential lot. In regard to the Johansen Acres identification marker, Ms. Wilson asked if there was also a marker on 25th Street, as well as the one on 24th Street. Mr. Butchee stated he was not sure.

Mr. Meadows, who has also been a resident in the area for many years, stated concerns as to the property selling and a new owner requesting higher zoning. Mr. Meadows was able to point out for Ms. Wilson the location of the subdivision markers, and suggested a good location for moving the marker on 24th Street would be 15' on the easement just inside the fence line.

Mr. McCollum, President of the Whitney Community Homeowners Association, joined the others in protest of this request. Mr. McCollum suggested a PUD or specific plans be submitted so the neighborhood would know what was being planned, rather than just the zoning.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Norman advised the marker was almost hidden by shrubbery, but the applicant had no objections to the homeowners moving the sign. He commented the applicant was not responsible for the changes along Sheridan over the last 35 years and was, in fact, the last to request any change on property along this part of Sheridan. In regard to the requests by the Interested Parties, Mr. Norman commented that most of these would be accomplished with an OL zoning designation.

Mr. Woodard inquired if the applicant had plans to sell the property once zoned OL. Mr. Norman stated the applicant, at 80 years of age, planned to change her residence in the next few years and may move to Dallas to be with her son. Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Norman to respond to the request for no entrance on 24th Street and the outside lighting. Mr. Norman stated he felt the Code should be amended in the office category so that lighting would not be directed downward onto residences. In regard to access, Mr. Norman indicated there was already access on 24th, and as far as safety was concerned, access should probably be permitted on 24th off of Sheridan. Mr. Norman reviewed the Stormwater Management recommendation for the area as presented at the previous hearings.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Gardner agreed that several of the suggestions/requests made by the Interested Parties were already requirements of OL zoning. If, for any reason there was an application before the BOA, then these items could be imposed as conditions of approval, at that time. Mr. Gardner assured those in attendance that their organized group had made accomplishments, as he felt that without this organization there could be retail commercial in this area along Sheridan, and because of the interest of the neighborhood, Staff has restricted this from happening.

Mr. Doherty asked Legal to comment on the suggestion to move the marker on the easement on Sheridan. Mr. Linker commented that putting any obstruction onto City right-of-way would require permission from the City Commission. Mr. Paddock asked that Mr. Norman's suggestion on parking lot lighting being directed away from residential areas be referred to the Rules and Regulations Committee.

Ms. Wilson requested the suggestions by Mr. Butchee be included in the minutes. She stated favor of approval due to the location and positioning on Sheridan and she felt it was appropriate use. Ms. Wilson added she would like to see the identification marker remain for the residents. Mr. VanFossen agreed with Ms. Wilson in that this was the last home (between 21st and 31st Streets) that was not facing a service road.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6130 Norman (Farmer) for OL**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

Lot 1, Block 4 of the Amended Plat of JOHANSEN ACRES, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

\* \* \* \* \*

PUD 179-L: South of the SE/c of East 71st Street South and South Memorial, being 7121 South Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation: Major Amendment

The subject tract is located south of the southeast corner of East 71st Street and South Memorial Drive at 7121 South Memorial Drive and is the site of a Ken's Pizza Restaurant. The purpose of the major amendment is to request an increase in the floor area to add a glassed-in eating area of 541.6 square feet to the west end of the building. The present

restaurant has an area of 2,376 square feet. This site was allocated 2,400 square feet of floor area under the original PUD; therefore, the floor area variance would be 508.6 square feet.

The existing parking would meet the Zoning Code requirements for the present and proposed floor area. Parking area requirements would be based on one space per each 225 square feet of existing floor area, and one space for each 100 square feet of additional floor area (a total of 40 parking spaces now exists on the site). The proposed addition will also not encroach into the required setback from the centerline of South Memorial which is a designated primary arterial street.

The major issue around which this case revolves is how to increase floor area within the PUD when all of the permitted floor area has already been allocated to each lot. In addition, several of the lots are interior in location and therefore, do not have any frontage on a major street. At the time PUD 179 was approved, land area was calculated as the area of the lot plus one-half or 30', whichever is less, of the right-of-way of any abutting street to which the lot has access. The present Code allows intensity calculations for gross land area to be based upon the lot area plus one-half of the right-of-way of any abutting street to which the lot has access. If the current Code was used to calculate commercial intensity, the gross commercial area of the PUD could be increased by 30' for that portion of the frontage zoned CS. The problem arises as to which lots would receive increases and which lots would not receive any increase in commercial floor area. All of the property owners within the PUD would have to agree to amend the PUD and assign to each lot the additional floor area permitted before today's zoning code requirements could apply. This approach does not appear to be attainable since a similar request failed previously.

Another alternative would be a variance by the Board of Adjustment. Each request could be evaluated on its merits and a hardship would have to be demonstrated. The concern of establishing a precedent would also be minimized.

The Staff cannot support the subject request because of the precedent it would establish and the problems inherent in such a procedure; however, the minimal building addition proposed would seem to have some merit as a variance through the Board of Adjustment.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner commented that, if the BOA were to grant a variance for the additional footage, then the TMAPC and the City could approve the amendment requested, as the footage would be there for allocation. Technically, if all the owners were to come back and file an application, using today's standards, then the Planning Commission would have jurisdiction and could allocate footage. Mr. Gardner reiterated that notice was given only to those within 300' of the subject property; not all of the property owners within the PUD.



Mr. Linker advised Legal did not feel the BOA would have jurisdiction at all, because the Zoning Code would permit what the application is requesting. The only time the BOA would have jurisdiction, in Legal's opinion, would be when a request involved a variance of the Zoning Code provisions. Mr. Linker stated the PUD, when originally established, in effect placed certain property rights, especially on all of the owners that had property in the commercial and office areas, as to any unallocated intensity. If you are going to cut into the intensity, Legal's position is that notice should be given to those owners that you would be drawing that intensity, or the potential to have that intensity drawn away from. Therefore, before proceeding with an application such as this, notice should be given to those not only within 300', but give notice to the owners of the commercial and office properties in the PUD.

Chairman Parmele stated he understood Legal as saying the TMAPC could handle this (without BOA action), but if this was readvertised, proper notice should be given to the other owners. Mr. VanFossen confirmed with Legal that they meant their opinion was based on reallocating existing square footage; not on any presumption of assuming anymore footage. Mr. Linker stated he was talking about what would NOW be available under the Code, as the Code had been changed since this PUD was originated; floor area square footage that would not have been available until the Code was changed. Therefore, notice should be given to all of the commercial and office property owners before taking away their right by allocation. Chairman Parmele remarked he could foresee some problems because of this. He did not have a problem with the applicant's request for a 20% increase, but should each owner within the PUD want a 20% increase, then there would be basis for a significant argument in the future.

Mr. Gardner clarified that Legal was saying this Commission had jurisdiction, with proper notice. However, allocation would become a problem as it would be difficult to get the property owners to agree. To give a brief history of the PUD, Mr. Gardner commented that when this PUD was approved, all of the maximum footage was assigned and attributed to the various parcels, not giving any consideration for expansion. Today on PUD's, consideration is given for expansion. Mr. Gardner continued by stating, if the Ordinance had not been changed, then Legal would have no basis to express the BOA does not have jurisdiction. What complicated the issue was the fact that the Ordinance was amended, but if it had not been, then the applicant would have more problems.

Chairman Parmele inquired as to what would happen if the applicant wanted to withdraw from the PUD. Mr. Gardner commented this was always an option, but under the circumstances, Staff's recommendation would be to not allow that. If the applicant was to withdraw from the PUD and it was approved, then the applicant would have 17,000 square feet permitted under the zoning. This could be a real problem if others wanted out of the PUD. Mr. Linker stated he would have a problem should withdrawal from the PUD be allowed, and cited what could possibly happen. Mr. VanFossen recalled, from his involvement early in the development of the PUD as a consultant,

**PUD 179-L Ikenberry (KRS Realty) - Cont'd**

that as the developer had a chance to sell a parcel/portion, he reallocated space to fit the need. Mr. VanFossen suggested the simplest step for the applicant would be to go to some property owner with a surplus of space that he did not use and purchase that right for transfer into the subject property.

Due to the confusion and legal questions involved, Mr. Doherty suggested a continuance might be in order to allow time to resolve some of these issues and explore other options. Chairman Parmele stated the TMAPC should decide if they want to hear this as a major amendment and, if so, it would need to be readvertised. Discussion continued as to options available and the Legal/Staff position.

Mr. VanFossen inquired of Legal, if the applicant reapplied and gave notice as suggested by Legal, would the TMAPC have the jurisdiction to decide how to reallocate the new land. Mr. Linker confirmed they would. Mr. VanFossen then asked what the consequences, if any, would be should the Commission reallocate 500' to this one parcel. Mr. Linker advised that, should the other owners not show or protest this at the hearing, then they would be out, but anyone that might show up at the hearing would be able to pursue their legal remedies if they were dissatisfied with the decision of the Planning Commission. Discussion ensued on this possibility and a continuance.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Kevin Ikenberry, representing KRS Realty, Inc., stated he was attracted to the idea of giving notice to commercial and office property owners, as he agreed it was unrealistic to try to get everyone together to work out a "package deal". He also added they would really not want to purchase space from someone else, and the most expedient process would be to readvertise and come back. In reply to Ms. Wilson, the applicant commented they did not anticipate this type of problem on the allocation.

Mr. Doherty confirmed with Staff, on behalf of the applicant, the time needed to readvertise this item and to notify those within the commercial and office portion of the PUD, as well as those within 300'. He then moved for consideration of this application, as a Major Amendment, until November 26, 1986. Mr. Paddock suggested Staff provide information as to actions taken on PUD 179-D through 179-K.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Doherty, Draughton, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 179-L Ikenberry (KRS Realty)** until Wednesday, **November 26, 1986** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center, to readvertise and give notice to all owners of commercial and office property owners within PUD 179.

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:

Triad Center (PUD 202)(283) SE/c East 61st Street & South 76th East Avenue

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-1 (Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE the Final Plat of Triad Center (PUD 202) and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

\* \* \* \* \*

Woodside Village IV (PUD 306-3)(2083) East of SE/c 91st & South College Place

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE the Final Plat of Woodside Village IV (PUD 306-3) and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #385-3: NW/c of East 71st Street South and South Utica Avenue  
Lot 1, Block 1, Laurenwood Addition

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment for Signage

PUD #385 is approximately 1.7 acres in size and is located on the northwest corner of South Utica Avenue and East 71st Street South. It is abutted to the north by a developing office park, to the west by Joe Creek Channel, to the south by an apartment complex and to the east by an office park. The applicant is requesting a minor amendment to change the approved sign and types on the south and east elevations. Detail Sign Plan approval was granted by the TMAPC on July 23, 1986 for a 6'6" X 11'10" project monument type ground sign. The applicant is now requesting a minor amendment to allow the substitution of the approved "Decorative Center" sign which is to be a stucco type to a "Carpet World" sign which will be backlighted on the south elevation and a similar wall mounted sign on the north end of the east elevation.

After review of the applicant's application and drawings, Staff finds the request to be minor in nature but can only support the request in part. Staff can support the substitution to the tenant sign on the south elevation only, due to its frontage on a major street. Staff cannot support the South Utica Avenue elevation due to the non-arterial frontage, as well, Staff could not support similar signage for the other tenants.

When PUD 385 was approved, uniform consideration was given to the tenants by allowing 12" vertical band with sewn or silkscreened letters on awnings for tenant signage (submitted by the applicant). Staff would also note that the area is not in a retail area and the structure and abutting structures are office in nature, which would also make the sign out of character with the area. South Utica Avenue provides limited access to a low intensity office development, again where signage is restricted.

Based on the above findings, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the proposed sign and type for the south elevation and **DENIAL** on the east elevation.

**October 15, 1986:** As requested by the Commission, Staff researched previous actions on PUD 385 from its inception as summarized in the attached "History of the Tulsa Design Center." Included in the "History" is an excerpt from the Text which addresses "Sign Standards" which were modified by the applicant at the submission of the Detail Site Plan and PUD 385-1 on June 19, 1985 (pp. 16- 20 of these minutes). The character of the signage was discussed at length when the applicant was requesting 4' tall lettering on the building; a compromise at 3' was approved. It was at that time the more restrictive sign standards were introduced as shown on page 19 of the June 19, 1985 minutes. Staff continues to support the October 8, 1986 recommendation to **APPROVE** PUD 385-3 to allow the backlighted sign as requested by the applicant on the south elevation (East 71st Street), but to **DENY** any changes in the type and character of the signs on the east elevation.

**Note:** Reference is made to the original PUD Staff recommendation (June 12, 1984 TMAPC minutes page 17) in which CS was not supported on the entire tract; however, the compromise OM/CS pattern was supported. It is noted that CS zoning was supported by Staff on only those portions of the tract that did not abut adjacent developed and developing areas which were primarily office at that time and continue to be so today.

**TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present**

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 385-3** until Wednesday, **November 5, 1986** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PUD #414:** West of the NW/c of East 36th Street South & South Zunis Avenue  
Kennebunkport Addition

**Staff Recommendation:** **Detail Landscape Plan, Detail Sign Plan  
& Detail Fence Plan**

The subject tract is 2.73 acres in size and was approved on April 9, 1986 for the development of 10 residential single-family lots which is in accordance with the underlying RS-2 zoning. The applicant is now requesting Detail Landscape Plan, Detail Sign Plan and Detail Fence Plan approval as per TMAPC requirements. The Detail Site Plan requirement was met by the approval of the Final Plat. The Final Plat has been approved by the City of Tulsa, but as of this writing has not been filed of record. As per TMAPC approval, notice of the application has been given to interested parties that spoke at the original PUD hearing.

The applicant has submitted plans which show detail landscaping on the south approximately 180 feet. The plan is consistent with the original PUD and incorporates a number of large existing shade trees. The plan reflects plant types as well as sizes which is consistent with other landscaped areas along 36th Street South.

The applicant has also submitted plans for the proposed signage which indicates an approximate 6.5 square foot sign, 6'4" in height, to be located at the East 36th Street entrance. Staff can support the proposed sign, finding it in character with the proposed development and existing residential areas. Staff support is subject to the proposed sign meeting all other codes and ordinances of the City of Tulsa.

Detail Fence Plans were also submitted, which show a decorative 6 feet tall solid cedar fence with brick columns located at each change in direction. The south portions of the fence will be double-sided fence with the remainder being single-sided installed with the finished side out. Again, Staff finds the proposal to be consistent with the original PUD and more than adequate to provide separation of abutting conventional developments.

Based on the above findings, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan, Detail Sign Plan and Detail Fence Plan as submitted.

**TMAPC ACTION:** **8 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Landscape Plan, Detail Sign Plan and Detail Fence Plan for PUD 414**, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

PUD 379-A-1: 6800 Block of South Memorial

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment for Signs

The subject tract is located on the west side of South Memorial in the 6800 Block. The tract is the site of the Village at Woodland Hills Shopping Center which is a retail-commercial development with an area of approximately 33 gross acres. Space has been developed for three major tenants (Marshalls, Bealls and Mervyns Department Stores), construction is completed on the shell of the speculative retail space, and TMAPC has approved a freestanding restaurant on the Memorial frontage. The total area of retail/commercial space approved for this development is 352,500 square feet.

The applicant is requesting that the approved sign standards for three ground signs with a display area of 90 square feet each (270 square feet total) along Memorial be amended to permit two ground signs with a display area of 176 square feet each (352 square feet total). The CS portion of the underlying zoning which supports this signage would permit signs with approximately 765 square feet of display area and the PUD regulations would permit signs 25' tall at the proposed locations.

The design of the two ground signs reflects the architectural theme of the major entrances to the shopping center and be located at the signalized entrance with Memorial at about the 6800 Block and the entrance to the south. The structural elements of the sign will be painted tan which is the same color as similar structural elements at the major entrances. The theme of the signs will be "art deco" which is in harmony with the construction facades of the shopping center and a popular architectural style being used on similar centers recently developed. The proposed signs are 20' tall and the sign face includes a reader board 8' tall by 13' wide (104 square feet) and the structural elements of the sign (legs and arches) which will be decorated with neon tubes. Staff calculates the total display surface area of each sign to be 176 square feet; total for two signs would be 352 square feet.

Staff review of the requested minor amendment finds that the signs will be architecturally compatible with the character of the shopping center being advertised, be located within the commercially zoned portion of PUD 379-A, result in a reduction in the number of signs from three to two, and be in harmony with the retail/commercial district which also characterizes abutting development (the City's largest retail mall is located immediately east of this site).

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 379-A-1 subject to the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code, Section 1130.2.b.1 (nonflashing), and subject to the submitted plans and text unless revised herein.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Charles Norman, representing the applicant, requested permission to modify this application and submitted a revised plan for the signs. Mr. Norman reviewed these modifications with the Commission and indicated the south sign would be smaller than the north (main entrance) sign and the overall display area would be somewhat reduced from the original request. Staff concurred with the revisions and expressed support of the revised plans.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE the Minor Amendment for PUD 379-A-1, as modified.

\* \* \* \* \*

PUD 159-9: NE/c of South 28th West Avenue & West 68th Street  
Lots 35 & 36, Block 1, West Highlands III Addition

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment & LNO 16767

This is a request to adjust a side lot line so it parallels the existing residences on each lot, whereby making the lots appear more uniform and will allow Lot 35 to have frontage on Page Belcher Golf Course to the north.

The original PUD 159 approved by the TMAPC on June 5, 1974 allowed a total of 1,830 residential dwelling units on 302 acres that was located between 61st Street to 71st Street, and Union Avenue and 33rd West Avenue.

After careful review of the applicant's submitted plot plan, the Staff finds this request to be minor in nature and consistent with the intent of the original PUD. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the request as presented in the applicant's plot plan, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That tie language be placed on the face of the deed tying the newly created tracts together.
- 2) This lot split does not change any easements of record, all which still apply, and any easement vacations or relocation of existing service lines would be at the property owner's expense.
- 3) That this application meets all other requirements of PUD 159, unless revised herein.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE the Minor Amendment & LNO 16767 for PUD 159-9, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

PUD 268-5: 9364 South 93rd East Avenue, Being Lot 1, Block 3  
Woodland Glen Extended II

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Front Yard Setback

The subject tract is a corner lot which has a 25' building line from both South 93rd East Avenue and East 95th Street South. The applicant is requesting that a minor amendment be granted to allow the side of the house, which abuts South 93rd East Avenue, be permitted to be built 22' from the property line. Staff review of this request indicates that it is minor in nature. All other building setbacks will be met.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD 268-5 to allow a 22' building setback on Lot 1, Block 3, Woodland Glen Extended II from South 93rd East Avenue.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE the Minor Amendment to Front Yard Setback for PUD 268-5, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

Date Approved

11-5-88

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

ATTEST:

Marilyn A. Wilson  
Secretary  
1st Vice-Chair.