

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1646
Wednesday, April 15, 1987, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

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

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, April 14, 1987 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 1:32 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of Minutes of April 1, 1987, Meeting #1644:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-0** (Draughon, Paddock, Parmeale, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Kempe, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of April 1, 1987, Meeting No. 1644.**

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Paddock advised the Rules & Regulations Committee would be meeting this date with City agencies and local developers to review the septic system situation in South Tulsa. He also announced this Committee would be meeting April 22nd to continue discussions on the Historic Preservation (HP) Zoning Ordinance draft.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL:

Trail's End (PUD 424)(2814) 81st Street North & North 129th East Avenue (RS)

This plat has a "sketch plat" approval by TAC on 2/26/87, as per conditions listed in the minutes thereof. A copy was provided for information, with Staff comments in the margin. Some conditions have been met regarding the redesign and stub street.

TMAPC Staff has been advised that there may be difficulty in obtaining sewer service for this tract. Other development inside the City of Owasso is being processed and will probably take priority over development outside the city limits. Applicant was advised to work with Owasso officials for sewer service. A release letter will be required (condition #4). Health Department advised staff prior to meeting that they had no problems with the plat and sewer service requirements would be through Owasso.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plat of Trail's End, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of PUD 424 shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat. Include PUD approval date and references to Section 1100-1170 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
2. Identify and show on plat:
 - (a) East 81st Street North on the west side of North 129th East Avenue. (Verify this street name).
 - (b) Show Owasso City Limits on face of plat and on location map.
3. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property lines and/or lot lines. (PSO and ONG will require some additional easements.)
4. Water and sewer plans shall be approved by the The City of Owasso prior to release of final plat. Include applicable language for water and sewer facilities in covenants. A release letter will be required from Owasso.
5. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s). (Include paragraph in Section I-C.)
6. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the County Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design subject to criteria approved by the County Commission.

Preliminary Plat: Trail's End - Cont'd

7. A topo map shall be submitted for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (Subdivision Regulations). Submit with drainage plans as directed.
8. Street names shall be approved by County Engineer.
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. Bearings, or true north-south, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by County Engineer.
11. All adjacent streets, intersections, and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat. See #2 above.
12. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefore, shall be approved by the City-County Health Department.
13. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
14. A Corporation Commission letter (or Certificate of Nondevelopment) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged.
15. Completely revise Section VI of covenants to reflect PUD approvals and conditions. Also omit reference to Owasso in title of plat (this is County).
16. The zoning application CZ-155 and PUD 424 shall be approved and the resolution therefore published before final plat is released. Plat shall conform to the applicable zoning approved. Zoning approved by TMAPC on 2/11/87 and County Commission on 3/9/87; resolution pending. PUD 424 approved by TMAPC 3/18/87. Pending approval of County Commission and publication of resolution. Hold final plat for resolutions/publications.
17. This plat has been referred to Owasso because of its location near or inside a "fence line" of that municipality. Additional requirements may be made by the applicable municipality. Otherwise only the conditions listed apply.
18. Although the PUD does include the east 20 acres, it has been designated "Development Area B" and is not included in this plat. PUD documentation is required on the east 20 acres and may be by separate instrument.
19. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations.
20. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Preliminary Plat: Trail's End - Cont'd

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Wilmoth advised that this would be on Owasso utilities, but was outside the Owasso city limits and would be placed on a waiting list. He added this was not a condition for approval and commented all the other conditions were routine and Staff recommended approval.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-1** (Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Kempe, "abstaining"; (Carnes, Doherty, Wilson, Crawford, "absent")) to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Trail's End**, as recommended by Staff.

REQUEST FOR WAIVER (Section 260):

CZ-85 (Unplatted)(2984) SW/c of 101st Street & South 129th East Avenue (CS)

This is a request to waive plat requirements on two small parcels of land approximately 20' x 50' each to permit construction two outdoor advertising signs in the CS district. The entire ten acres was zoned CS and is subject to platting. However, there are no development plans or platting anticipated in the near future, so the request is only to waive plat on those two small parcels which would include the sign and some working room around it. Staff has no objection to the request since development of the entire acreage will require platting and be processed in the usual manner. For the record, the drawing submitted by Staff shows the future right-of-way requirements on this tract (which the signs will clear). In the event that street improvements on these two arterials is necessary prior to platting, the TMAPC may want to require dedications at this time. Staff has only worked with the sign company and has had no contact with the owner regarding dedication of right-of-way.

Comments & Discussion:

Commissioner Rice advised that he had talked with the owner and the owner was supportive of this request for waiver. Mr. Paddock inquired if Staff was requesting TMAPC action on the dedication of right-of-way at this time. Mr. Wilmoth stated that if this was not platted in the near future, then dedication would not be needed. Commissioner Rice stated he understood that it may be several years before any action would be taken for a plat on this property, and there were no plans for the property other than use for these two signs. Chairman Parmele agreed that dedication would be appropriate at the time of platting.

Waiver Request: CZ-85 - Cont'd

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **RICE**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for CZ-85**, as recommended by Staff.

CORRECTION TO RECORDED PLAT:

Alexander Trust Amended (2593) South 93rd East Avenue, South of the BA Exprwy

An error has been discovered in a lot dimension on Lot 7, Block 3 and is being corrected by this document. It does not affect any easements and/or right-of-way. The original plat was approved by the TMAPC on April 6, 1966. Staff recommends approval, subject to review of the format of the document by the City Legal Department.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Wilson, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Correction to the Recorded Plat of Alexander Trust Amended**, subject to review of the format of the document by the City Legal Department.

REQUEST TO REINSTATE FINAL PLAT APPROVAL:

South Point (3483) 115th & South Hudson Avenue (expired 10/1/80) (RS-2)

Mr. Wilmoth reviewed the letter submitted requesting this action, advising that the project was dropped in 1979 based on a requirement by the Water Department for one-half mile of off site 12" waterline, which was too expensive to be feasible at that time. As the water line would not be a requirement at this time, the the applicant requests reinstatement of the final plat. Mr. Wilmoth pointed out that this is in an area that does not have any sewer and was approved for septic tanks in 1979. However, the Health Department is now indicating that they would not be in favor of a reinstatement. Mr. Wilmoth advised that Staff recommended, as a compromise, putting this back in the process as a preliminary approval, which would require TAC review and new release letters.

South Point - Cont'd

Comments & Discussion:

Chairman Parmele inquired if there had been any changes in the Subdivision Regulations since 1979 that might affect this case. Mr. Wilmoth mentioned DSM requirements, but a detention pond had already been built. In reply to Mr. Draughon he pointed out that, should this be reinstated as a preliminary, it would be required to go back to TAC, which would provide any new requirements.

Mr. Roy Johnsen, representing the applicant, stated agreement to reinstatement as a preliminary, and added that reinstatement would recognize this as an ongoing plat, as opposed to starting fresh. He commented that at the time approval was given on the Final (1/17/79), it was conditioned upon review and approval by the City Engineer and the Health Department. However, he had no objection to Staff's preference that this be reinstated as a Preliminary.

Mr. Linker stated he had no problems with this procedure as long as it was understood that this would not "grandfather" in anything, i.e. it would have to be presented as is subject to current regulations. Chairman Parmele confirmed that Staff was suggesting a preliminary plat approval subject to review by the Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. Wilmoth pointed out that when this was previously reviewed, a preliminary plat was much less detailed than today's plats, and a conditional Final Plat back then was essentially what a Preliminary Plat is now.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Reinstatement of the Plat for South Point as a Preliminary Plat, subject to review by the TAC.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-16840 Williams (1814)

11150 East 99th Street North

(RE)

This is a request to split a 325' x 132' tract into four lots. Two 72.5' x 132' lots, a 100' x 132' lot and a 80' x 132' lot. The subject tract is zoned RE which requires a much larger lot than is proposed. This action will require a variance of the bulk and area requirements allowable in the RE district in order to permit the development. It was noted that the abutting lots to the south are similar to these being created.

L-16840 Williams - Cont'd

The staff recommends that this approval be subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Approval from the County Board of Adjustment for the above mentioned variances of bulk and area requirements.
- (2) A letter from the applicable water district stating that water service is available to each of the subject tracts.
- (3) A letter from the applicable sewer department stating that sewer service is available to each of the subject tracts.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of L-16840, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughton, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Lot Split Waiver for L-16840 Williams**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

L-16844 Girod (3502)

1017-19 North Denver Avenue

(RM-1/CS)

This is a request to split off an irregular shaped 8' strip from a 50' x 158.1' tract which contains a driveway and attach it to the abutting lot to the south. Several variances of the bulk and area requirements will be necessary because the fourplex was built on a substandard lot as compared to today's standards and the age of the development.

Staff recognizes the applicant's attempt to try to "clean-up" the title to this development by merging the driveway to the lot in which it serves. Based on the above mentioned reasons, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Approval from the City Board of Adjustment for the variances required in order to permit the lot split. (Includes setbacks and parking variances.)
- (2) Any utility easements that may be necessary or any extensions of service lines that may be necessary in order to service the subject tract.

Staff inquired how parking would be provided for the north tract (fourplex) if the driveway is split and attached to the south tract. Mr. Girod advised that new parking can be provided for the fourplex from the alley. There were no utility requirements.

L-16844 Girod - Cont'd

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of L-16844, subject to the condition #1 above (Board of Adjustment Approval.)

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Wilmoth advised that condition #2 had already been met; therefore, Staff recommended approval, subjection to condition #1 for BOA approval.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Lot Split Waiver for L-16844 Girod**, subject to condition #1 as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

L-16845 Roland & Associates (684)

1114 East 68th Street

(RS-3)

NOTE: Although the TMAPC action on this item is recorded in these minutes, a ruling by the City Legal Department was made 4/15/87 advising action was null and void. As the property address was incorrectly stated on the agenda, it must be placed on a future agenda. The correct address is 11114 East 68th Street South.

This is a request to split a irregular-shaped residential lot. This lot was platted the way it is because of a drainage way and drainage easement that covers the Eastern 1/3 of this tract. A variance will be required in order to permit this lot split because each lot must have a minimum of 30' of frontage on a dedicated street, while the proposed development will have only 15' of frontage for each lot.

The staff recommends approval be subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Approval from the Department of Stormwater Management relating to grading and drainage.
- (2) Approval from the City Board of Adjustment for the above mentioned variance.

Staff reminded the TAC that a plat had been submitted for six lots for three duplexes on this tract, under PUD 391 (Southbrook V). Most conditions were routine and a sketch plat approval was recommended 2/28/85. Water & Sewer had advised that sewer is available, but backwater valves may be required dependent on pad elevation. Subsequently the PUD was denied so the plat is no longer valid. The property is not "subject to a plat" so this current application is only for a lot split.

L-16845 Roland & Associates - Cont'd

Department of Stormwater Management advised that they cannot approve the split until review of plans on how the overland relief for the storm sewer is going to be conveyed through this area. Considerable discussion took place regarding the use of the drainage easement for access. Developer was advised to work closely with Department of Stormwater Management and submit the required plans.

Water and Sewer Department requested an 11' utility easement parallel to the northwest side of the tract.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of L-16845 subject to the conditions outlined by Staff, further noting the detailed requirements of Department of Stormwater Management, the minimum pad elevation and 11' utility easement required by Water and Sewer Department.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. VanFossen requested clarification as to a detention pond or reserve area and requested review of the original plat. Discussion followed as to DSM comments and review of the plat. In reply to Mr. Draughon, Mr. Wilmoth pointed out that a condition of TAC approval was DSM review, and the applicant would not be able to proceed further without this review.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Phil Roland (PO Box 660, Coweta) commented that this lot was approximately 50,000 square feet while the normal lot was about 10,000 square feet. He stated that the original plan had proposed five or six lots. Mr. Roland reviewed the proposed building sites and submitted the drainage plan for TMAPC review.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Kempe agreed with Chairman Parmele that she had no particular problem with this application since it was subject to other city agencies review and approval. In response to Mr. Draughon, Mr. Wilmoth reviewed the conditions as recommended by TAC.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Lot Split Waiver for L-16845 Roland & Associates**, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Approval from the Department of Stormwater Management relating to grading and drainage.
- 2) Approval from the City Board of Adjustment for the above mentioned variance.
- 3) Minimum pad elevation for sanitary sewer.
- 4) An 11' utility easement along the northwest side.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-16848 (603) Vann
L-16849 (983) R & F Homes, Inc.

L-16850 (783) Anderson Properties

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Above Listed Lot Splits for Ratification of Prior Approval, as recommended by Staff.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **Z-6153** Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: **Young (Carroll)** Proposed Zoning: CS, OL & RM-2
Location: NW/c of South Memorial & East 111th Street
Size of Tract: 39.87 acres
Date of Hearing: April 15, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Terry Young, PO Box 3351 (583-4611)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 26 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity - Commercial (10 acre node) and Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the proposed **CS District is** in accordance with the Plan Map at the 10 acre node. The proposed **OL District may be found** in accordance with the Plan Map for the Low Intensity portion and the proposed **RM-2 District is not** in accordance with the Plan Map for the Low Intensity portion.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is 39.87 acres in size and is located at the northwest corner of South Memorial Drive and East 111th Street South. It is partially wooded, gently sloping, vacant and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by a vacant single-family dwelling that has been approved for a golf driving range, zoned AG; on the east across Memorial Drive by vacant property and portable building sales, zoned CS; on the south across 111th Street by a vacant single-family dwelling and stables, zoned AG; and on the west by a riding stables facility, zoned AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The City of Bixby has permitted commercial zoning and development along the east side of Memorial Drive. The Board of Adjustment has approved a medium intensity use abutting the subject tract to the north.

Conclusion: The subject tract qualifies as a 10 acre Type II Node due to its location at the intersection of a Primary and Secondary Arterial Street. Commercial zoning on the east side of Memorial would also support commercial zoning. The requested RM-2 zoning would not be consistent with either the Comprehensive Plan or Development Guidelines for the interior portion of the subject tract.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of 10 acres of CS zoning (measured from the centerline of the streets) with a 300 foot wrap around buffer of RM-0 zoning along the west and part of the north with OL 330' deep on the Memorial frontage. For the balance of the subject tract, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the requested RM-2 zoning and **APPROVAL** of RS-3 zoning in the alternative.

NOTE: Revised legal is to be furnished by the applicant.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Terry Young, representing Alden & Hazel Carroll, presented scenarios combining the the Comprehensive Plans of Bixby and Tulsa at this particular location, which is in the far southeast corner of the Tulsa city limits, adjacent to Bixby city limits. He pointed out that a special study done on Memorial Drive indicated a corridor depth of 1,320' along Memorial. Mr. Young stated he preferred a combination of the two Plans with the existing zoning patterns, and presented a request for commercial 550' along Memorial with a 990' depth; OL of 770' with a 660' depth; 770' of RM-1 with a 330' depth; and RS-2 of 330' with a 1,320' depth.

In reply to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Young stated he thought there was a planned depth for medium intensity of 990' on the southwest corner (along 111th Street), according to the Bixby Comprehensive Plan. He added the zoning was not in place and the map he was using was from the special study. Ms. Wilson pointed out that the TMAPC never approved this special study.

Mr. Gardner commented that 1/4 mile on either side of Memorial just indicated that this was the boundaries of the area under study and should not be construed as a recommendation for zoning. Mr. Gardner advised Staff did not have a problem elongating the commercial east and west as long as it did not go over ten acres, as this is what is in the Development Guidelines. He added that this street was one of the areas under consideration in the upcoming amendment to the Development Guidelines. In reply to Chairman Parmele, he advised that the proposed amendment called for commercial on the west side consistent with the east side, of 330' of depth with a PUD filing.

Mr. Paddock asked Mr. Young if he was agreeable with the Staff recommendation in regard to the ten acres of CS. Mr. Young stated his request was for 12.5 acres, which he based upon the zoning granted on two of the other three corners. Mr. Paddock then inquired if the applicant was agreeable to the wraparound of RM-1. Mr. Young stated he had amended his request to reflect this, and added that where the Staff had recommended RS-3, the applicant was seeking RS-2. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Young stated that due to the fact that they were asking for an increase in office and commercial, he felt a less dense residential category would be a fair trade.

Chairman Parmele asked Mr. Young if the request for OL aligned with the CS across Memorial (east) as far as depth. Mr. Young reviewed the zoning patterns of this area across Memorial. Mr. Gardner advised that the northeast corner currently had 8.8 acres of CS and the southeast corner had 9.3 acres of CS, while the Development Guidelines allowed a maximum of ten acres. Mr. Gardner acknowledged that the current study of Special Consideration Areas for Low and Medium Intensity would take into consideration the strip zoning of commercial on the Bixby frontage. He added that Staff based their recommendation on the fact that the study had not yet been approved; therefore, the existing circumstances must be considered. Chairman Parmele confirmed that Staff's main objection was the request for 12.5 acres versus 10 acres. Mr. Gardner added that, should the TMAPC approve the 12.5 acres, it would be amending the Development Guidelines.

Mr. VanFossen inquired as the purpose of the zoning at this point, and why was the 2.5 acres that critical as the applicant was not submitting a PUD. Mr. Young stated his client was wanting the same treatment as the other three corners in Bixby.

Review Session:

Mr. Draughon pointed out that the DSM comments indicated that on-site detention would be required unless the Bixby City Engineer allowed fees-in-lieu-of detention. He inquired who would be making this decision, and if fees were allowed, who would get the fees. Mr. Gardner advised that DSM would be investigating this as it would have to be platted.

Mr. VanFossen moved for approval of the Staff recommendation, with an amendment from RM-0 to RM-1 to allow more intensity. He added that, until the TMAPC could see something to indicate a basis for the use, he felt the Development Guidelines should be followed. Mr. Paddock agreed with Mr. VanFossen as he did not think that the 2.5 acres difference between the Staff's recommendation and the applicant's request was critical enough to violate the Development Guidelines.

Chairman Parmele commented he agreed with the applicant in that an applicant should not have to wait for possibly another 3 - 4 months to see what the amendments might be to the Development Guidelines, and he agreed based on the surrounding zoning patterns of what Bixby has zoned. Ms. Wilson commented that the Commission should keep in mind the basis for the

Z-6153 Young (Carroll) - Cont'd

special study which was to not have Memorial stripped out as it is between 11th and 51st. Ms. Wilson commented she agreed with those who wished to stay within the Development Guidelines. Chairman Parmele stated he was not opposed to the zoning, but he was opposed to the form of the motion in the way the zoning was outlined.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **6-2-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Parmele, Rice, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6153 Young (Carroll)** for ten acres CS, a 300' wraparound buffer of RM-1 along the west part of the north with a 330' depth of OL on the Memorial frontage, and RS-3 on the balance of the subject tract.

Legal Description:

The following described zoning, all in Section 26, T-18-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, to-wit:

CS Zoning: The SE/4 of the SE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 26;

OL Zoning: The E/2 of the NE/4 of the SE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 26;

RM-1 Zoning: The ^{EAST 300'} ~~E/2~~ of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of the SE/4 and the south 300' of the east 300' of the NW/4 of the SE/4 of the SE/4 and the south 300' of the west 330' of the NE/4 of the SE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 26;

RS-3 Zoning: The west 360' of the south 960' of the SE/4 of the SE/4 and the north 360' of the west 990' of the SE/4 of the SE/4.

** Corrected per the TMAPC
June 10, 1987*

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 108-A: SE/c of East 31st Street & South 73rd East Avenue

Staff Recommendation: Detail Landscape Plan

The subject tract has an area of 1.5 acres and is located southeast of the intersection of East 31st Street and South 73rd East Avenue. PUD 108-A was approved by the TMAPC and City Commission for a church parking lot with no overnight storage of church vehicles (buses in particular) of any type. The Development Standards for PUD 108-A are as follows:

- 1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- 2) Development Standards:
Land Area: 1.5 acres

Permitted Uses: Church parking lot with no overnight storage of Church vehicles (buses in particular) of any type.

Minimum Landscaped Open Space: 3' tall landscaped berm on the south, north and west boundaries with 3' tall shrubbery and trees on the top of the berm.

Minimum Screening: East boundary - 6' tall solid screening fence repaired and maintained upon completion of the parking lot by the lot owner.

Drainage: All storm water shall be managed on the site at a level not to exceed the run-off from said area prior to it being paved and improved.

- 3) That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit. Required landscaping shall be maintained and replaced as needed as a continued condition of granting the Building Permit.
- 4) That the two drives on South 73rd East Avenue shall be directional drives and allow traffic to enter or exit only from, or to the north as shown on the Plan.
- 5) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code has been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.
- 6) The City of Tulsa Traffic Engineer has reviewed the Outline Development Plan and recommends the following requirements:
 - a) That the landscape berm which is to be constructed on the City right-of-way, be built in such a manner as to provide adequate sight distance at the intersection of the private parking lot driveways and South 73rd East Avenue.
 - b) That the landscape berm which is to be located on the City right-of-way provide for pedestrian use of the grassed area behind the curb on the east side of South 73rd East Avenue.

NOTE: Although no Detail Site Plan review requirement was made on PUD 108-A, Staff would note that the proposed aisle widths and space dimensions do not meet standard planning design criteria for lots of this type.

The submitted Detail Landscape Plan initially only indicated a 3' tall berm with 3' tall landscaping on the south and part of the west boundary. The parking lot design and requirements for detention of storm water at the north end will cause the parking lot to be approximately 5' above the level of the cul-de-sac and townhouses to the north. The elevated parking lot will cause the top of a 3' berm to have a 1:1 slope with the top of the street curb. Although the language of the PUD would require placement of the berm in this location, Staff would be supportive of a minor amendment to delete all or a portion of the berm while reducing the shrubbery spacing dimension from 5' on center to 3.5' on center on the north boundary only for a more dense screen at the time of parking lot construction. Staff strongly recommends the 3' berm be constructed on all of the south and west boundaries with the shrubbery and trees as indicated on the Plan. A drainage catch-basin and storm sewer is indicated on the Plan to carry water from the site to the north.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan with landscaping to be as shown on the submitted Plan, including a 3' berm on the north, south, and west boundaries, or approval subject to TMAPC approval of a minor amendment to delete the berm only from the north boundary and reduce the spacing of the burford holly shrubs along the north boundary only from 5' on center to 3.5' on center.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Frank clarified Staff's recommendation on a minor amendment to delete the berm, which might require a continuance of this case in order to meet advertising and notification requirements. Mr. Linker advised that the TMAPC could always continue a case should they feel more notice was needed. He stated he was not sure that, since this involves the berming, it was not already a part of the Detail Landscape Plan, which had been advertised. Mr. VanFossen commented he would have a problem deleting the berm without the abutting property owners being notified.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bob Swanson, architect for the church, stated that the applicant would agree to a compromise solution in order to expedite this application. Mr. VanFossen suggested the parking on the north be pulled back far enough to allow a sufficient berm. Mr. Swanson stated they would do whatever was deemed necessary by the TMAPC.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **7-1-0** (Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Kempe, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent")) to **APPROVE** the **Detail Landscape Plan for PUD 108-A Woodlake Assembly of God Church**, as revised to include a 3' berm and subject to a revision of the parking spaces on the north end of the parking lot, if needed.

* * * * *

PUD 268-9: Lot 6, Block 2, Woodland Glen Extended II,
being 9341 South 93rd East Avenue

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Side Yard Setback

The subject tract is described as Lot 6, Block 2, Woodland Glen Extended II and is located at 9341 South 93rd East Avenue. The applicant is requesting that the minimum side yard for the proposed single-family residence be reduced from 5' to 4.5'. Lot 6 is 49' wide.

Staff considers this request minor and recommends APPROVAL subject to the submitted plot plan and subject to meeting all other provisions of the City Codes including, but not limited to, the Zoning Code and Building Code.

* * * * *

PUD 268-10: Lot 3, Block 2, Woodland Glen Extended II,
being 9329 South 93rd East Avenue

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Side Yard Setback

The subject tract is described as Lot 3, Block 2, Woodland Glen Extended II and is located at 9329 S. 93rd East Avenue. The applicant is requesting that the minimum side yard for the proposed single family residence be reduced from 5' to 4.5'. Lot 3 is 49' wide.

Staff considers this request minor and recommends APPROVAL subject to the submitted plot plan and subject to meeting all other provisions of the City Codes including, but not limited to, the Zoning Code and Building Code.

* * * * *

PUD 268-11: Lot 8, Block 1, Woodland Glen Extended II,
being 9229 South 94th East Avenue

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Side Yard Setback

The subject tract is described as Lot 8, Block 1, Woodland Glen Extended II and is located at 9229 South 94th East Avenue. The applicant is requesting that the minimum side yard setback on the north side of the proposed residence be reduced from 5' to 4'. A 5' utility easement exists on the south side. Lot 8 is 49' wide.

According to the plot plan, "dimensions shown are over frame." This means that the setbacks on the side yards shown on the plan will be reduced by siding and other exterior materials; specifically, the ultimate north side yard will be less than 4', and the fascia and exterior materials on the south side of the residence will likely encroach into the utility easement.

Therefore, although staff finds the request minor, APPROVAL is recommended only as follows:

- (1) Subject to the submitted plot plan.
- (2) That no portion of the proposed dwelling shall be less than 6' from the dwellings constructed on abutting lots to the north and south.
- (3) Compliance is required with all other City Codes including, but not limited to, the Zoning Code and Building Code.
- (4) That if any portion of the proposed dwelling encroaches into the utility easement on the south, approval shall be required from the City of Tulsa and the appropriate other private utilities.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Frank advised that, according to the applicant, the note on the survey "dimensions shown are over frame" was in error. This meant that the side yard setback dimensions shown on the survey would be complied with.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **RICE**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment for Side Yard Setbacks for PUD 268-9, PUD 268-10 and PUD 268-11**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Date Approved

5-6-87



Chairman

ATTEST:


Secretary

