

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1657
Wednesday, **July 15, 1987**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carnes
Doherty, 2nd Vice-
Chairman
Draughon
Paddock, 1st Vice-
Chairman
Parmele, Chairman
VanFossen, Secretary
Wilson
Woodard

MEMBERS ABSENT

Crawford
Kempe
Rice

STAFF PRESENT

Frank
Jones
Setters
Wilmoth

OTHERS PRESENT

Linker, Legal
Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, July 14, 1987 at 10:05 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of Correction to the Minutes of May 27, 1987, Meeting #1651:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-1** (Carnes, Draughon, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, "abstaining"; Crawford, Doherty, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Correction to the Minutes of May 27, 1987, Meeting #1651**, page 6, by correcting the legal description for Z-6158 Williams to read Lot 16, not Lot 6.

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Parmele announced the Joint Committee meeting scheduled for July 22, 1987 to review the draft of the amendments to the Development Guidelines, and review the amendments to the applicable District Plan Text and Maps.

Committee Reports:

Mr. VanFossen advised of the Comprehensive Plan Committee meeting this date to review the Master Drainage Plan (MDP) for Coal Creek. Based on the Committee's recommendation, Mr. VanFossen moved that a public hearing be set for August 19, 1987 to review said MDP.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Doherty, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **SET a Public Hearing for August 19, 1987** in regard to the Coal Creek Master Drainage Plan.

Director's Report:

Mr. Frank advised the TMAPC members that, effective next week, they would need to bring their tentative agenda packets to the TMAPC meeting, as new agenda packets would only be copied and distributed if there were changes made to the tentative agenda. The Commission members agreed with this suggested procedure as an effort to cut copy expense and reduce paper work.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL:

Camelot Park (PUD 420A)(2783) East 101st & South Granite Avenue (RS-2)

This plat has a sketch plat approval by TAC on 5/14/87. A copy of said approval was provided with Staff comments in the margin.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plat of Camelot Park, subject to the following conditions:

1. Based upon previous discussions, applicant should make certain that all of this tract can be served by sanitary sewer. Elevations are important!
2. In locations where there is a "3' fence easement", make sure that there is adequate room for utilities. (A 20-1/2' easement may be required, with "3' reserved for fence" in order to have the minimum 17-1/2' utility easement available for utilities.) Designate as a "3' Fence Reserve consistent with covenants. Make sure it is clear that the utility easement also covers the 3'. Also, provide that Reserve A is also a utility easement.

Camelot Park (PUD 420-A) - Cont'd

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.
4. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
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).
6. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
7. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by Stormwater Management and/or City Engineer, including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by City Commission.
8. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer.
9. Limits of Access or (LNA) as applicable shall be shown on the plat along 101st Street as approved by Traffic Engineer. Design of median subject to review and approval of Traffic Engineering. Show "LNA" on side lot lines on entry street.
10. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineer during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)
11. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
12. 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.
13. All conditions of PUD 420-A shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat.
14. 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.
15. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Camelot Park (PUD 420-A) - Cont'd

PUD 420-A: Detail Site Plan, Detail Fence Plan, Detail Sign Plan and Detail Landscape Plan.

The subject tract is approximately 40 acres in size and is located east of the southeast corner of East 101st Street South and South Yale. The underlying zoning of PUD 420-A is RS-2 and the TMAPC and City Commission have approved a maximum of 120 single-family detached dwelling units. A preliminary plat will be presented to the TMAPC July 15, 1987 and the development will be called, Camelot Park. It is noted that a homeowners association is required to maintain and replace fencing, landscaping, retention/detention areas and other common facilities.

NOTE: A further recommended condition of approval of each of the submitted plans is that prior to construction of any of the proposed features or facilities which would be located over a public or private utility easement, approval of the various utility companies is required.

Detail Site Plan/Detail Fence Plan: In accordance with PUD 420-A, TMAPC approval of these plans is required related to design of common areas and screening along East 101st Street where residential lots back into the arterial street. The submitted Plans indicate an elaborate entry is planned utilizing a brick paving surface for the entry street with several landscaped islands.

The fencing materials will be of masonry construction and include architectural features to the east and west of the entry street. The design and location of the proposed screening exceeds PUD 420-A requirements; therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Site Plan and Fence Plan per the submitted drawings, and subject to approval of the size and location of the center islands by the Traffic Engineer.

Detail Sign Plan: The proposed Detail Sign Plan indicates one entry sign that will have a masonry support structure and granite face. The entry sign will be built in the landscaped island closest to the arterial street. The height and area of the sign is in compliance with the underlying RS-2 zoning; therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan as submitted.

Detail Landscape Plan: The Detail Landscape Plan indicates that plant materials will be installed along the masonry wall facing East 101st Street and also within the islands located at the entry way from East 101st Street. The Plan indicates the type, size, and location of a variety of trees, plantings and shrubbery which will be utilized. The planted areas will be irrigated by an inground sprinkler system. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan as submitted and notes that construction and installation of the sprinkler system should be coordinated with the various public utilities if placed on an easement or right-of-way.

Camelot Park (PUD 420-A) - Cont'd

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock confirmed with Staff that this development would be on City sewer service. Mr. Draughon inquired if there was to be retention or detention of stormwater. Mr. Jerry Ledford (8209 East 63rd Place South), Engineer for the project, advised that retention would be provided on the southerly portion of the 80 acre tract in a sump area. He added that they have had several meetings with Stormwater Management, and the general maintenance would be provided by the homeowner's association, while the City would own and maintain the retention facility.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Plat for Camelot Park, and the Detail Site Plan, Detail Fence Plan, Detail Sign Plan and Detail Landscape Plan for related PUD 420-A, subject to the conditions of the TAC and Staff recommendation, including the "NOTE" on page 4.

* * * * *

Woodbine II (PUD 364)(1984) East 98th & South 99th East Avenue (RS-3)

This is the second phase in the overall plan for the Woodbine development. The plat meets the conditions of the PUD and most of the written portion is identical to the first plat of Woodbine.

Public Service Company advised they objected to the last line in the covenants, Section 1, Paragraph 1.1, regarding use of utility easements. They requested this portion be removed.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plat of Woodbine II subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of PUD 364 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. 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.
3. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat. (12" water line required on Mingo.)

Woodbine II - Cont'd

4. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utilities repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s).
5. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the W/S Department prior to release of final plat.
6. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer. (Already issued #2450)
7. Paving and drainage plans shall be approved by Stormwater Management, including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by City Commission. (WSDP #738 Issued)
8. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineer during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)
9. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
10. Covenants: page 3, Section 2.3.1; add: ..."except where easements are greater."
11. 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.
12. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Woodbine II**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

Tesoro Addition (PUD 179-N)(1283) SW/c of East 71st & South 85th East Avenue

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **CONTINUE** **Consideration of the Preliminary Plat for Tesoro Addition, and the related Detail Site Plan for PUD 179-N** until Wednesday, July 29, 1987 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

Southern Pointe (1583)

East 87th Street & South Yale Avenue

(RS-3)

Applicant provided a plat that had been revised to omit a small portion in the northwest corner next to Yale in Section 16. However, TAC and Staff recommended the parcel be included in plat as originally submitted, in order to dedicate an additional amount of right-of-way in that area for South Yale. Design criteria for improvement and widening in the future will require a longer radius, and thus a little more right-of-way to get around and over the hill. Applicant was advised to work with City and Traffic Engineers to determine exact design and right-of-way requirements.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY Plat of Southern Pointe, subject to the following conditions:

1. On face of plat show adjacent land as "unplatted".
2. Staff has no objection to 15' building lines on corner lots as long as they don't conflict with an adjacent front building line. Specifically, those that conflict are Lots 4 & 6, Block 2, and Lots 1 & 11, Block 4. Since the house on Lot 13, Block 4, will probably set at an angle, and Lot 14 is rather small, Staff has no objection to the 15' building line on Lot 14. Board of Adjustment approval is required and plat shall conform to any applicable Board conditions in the variance. Final plat shall not be released until Board of Adjustment approval is made.
3. Covenants:
 - (a) 1st page, last line: Omit "and the City of Tulsa" since this is not a PUD.
 - (b) Section III. Add: "The front of the house must face the most restrictive building line."
4. 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.
5. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat. (Secondary pressure system)
6. 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).
7. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
8. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by Stormwater Management and/or City Engineer, including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by City Commission. (Possible on-site detention in vicinity of Lots 7 & 8, Block 7.)

07.15.87:1657(7)

Southern Pointe - Cont'd

9. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer.
10. Limits of Access or (LNA) as applicable shall be shown on the plat as approved by Traffic Engineer.
11. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineer during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)
12. Street names shall be approved by City Engineer.
13. If an landscaped entry median is planned for the intersection of 87th and Yale, show a Reserve Area and include applicable language in the covenants for its maintenance. Design of any special features of the entry is subject to approval of City/Traffic Engineering Departments.
14. Provide right-of-way along Yale around the curve as recommended by Traffic and City Engineers.
15. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
16. The key or location map shall be complete. Show Pinnacle Estates and Lucenta Addition.
17. 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 the plat on any wells not officially plugged.
18. The zoning application (Z-6160) shall be approved and the ordinance or resolution therefore published before final plat is released. Plat shall conform to the applicable zoning approved.
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 the Subdivision Regulations.
20. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Wilmoth verified that another plat had been submitted including the parcel at the northwest corner next to Yale.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Southern Pointe**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:

River Port (783)

SE/c of 71st Street & Riverside Drive

(CS)

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Final Plat of River Port** and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

REQUEST FOR WAIVER (Section 260):

BOA 14538 Morningside/Maple Heights (1292)

1719 South Owasso Avenue (RS-3)

This is a request to waive plat requirements for a day care center to be located within an existing synagogue at the above address. Since the property is already platted and nothing new is being constructed, Staff recommends **APPROVAL**, as the day center will be using existing facilities. All use controls have been established through the BOA requirements.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for BOA 14538 Morningside/Maple Heights**, as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-16871 Parks/Wallace (292)

SW/c of Admiral Blvd. & Quanah Avenue

(RM-2)

This is a request to split a 76.7' x 100' platted lot into two tracts. The northernmost tract is proposed to be 56' x 76.7', while the southern lot measures 44' x 76.7'. This lot split will require a variance from the City Board of Adjustment because the proposed lots do not meet the minimum lot size standards in the RM-2 zoning district.

Staff notes that there are at least a dozen lots in the immediate area that are comparable to the above referenced proposal. Staff advised that this approval would be subject to the following conditions:

L-16871 Parks/Wallace - Cont'd

- 1) Board of Adjustment approval of case #14532 for the above mentioned variances.
- 2) Approval from the Water and Sewer Department for access to both services.
- 3) Any utility easement that may be necessary in order to better serve the subject tracts.

Water and Sewer Department advised that both lots would be served and they had no requirements. There were no other utility requirements. Due to the numerous lots of similar, or smaller size, Staff had no objections.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of L-16871 subject to approval of the BOA for variances of the bulk and area requirements.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Mr. VanFossen, Mr. Wilmoth confirmed there was a house located on the south lot.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE L-16871 Parks/Wallace**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR DISCUSSION:

L-16888 Elgin (3303) W of the SW/c of East Latimer Place & North Marion (RS-2)

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.

Ms. Wilson confirmed with Mr. Wilmoth that the larger lot could have access from Latimer and/or Louisville.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to **APPROVE L-16888 Elgin**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

L-16889 Phillips (1793)

SW/c of East 28th & South Atlanta Place (RS-1)

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

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Linker advised that the only question before the TMAPC was whether or not this lot split meets the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Roy Johnsen (324 Main Mall), representing the applicant, agreed with the counsel offered by Mr. Linker. He confirmed Mr. Wilmoth's comments that the tracts, while zoned RS-1, would exceed the requirements for RS-1. Mr. Johnsen stated the right-of-way and access requirements would also be met.

Chairman Parmele commented that, even though the lot split met the Subdivision Regulations, the TMAPC was reviewing this lot split on Staff's recommendation due to it being irregular in shape or size, and based on TMAPC policies in this regard.

Interested Parties:

Address:

Mr. Bill Jones	3800 First National Tower
Mr. Mike Atkinson	2417 East 33rd Street
Ms. Shirley Hawkins	2451 East 28th Street
Mr. Jim Bost	2507 East 30th Street
Ms. Ann Rice	2436 East 28th Street

Mr. Bill Jones, attorney, advised he was representing the property owners abutting the subject tract. All of the Interested Parties spoke in protest to the lot split application on the basis that it would not be compatible with the neighborhood and was not in keeping with the integrity, character and aesthetics of the neighborhood. Ms. Hawkins advised that there were nine homes on 19 lots, thereby establishing large lot development, with smaller lots being generally limited to the perimeter of the subdivision along 31st Street and Lewis. Mr. Bost submitted a petition of protest to the Commission. Ms. Rice added that this area was a unique part of Tulsa and should be preserved.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Johnsen stated that it was slightly misleading to suggest that the subject lots were the only lots of this size in the area, and he reviewed a map enlargement to show a comparison of lot sizes. Mr. Johnsen reiterated that this application was in conformance with the Subdivision Regulations, and the only irregularity that he could observe was that the frontage along Atlanta Place was slightly curved.

Review Session:

Mr. Carnes commented that he would have a problem supporting this as he could not see how these homes would be able to meet the same setbacks as established by the existing homes in the area. Mr. Doherty asked Staff, if Atlanta Place had been a straight street, would this have been brought before the TMAPC. Mr. Wilmoth stated that, due to the protestants, this probably would have been presented for TMAPC review.

Mr. Carnes moved for denial of the lot split; however, the motion died due to lack of a second. Mr. Doherty stated that, unfortunately, the only thing the TMAPC could do was determine if this meets the Subdivision Regulations, and the only reason this particular case might not, was the minor curvature on Atlanta Place. He added that this application, again, points out an urgent need for a larger zoning classification, i.e. RE (Residential Estate). Therefore, he moved for approval of the lot split. Mr. VanFossen commented that, based on review of the plat and the discussion of this case, he would have to support the motion. However, he agreed with Mr. Doherty that further study was needed on an RE zoning classification.

In regard to RE zoning, Mr. Paddock commented that several months ago the Rules & Regulations Committee reported favorably a proposal to include an RE District in the the Tulsa City Zoning Code. However, the recommendation had not yet been acted upon pending review of other zoning changes in order to present them all at one time. Mr. Paddock stated that, in view of the circumstances of this application and on advise of Legal Counsel, the TMAPC had no other alternative than approval of this lot split.

Ms. Wilson remarked she too had concerns with this case, however, the Commission needed to decide if the conditions of the Subdivision Regulations were, if fact, met. She also stated that density was an important issue. Therefore, she would be voting against the motion. Chairman Parmele stated he felt the issue of compatibility with the neighborhood should be closely reviewed and considered, and he did not feel this was compatible with the existing immediate neighborhood. Therefore, he was opposed to the motion. Chairman Parmele stated that, with the frequency of these type of applications, there was a growing need for review of the Subdivision Regulations to make allowance for these types of large lot subdivisions.

Mr. Doherty commented that, were this zoned RE and this was presented as a zoning question, he would have been strongly opposed to any rezoning. Mr. Paddock remarked that, being quite familiar with this area, it pained him to feel that he had no other recourse than to put a stamp of approval on this due to the position of the TMAPC with regard to the Subdivision Regulations.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **4-3-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, VanFossen, "aye"; Carnes, Parmele, Wilson, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE L-16889 Phillips**, as recommended by Staff, subject to obtaining the required releases from the Water & Sewer Department.

Additional Comments & Discussion:

In response to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Frank updated the Commission as to the status of the RE zoning classification study. Discussion followed among the Commission members as to bringing up the RE zoning issue, and any other pending zoning items, for public hearing. Mr. Paddock, as Chairman of the Rules & Regulation Committee, moved that the proposed amendment to the Tulsa City Zoning Code be set for public hearing on August 26, 1987 for consideration of an RE (Residential Estate) zoning classification.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Jones, as a zoning attorney, should an RE zoning classification be approved, what type of response he anticipated. Mr. Jones replied that, based on his experience, he felt citizens would really support an RE district as he new of several cases where these large lot homes would consider application for RE zoning.

Mr. Wilmoth pointed out that the Subdivision Regulations would not need to be amended, as Tulsa County currently has an RE zoning district, and a change in the City Zoning Code for RE would have no affect on the Subdivision Regulations.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, "absent") to **SET a Public Hearing for August 26, 1987** to consider an amendment to the Tulsa City Zoning Code as relates to establishing an RE (Residential Estate) zoning classification.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| L-16874 (3691) Brook | L-16883 (703) Bodine |
| L-16875 (3193) Reilly | L-16884 (193) Hoffman |
| L-16876 (3602) TDA | L-16885 (2593) Henshaw |
| L-16877 (193) TDA | L-16886 (3691) Taber |
| L-16879 (1393) Evangelical | L-16887 (3303) Elgin |
| L-16882 (2683) Jordan | |

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Above Listed Lot Splits, as recommended by Staff.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 426-1: East 102nd Street and South Louisville

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment

The subject tract has an area of approximately 4.5 acres and is a part of a 42 acre tract located at East 102nd Street South and west of South Louisville. PUD 426 was approved for single-family development with a range of 64-70 units (69 new and one existing on a 4.5 acre tract). The applicant for PUD 426-1 is requesting that the existing residence, which is located on a 4.5 acre tract, be deleted from the requirement that it be included within the homeowners association or otherwise be subject to assessments and liens for common open space and storm water detention maintenance costs.

Staff would consider the form of the association to be a matter of private concern subject to meeting all legal requirements. Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 426-1 as follows:

- 1) The following tract be deleted from the PUD condition requiring that it be included within the homeowners association or otherwise be subject to assessment and lien for common open space and stormwater detention maintenance costs:

Part of the W/2, NW/4 of Section 28, T18N, R13E of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the U.S. Government Survey thereof, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point 1,040.30' south and 190' east of the northwest corner of said Section 28; thence N 89°43'30" E 698.97'; thence due south 310'; thence S 85°36'05" W 195.58'; thence N 72°31'31" W 283.06'; thence S 89°08'26" W 199.63'; thence N 27°59'58" W 139.30'; thence N 14°54'01" E 120.70' to the POB; containing 4.5 acres more or less.

- 2) TMAPC approval of PUD 426-1 is subject to inclusion within the restrictive covenants and/or deeds of dedication a notation that the subject tract has been excluded from the homeowners association membership and obligations.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Roy Johnsen, representing the applicant, clarified that, for financing reasons, the tract under question was not being deleted from the PUD. It would just not be an obligation that this tract be a member of the homeowners association or required to contribute to the maintenance of common areas.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment for PUD 426-1**, as recommended by Staff.

PUD 136-12: Minor Amendment & L-16890

Lot 4, Block 1, Silver Oaks III Addition

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 136-12 & L-16890** until Wednesday, **August 22, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Mr. Paddock advised receipt of a letter from Circle K requesting a change in the method display surface area of signs was calculated. He commented that the promotional sign issue for Mr. Bill Stokely was also pending. Therefore, he suggested a meeting of the Rules & Regulations Committee be set for some time after the Historic Preservation matter was handled.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Date Approved 7-29-87
[Signature]
Chairman

ATTEST: [Signature]
Secretary

