

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1668  
Wednesday, **October 7, 1987**, 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>
Carnes	Draughon	Frank	Linker, Legal
Crawford	Kempe	Gardner	Counsel
Doherty, 2nd Vice- Chairman	Paddock	Setters	
Parmeale, Chairman	Rice	Wilmoth	
Wilson	VanFossen		
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, October 6, 1987 at 11:10 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 1:35 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**Approval of Minutes of September 16, 1987, Meeting #1666:**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmeale, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of September 16, 1987, Meeting #1666**.

**Approval of Minutes of September 23, 1987, Meeting #1667:**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmeale, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of September 23, 1987, Meeting #1667**.

**REPORTS:**

**Chairman's Report:**

Chairman Parmeale reminded the Commissioners there would be no meeting next week due to a lack of quorum.

RESOLUTION:

CONSIDER APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 1665:648 AMENDING THE DISTRICT 17 PLAN MAP & TEXT ESTABLISHING LINEAR DEVELOPMENT AREAS FOR LOW AND MEDIUM INTENSITY, AND RELATED MATTERS.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Resolution No. 1665:648, amending the District 17 Plan Map & Text establishing Linear Development Areas for Low and Medium Intensity, as recommended by Staff.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT:

Francis Hills (PUD 426)(2883) SW/c of East 102nd & So Louisville Ave (RS-1)

This plat has a sketch plat approval (2/26/87) under the name "Louisville Estates". The name has been changed, and this is the first phase of construction and platting. A copy of the conditions outlined in the sketch plat approval was provided with staff comments in the margin or notes added as indicated.

There was considerable discussion regarding easements parallel to the streets, and South Louisville in particular relating to landscaping and access to utilities. Utilities recommended any easements be directly abutting streets, with landscaping reserves behind same. This would be a requirement for approval. City Engineering advised that improvements to South Louisville will be required.\* Department of Stormwater Management advised that there may be fees required on a monthly basis on the private street system. This would be worked out directly with Department of Stormwater Management.

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

1. Clarify what is "easement" and what is "landscape easement" and the building line along Louisville. Add statement to covenants in Section I after Paragraph A regarding landscaping in easements. Example: "THE OWNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF ANY LANDSCAPING AND PAVING LOCATED WITHIN THE UTILITY EASEMENTS IN THE EVENT IT IS NECESSARY TO REPAIR ANY UNDERGROUND WATER OR SEWER MAINS, ELECTRIC, NATURAL GAS, COMMUNICATIONS OR TELEPHONE SERVICE."

\* See note on page 4.

Francis Hills - Cont'd

Utilities recommend that utility easements be directly abutting street right-of-way lines. Also that the private streets be labeled "utility easements".

2. Covenants:
  - Section I A Delete references to Yale and 121st Street. Delete "public streets and alleys and" in last line.
  - Section II First line: WHEREAS Francis Hills was "approved by the TMAPC" ... etc., on 3/11/87; City approval date is 5/5/87; Ordinance #16826, adopted 5/29/87. (You can omit publication date.)
  - Section II A-1 Date is 3/11/87
  - Section II D Add: 6. Maximum structure height is 35'  
Add: 7. Minimum livability space; 7,000 sq. ft. per dwelling unit, computed on overall area of the subdivision.
  - Section II D-4 Add after the word "yard", "...as per zoning code".
3. Make sure the terminology in the covenants is consistent with the face of the plat in referring to the Reserve Area and/or storm water drainage/detention, etc. The information is included but should be clarified.
4. Since this is only the first phase of the PUD, it may be necessary to file the PUD conditions applicable to the remaining land by separate instrument.
5. Show standard easements throughout the plat (11' or 17.5'). Also the private street systems should be designated as utility easements. Show building lines in accordance with the PUD approvals.
6. All conditions of PUD 426 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.
7. 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. Also see #1 and #5 above. Show 24.75' statutory easement along west property line, or if vacated, show Book and Page reference. Side lot easements required for street lights.
8. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
9. 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).
10. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat. Provide access for treatment plant.

## Francis Hills - Cont'd

11. 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. Including improvements on South Louisville as recommended by City Engineer (Also see #12).\*
12. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer. (Also see #11)
13. 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.
14. Street names shall be approved by City Engineer.
15. 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.
16. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

\* NOTE: After the TAC meeting, the Engineering Department informed the Staff a clarification had been made on the conditions for "improvement to South Louisville Avenue". Full curb/gutter standard improvement will not be required as a condition of approval of the plat. Conditions #11 and #12 will cover any requirements of the City Engineering Department and detailed plans (if required) would be a function of that department.

### Comments & Discussion:

**Mr. Mark Lyons** (610 South Main), attorney for the adjoining land owner to the north, stated he had a problem with the way the proposed plat was presented in light of the problems with water flow and stormwater in this area. He commented that the staff at DSM had advised him there would be a higher peak load from the drainage easement than what currently exists. Mr. Lyons confirmed with Chairman Parmele that he understood any TMAPC action was subject to DSM review.

**Mr. Steve Bunting** (525 South Main), representing Mr. Roy Gann, advised that Mr. Gann recently had surveyors on his property regarding installation of a sewer line, and he had not been made aware of any sewer line for a proposed sewage treatment facility in the subject plat. Mr. Bunting questioned building this private facility instead of waiting for installation of public facilities by the City.

Mr. Carnes inquired if the TMAPC had to approve the plat before it went to DSM. Mr. Gardner explained that the applicant needed to know the type of development preliminarily approved by the Commission before proceeding with the next step, and without this preliminary approval, there was nothing to work from. He commented further that the surveying being done was probably a preliminary stage to determine elevations, and nothing

could be initiated on acquiring an easement without negotiation and approval of the property owners. Chairman Parmele reviewed condition #10 regarding a request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District.

**Mr. Jack Page**, Manager of the Watershed Management Division of DSM, advised DSM has reviewed this particular project quite closely. He stated the applicant was meeting DSM requirements by constructing an interceptor storm sewer system so no water would be going to the south, and stated there was absolutely no increase in discharge of stormwater. Mr. Page further advised the major portion of the development drained to the west/northwest and would be discharged to the existing pond which was to be used for detention. Regarding drainage to the north, Mr. Page stated DSM had done some site investigations and found there was no present storm sewer system in that location, and stormwater would be carried from the site by an open drainageway. He commented DSM was mainly concerned with erosion control for that portion draining to the north and had, therefore, placed a requirement that the applicant was to have an open drainage system in that location. Mr. Page added this was contrary to the normal DSM position that usually required piping. However, in this situation DSM was concerned that piping would cause more severe erosion and be less compatible with the type of development that had previously developed in the basin. He pointed out that onsite detention was not required for that portion draining to the north as there were no structures subject to flooding. He commented this was in accordance with the ordinance, and confirmed for Chairman Parmele that there would be no adverse impact on the properties to the north, as defined by the ordinance regarding structural flooding.

Ms. Wilson inquired if there would be water directed to the north/northwest, and if there was anything in the ordinance that might take care of this situation. Mr. Page stated there would be an increase in discharge of the water draining to the north, and he reiterated that DSM concerns were more with controlling erosion than controlling the "peaks". He stated that the peak discharge, in this case, would not cause flooding of any structures, and the volume could not be changed, regardless of any detention. Ms. Wilson recalled that, due to the elevations, homeowners had voiced concerns as to the existing run-off causing erosion of their yards, and that this run-off might increase. She questioned if anything could be done to reroute the water to prevent further damage. Mr. Page answered that, for the portion draining northeast across Louisville, DSM had required that a bar ditch be constructed on the west side of Louisville, which would divert water from going across Louisville. In response to Chairman Parmele, Mr. Page commented that the requirements that have been placed on this development would help the drainage situation for everyone in this basin.

In reply to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Page stated that DSM was not aware of any flooding to the north, and had no reports on file. Mr. Gardner pointed out that the area which drains to the northeast corner was a very small portion (approximately 1.5 acre) of the total plat area which was about 40 acres.

Francis Hills - Cont'd

**Ms. Pauline Puroff** (3220 East 101st) stated she was not protesting the development, but was concerned as to the detention pond which would abut their fenceline. She commented that the old Vensel Creek, which runs along her property, needed cleaning out very badly. Ms. Puroff stated that, during the 53 years she has resided in this area, she has never had water on her property, and she was concerned that development might change this. Ms. Puroff also voiced concerns regarding the proposed sewage treatment plant.

**Mr. Bill Puroff** (10505 South Delaware), son of Pauline Puroff, confirmed the need to have the old Vensel Creek cleaned out to assure proper water flow. He commented that Grupe Development had been required to dig a huge, deep ditch, which helped with the water flow situation along Vensel Creek, but this development did not have the same requirement. He was concerned about any future flooding from the detention pond on his parent's property that has not been a problem in the past.

**Ms. Pat Wheatley** (3300 East 101st Street), stated she was mainly concerned about erosion, not necessarily flooding, and any more run-off would only add to the erosion.

Review Session:

In regard to Vensel Creek and the comments made, Ms. Wilson inquired if DSM had any current plans for cleaning out this creek. Mr. Page advised that, although he could not make any commitments as to a time frame, he would initiate a work order with the proper division for getting this old Vensel Creek channel cleaned.

Mr. Carnes stated that no one appeared to oppose the development, and the drainage/erosion concerns were being addressed by DSM; therefore, he moved for approval with the conditions as stated. Mr. Carnes added a condition that a work order be initiated by Stormwater Management regarding the cleaning of Vensel Creek.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Francis Hills**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff, and the addition of a condition requiring DSM initiation of a work order to clean out the old Vensel Creek channel.

Keyport Center West (PUD 384-A)(1282) East of West 71st & South Elwood (CS,AG)

This plat will contain a mini-storage on Lot 2 and a garden center on Lot 1, in accordance with the PUD. A detail site plan is in progress on the mini-storage, but the garden center is still in the conceptual stages. A subsurface meeting had already been held and an updated plat provided for review.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plat of Keyport Center West, subject to the following conditions:

1. On face of plat show building lines required by PUD. (Lot 1: 60' on west; 25' on east; 17.5 building line and utility easement on the south or wider if required because of retaining wall structures.)
2. Since this subdivision will utilize a septic system, include applicable language recommended by Health Department in the restrictive covenants.
3. Covenants:
  - (a) Add paragraph regarding landscape repair within utility easements. (see sample)
  - (b) Section III-A-1, "Use Unit 17", add "...also known as Lot 2".
  - (c) Section III-A-5, second line should contain language "...solely for circulation".
4. All conditions of PUD 384-A 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.
5. 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.
6. Water plans shall be approved by Creek County Rural Water District #2 prior to release of final plat. Include language for Water and Sewer facilities in covenants stating "and/or Creek County RWD 2".
7. 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).
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.
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 the Traffic Engineer. Include applicable language in covenants.

Keyport Center West - Cont'd

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. 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.
13. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefore, shall be approved by the City-County Health Department. Percolation tests required prior to preliminary approval.
14. The owner(s) shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot: type, size, and general location. This information is to be included in the restrictive covenants on plat.
15. 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.
16. Scale of plat is 1" = 60'. Staff and TAC have no objection, but this does require waiver from the standard 1" = 100'. Recommended approval.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Steve Raglan (7251 South Elwood) voiced concerns about water run-off due to the downhill grade.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Keyport Center West**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE PLUS MINOR AMENDMENT TO REALLOCATE FLOOR AREA:

Tesoro Addition (PUD 179-C-5 & 179-N-2)(1283) SW/c of East 71st Street & South  
85th East Avenue (CS)

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located at the southwest corner of East 71st Street and South 85th East Avenue and has underlying CS zoning. The TMAPC initially approved PUD 179-C-4 to allocate floor area and related matters (parking, open space, etc.) within Lot 4, Block 1 of the El Paseo

Addition. PUD 179-N was subsequently approved to permit an automotive accessory store to be constructed at the intersection of East 71st and South 85th East Avenue. During the development process and sale of property for the PUD 179-N tract, it was determined that not all of that lot would be needed and for bookkeeping purposes, unused land area, floor area, and related matters should be reallocated by a minor amendment. The development standards of this minor amendment will be reflected in a replat to be referred to as the Tesoro Addition.

Staff considers the reallocation of floor area and related matters in accordance with PUD 179-C-5 and PUD 179-N-2 for the Tesoro Addition to be minor and recommends **APPROVAL** as follows:

1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein. Lot 1 is the most westerly lot having frontage on East 71st Street. Lot 3 is the middle lot having frontage on East 71st. Lot 4 is located at the southwest corner of East 71st and South 85th. Lot 2 is the southern lot having frontage on South 85th and an access handle to East 71st between Lots 1 and 3.

2) **Development Standards by Lot:**

Lot 1 (10.82% of Addition)

Land Area:	28,575 sf
Permitted Uses:	Uses permitted by right in a CS District
Maximum Building Floor Area:	8,009 sf
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from centerline of E. 71st	110'
from other internal boundaries	None required
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	40 spaces or as required by the applicable Use Unit
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	2,937 sf

Lot 2, (62.57% of Addition)

Land Area:	165,237 sf
Permitted Uses:	Uses permitted by right in a CS District
Maximum Building Floor Area:	46,317 sf
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from centerline of S. 85th	55'
from other internal boundaries	None required
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	229 spaces or as required by the applicable Use Unit
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	16,985 sf

Lot 3, (16.77% of Addition)

Land Area:	44,278 sf
Permitted Uses:	Uses permitted by right in a CS District
Maximum Building Floor Area:	12,414 sf
Minimum Building Setback:	
from centerline of E. 71st	110'
from other internal boundaries	None required
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	61 spaces or as required by the applicable Use Units
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	4,553 sf

**NOTE:** Other bulk and area requirements for Lots 1, 2, and 3 are in accordance with the CS District of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

Lot 4, (9.84% of Addition) \*

Land Area:	26,000 sf
Permitted Uses:	Uses permitted by right in a CS District with Special Exception uses in Use Unit 17 (Allied and Automotive Activities) to include only "services" related to vehicle repair and service per PUD 179-N and subsequent amendments excluding bars, taverns, nightclubs, and dance halls.
Maximum Building Floor Area:	7,284 sf
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	36 spaces or as required by the applicable Use Units
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from centerline of E. 71st	110'
from centerline of S. 85th	55'
from west and south boundaries	None required
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	2,671 sf

\* A Detail Site Plan for an automotive accessory store was approved by the TMAPC on Lot 4 on 7/29/87 and a minor amendment for signs (PUD 179-N-1) on 9/23/87. Approval of PUD 179-C-5 and PUD 179-N-2 supercedes only previous floor area allocations to this lot.

- 3) That all trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view.
- 4) All signs shall be subject to Detail Sign Plan review and approval by the TMAPC prior to installation and in accordance with Section 1130.2(b) of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code and as follows:

- **Ground Signs:** One ground sign on East 71st Street for Lots 1 and 3 with a maximum display surface area of 140 square feet and a maximum height of 25' as measured from the curb line of the lot on which it is located. One ground sign on South 85th East Avenue for Lot 2 is permitted with display surface area and height limits as established for Lots 1 and 3.
  - **Wall Signs:** Wall signs shall not exceed a display surface area of one square foot for each lineal foot of building wall to which it is attached.
  - No signs shall be flashing and illumination shall be by constant light.
  - Signs on Lot 4 shall be in accordance with PUD 179-N-1 as previously approved by the TMAPC.
- 5) That a Detail Landscape Plan for each lot shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval and installed prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The landscaping materials required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continued condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit. Landscaped open space shall include internal and external landscaped open areas, parking lot islands and buffers, but shall exclude pedestrian walkways and parking areas designed solely for circulation.
  - 6) Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
  - 7) That a Detail Site Plan for each lot shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
  - 8) 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.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Final Plat and Release for Tesoro Addition, and the Minor Amendment for PUD 179-C-5 and PUD 179-N-2**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

Southern Pointe (1583)

East 87th Street & South Yale Avenue

(RS-3)

Mr. Wilmoth advised that all release letters had been received, however, a condition was being added that the developer show a 24.75' dedication of the statutory easement on the plat. Mr. Wilmoth stated the developer was in agreement to this condition.

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Final Plat of Southern Pointe and release same as having met all conditions of approval; plus showing the addition of the 24.75' dedication of the statutory easement on the face of the plat.

**CORRECTION TO RECORDED PLAT:**

Heritage Hills III (2502)

NW/c of East Pine & North Greenwood

(RS-3)

The Tulsa Development Authority (TDA), formerly TURA, as developer of this tract has determined that an error exists in the legal description on the recorded plat. Documentation is being prepared by the Engineer and TDA to correct the error and further clarify some previous ownerships within the plat boundary. All release letters were received and the plat was granted final approval and released on 5/20/87, subsequently being filed as Plat #4690. This correction and clarification does not affect the drawing portion of the plat, or any of the required conditions of approval. It is recommended that the correction be approved as requested by TDA. Documentation for signatures will follow.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Correction to the Recorded Plat for Heritage Hills III**, as recommended by Staff and subject to review of the documentation by Legal.

EXTENSION OF APPROVAL:

Coyote Hills (2590, 3091) West 51st Street & South 175th West Avenue (RE)

Hunters Hills (PUD 358)(3483) East 121st Street & South Canton Avenue (RS-1)

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Extension of Approval for Coyote Hills and Reinstatement and Extension of Approval for Hunters Hills**, as recommended by Staff for one year.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-16908 Lashley/Kabrck (2993) East of the NE/c of 44th Pl. & South Columbia

Staff advised that a request had been submitted by the applicant for withdrawal of this application.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Withdrawal Request for L-16908 Lashley/Kabrck**, as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-16939 (1283) Tesoro/Curry	L-16943 (1993) Rogers/Sondel
L-16940 (3602) TDA	L-16944 (1893) Dodson
L-16941 (1293) Lloyd/Keys	

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Above Listed Lot Splits for Ratification of Prior Approval**, as recommended by Staff.

OTHER BUSINESS:

**PUD 362-1:** SE/c and SW/c of East 72nd Street South & South Columbia Place

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment of Setback Requirement

Lots 2 and 3, Block 1, Rockwood Hills Pond Addition are corner lots within a small residential development with an underlying zoning of RS-1. The applicant is requesting a minor amendment of the required 35 foot setback from South Columbia Place to 25 feet. Notice of the proposed amendment has been given to abutting property owners.

It should be noted that the portion of the PUD located on the south side of East 72nd Street is being redesigned due to a 2.4 acre tract abutting the subject tract to the south being included in the development, but not the PUD. Block 1 will now contain 8 lots instead of the previous 7. The proposed development has received both TAC and TMAPC approval for a sketch plat. After review of the applicant's submitted plan, Staff finds the request to be minor in nature and consistent with the original PUD.

Therefore, the Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of minor amendment number PUD 362-1, subject to the following conditions:

1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan originally submitted with the PUD be made a condition of approval unless modified herein.

2) **Development Standards:**

Land Area (Gross)	8.5 acres
Permitted Uses:	Detached single-family & accessory uses
Maximum Number of Lots:	14 + Detention Area
Maximum Building Height:	35'
Minimum Livability Space:	
Total	98,000 sf
Per lot	7,000 sf average
Minimum Lot Width:	100' average
Minimum Lot Area:	13,500 sf average
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from Front Yard	
Right-of-way of Public Street	35' *
C/L of Private Street or Drive	25'
from Drive	35'
from Rear Yard	25'
from Side Yard	
One side	10'
Other side	5'
Minimum Off-Street Parking	2 covered spaces per lot

\* Lots 2 and 3, Block 1, may setback 25 feet from the right-of-way of South Columbia Place.

**PUD 362-1 Minor Amendment - Cont'd**

- 3) That all private streets shall be a minimum of 26 feet in width.
- 4) That signage be consistent with Section 1130.2(b) of the Zoning Code and approved by the TMAPC prior to installation.
- 5) That the approval of a Final Plat can be considered as approval of the Detail Site Plan.
- 6) That a Detail Landscape Plan be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy of any building, including any screening fences or landscaping and the design of an entryway. A 6' screening fence shall be installed along the south side of East 71st Street where residential lots to be developed abut this arterial.
- 7) That a Homeowner Association be established to maintain all common paved streets, open space areas, or other common areas and facilities.
- 8) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code, including the abutting 2.4 acre property to the south, have been satisfied and submitted to 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 the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.
- 9) Covenants should be completely rewritten, submitted to and approved by the TMAPC separating the various components into three sections as follows: I - Dedications for streets, easements, stormwater, etc.; II - PUD restrictions; and III - Private restrictions.
- 10) Subject to review and approval of conditions as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee. Further, no access shall be permitted from PUD 362 to East 71st Street upon completion of South Columbia Place.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment for PUD 362-1**, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PUD 243-5 & PUD 243-6:** NE/c of South Harvard Avenue & East 59th Place South

Staff Recommendation: **Minor Amendment of Rear Yard & Detail Site Plan Requirement, and Detail Site Plan Review**

PUD 243 is a 14 acre development containing 51 lots and an open space reserve area (Lot B) with an underlying zoning of RS-2. The Glenoak Addition is located at the northeast corner of East 59th Place and South Harvard Avenue. The applicant is requesting a minor amendment to eliminate the 20 foot rear yard requirement for those vacant lots that abut Lot B and requesting that the Detail Site Plan requirement be waived for the lots located on the perimeter of the development providing they meet all development standards for PUD 243. The Detail Site Plan requirement for each lot that abuts Lot B will remain in place. In the alternative, the applicant is requesting a minor amendment of the required rear yard for Lots 26, 30 and 32/33 along with Detail Site Plan approval. Notice of the application has been given to property owners within the Glenoak Addition.

Staff can support an amendment from the approved 20 foot minimum rear yard to 10 feet on the lots backing up to Lot B; adequate rear yard building separation, plus common outdoor living space for each dwelling is provided in accordance with the RS-2 District. A minimum 10 foot rear yard would insure construction was off any easements and would allow the maintenance of the dwelling, deck areas and retaining walls while remaining on private property. Proposed construction with rear yards less 10 feet abutting Lot B should continue to be reviewed on an individual basis by the TMAPC as a minor amendment and Detail Site Plan. Staff also supports waiving of the Detail Site Plan review on only those lots which abut South Harvard and meet the PUD Development Standards and contends that this requirement should remain in effect unless abutting other owners outside the Glenoak Addition are given proper notice. Staff further supports the continued requirement for Detail Site Plan review for the interior lots of the development which abut the common open space in Lot B.

Therefore, Staff review of PUD 243-5 and -6 finds that it is minor and recommends **APPROVAL** (in part) of the applicant's request and the submitted Detail Site Plans as follows:

- 1) The minimum rear yard setback for only lots abutting Lot B (being Lots 23-43) be amended from 20' to 10' minimum and the requirement for Detail Site Plan approval remain in effect on said lots.
- 2) That minor amendments and Detail Site Plans for Lots 26, 30, and 32/33 be approved as submitted. The rear yard on Lot 26, 30 and 32/33 is 7', 7'8", and 14' respectively.

- 3) Deletion of the Detail Site Plan requirement only for Lots 44-49 if said lots meet all development standards of PUD 243, and denial of the request to eliminate this requirement on the balance of said exterior lots in the Glenoak Addition. Prior to consideration of any waiver of the Detail Site Plan requirement for Lots 1-22, 50 and 51, notice should be given to abutting property owners outside the Glenoak Addition.

**NOTE:** Except where a zero lot line is indicated on the plat and attached single family residences are built thereon, PUD 243 requires a minimum of 15' separation between residences for side yards.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Carnes stated, in regard to the setbacks, he did not feel comfortable going back and eliminating a requirement of the PUD.

Mr. Roy Johnsen, representing the owners of the undeveloped lots, requested the Commission give consideration to changing some of the requirements applicable to Glenoak. He commented that the plans were initially for attached dwellings, but that concept had changed and the units were now single-family detached. Therefore, the need for review of the requirement for TMAPC approval of Detail Site Plans for every lot in Glenoak. Mr. Johnsen stated agreement with Staff's requirement for Site Plan review of those lots abutting Lot B. However, he did feel that the 10' rear yard requirement was too restrictive, and he suggested a minimum of 5' for those lots abutting the common open space, keep the Site Plan requirement. Mr. Johnsen stated he did not see the need for Site Plan review of those lots maintaining the 20' rear yards.

Mr. Doherty inquired if the applicant would object to a 7' rear yard, and Mr. Johnsen stated agreement to this suggestion. Mr. Doherty commented he had no problem with eliminating Site Plan review on anything on the interior.

Mr. Jim Wells (3404 East 58th Place), a property owner in Glenoaks, stated agreement to Staff's recommendation for a 10' setback line. He commented some consideration should be given to the fact that, when converted from duplexes to single-family units, there were problems regarding placement on lot lines.

Mr. Doherty moved for approval of the setback variance on Lots 26 and 30; approval of Lot 32/33 as submitted; waive Site Plan review on the interior lots abutting Lot B and those lots abutting Harvard Avenue; continue the discussion of the waiver of Detail Site Plan requirement on those lots on the perimeter abutting other properties, subject to notification of those property owners; and a blanket setback variance on those areas abutting Lot B to 7'.

Mr. Carnes agreed with Mr. Wells in that, when conversion from duplex to single-family, each lot becomes a problem. Therefore, he would have difficulty voting for the motion. Mr. Frank pointed out there would still be Site Plan requirements on the lot abutting Lot B. Mr. Doherty amended his motion to withdraw any waiver of Site Plan requirements.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minor Amendment to PUD's 243-5 and 243-6, as follows: approval of the setback variance on Lots 26 and 30; approval of Lot 32/33 as submitted; and a blanket setback variance on those lots abutting Lot B to 7' minimum rear yards.

Mr. Doherty then moved a continuance of any discussion of Detail Site Plan requirements on all lots of the PUD for three weeks. Ms. Wilson concurred as this would allow discussion as to the validity of this being a requirement presently.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **Consideration of PUD 243-5 and PUD 243-6** as relates to discussion of Detail Site Plan requirements on all lots within this PUD until Wednesday, **October 28, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PUD 187-15:** NE/c of East 64th Street and South 73rd East Avenue

**Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Rear Yard**

The subject tract is located at the northeast corner of East 64th Street and South 73rd East Avenue, being Lot 11, Block 6, Shadow Mountain Addition. The applicant is requesting that the rear yard be amended from 20' minimum to 7.5' minimum to permit construction of a one story addition to the existing two story residence. The proposed addition is 12'10" x 27'4" and the rear elevation of the dwelling unit is 73'2" long. The room addition will be finished of the same materials as the existing residence, be a maximum of one story, and Staff notes a 6' screening fence has been installed along the lot boundary by the applicant. Similar amendments have been approved in the Shadow Mountain Addition for residential add-ons. The subject tract is a corner lot and has a 25' minimum building line on the west and south. Minimum requirements for livability space in the RS-3 District will be exceeded by 37%.

**PUD 187-15 Minor Amendment - Cont'd**

Review of PUD 187-15 finds that it is minor. Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** as follows:

- 1) The submitted plot plan be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- 2) Proposed construction be limited to a maximum of one story with the finish of the exterior facade (to include the roof) being of the same materials as the main dwelling unit.
- 3) That a 6' screening fence be maintained by the owner of the subject tract along the north, east, and south boundary of said lot.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment to PUD 187-15**, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PUD 414-3:** North of the NE/c of East 36th Street & South Yorktown Place,  
being Lot 10, Kennebunkport

**Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Rear Yard Setback**

The subject tract is described as Lot 10, Kennebunkport and is located at the north end of the cul-de-sac for South Yorktown Place. The applicant is requesting an amendment from the 20' minimum rear yard setback to 15'. This tract is abutted on the north by a 50' wide Reserve A which is a detention and common open space area maintained by the homeowners association. Lot 10 has a 15' access easement on the west and 6.5' easement on the east.

Notice has been given to abutting property owners on the west and also owners of property north of the Reserve A area. The applicant also indicated he would handcarry notices to said owners. Staff considers this application minor based on the requested 15' rear yard in combination with the 50' wide reserve area, which would provide a 65' separation from properties to the north.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 414-3 subject to the submitted plot plan.

**Comments & Discussion:**

Mr. Doherty obtained clarification of the setbacks along the east side. Ms. Wilson confirmed with Staff and the applicant that the notices had been handcarried, as indicated.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On MOTION of CARNES, the TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to APPROVE the Minor Amendment to PUD 414-3, as recommended by Staff.

PUBLIC HEARING:

TO CONSIDER THE ADOPTION OF THE DIRTY BUTTER CREEK MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA AND THE DISTRICT PLANS FOR DISTRICTS 2, 3, 11 AND 25

Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Dane Matthews reviewed the Staff's recommendation for approval. Ms. Wilson advised the Comprehensive Plan Committee had met and reviewed this MDP and were unanimous in recommending approval. Therefore, she moved for approval of the Dirty Butter Creek Master Drainage Plan, and amendments to the District Plans for Districts 2, 3, 11 and 25, as presented by the Department of Stormwater Management. For the record, there were no interested parties in attendance on this matter.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On MOTION of WILSON, the TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Crawford, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Rice, VanFossen, "absent") to APPROVE the Adoption of the Dirty Butter Master Drainage Plan and Amendments to the District Plans for Districts 2, 3, 11 and 25, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:33 p.m.

Date Approved 10-21-87

Robert J. Paul  
Chairman

ATTEST:

James Robert  
Acting Secretary