

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1708  
Wednesday, **August 10, 1988**, 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	Harris	Frank	Linker, Legal
Coutant, Secretary	Paddock	Gardner	Counsel
Doherty	Randle	Matthews	
Draughon	Woodard	Setters	
Kempe, Chairman			
Parmeale, 1st Vice-Chairman			
Wilson			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, August 9, 1988 at 9:45 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:37 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**Approval of the Minutes of July 27, 1988, Meeting #1706:**

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **4-0-3** (Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "aye"; no "nays"; Coutant, Doherty, Wilson, "abstaining"; Harris, Paddock, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of July 27, 1988, Meeting #1706**.

**REPORTS:**

**Committee Reports:**

Mr. Carnes announced the **Comprehensive Plan Committee** would be meeting next Wednesday, August 17th, upon adjournment of the regular TMAPC meeting.

In Mr. Paddock's absence, Mr. Gardner advised the **Rules & Regulations Committee** would be meeting at noon on August 17th to review the final draft of amendments to the Tulsa City and County Zoning Codes regarding the Manufactured Housing Study and related matters. He also suggested another agenda item be review and discussion of the TMAPC Goals and Objectives for FY 89 and/or a Mission Statement, as requested by the Mayor's office.

**Director's Report:**

Ms. Dane Matthews reviewed the Master Drainage Plan (MDP) Status Report as submitted by the Department of Stormwater Management, and answered questions from the Commission regarding the MDP process. Ms. Wilson suggested a letter of inquiry be sent to Stormwater Management regarding the status of those MDP's specifically listed on the Capital Improvements Program list.

**ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:**

Application No.: **PUD 232-A (Abandonment) and** Present Zoning: RS-3, RM-1  
**Related Z-6198 and PUD 441** Proposed Zoning: CS & RM-1  
Applicant: **Johnsen**  
Location: North side of West Pine Street at North Union Avenue  
Date of Hearing: August 10, 1988  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Roy Johnsen, 324 Main Mall (585-5641)

**NOTE:** PUD 232-A is a request to abandon PUD 232 and retain the underlying RM-1 zoning. Z-6198, if approved, would create a Type I Node (467' x 467') of CS zoning at the northwest and northeast corners of West Pine and North Union.

**Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:**

The District 11 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use and Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested CS District per Z-6198 is in accordance with the Plan Map and Text subject to a PUD, and the existing RM-1 District is a may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

**Staff Recommendation: Z-6198**

**Site Analysis:** PUD 232-A is 13.18 acres in size located at the northwest corner of West Pine Street and North Union Avenue, is partially wooded, steeply sloping, vacant, and has underlying RM-1 zoning.

The subject tracts being considered for CS zoning are located at the northeast and northwest corners of West Pine Street and North Union Avenue, gently sloping, vacant, with the northwest corner being zoned PUD 232-A/RM-1/RS-3 and the northeast corner zoned RM-1.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The subject tracts for PUD 232-A and Z-6198 are abutted on the north by both vacant property and single family dwellings zoned RM-1 and RS-3; on the south across West Pine Street by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3, and on the east and west by vacant property zoned RM-1.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Zoning patterns in this general area include both RM-1 (with and without a PUD), and RS-3.

**Conclusion:** The nodal portions of the subject tracts are planned for Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use subject to a PUD, based on a recent amendment to the District 11 Plan. This amendment also included redesignation and down zoning of the northwest corner of West Pine and the Osage Expressway from medium to low intensity to recognize its public ownership and use as a detention pond (see Z-6199). The request to retain the underlying zoning of RM-1 in conjunction with abandonment of PUD 232 is consistent with zoning patterns in this immediate area.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of abandonment of PUD 232-A while retaining the underlying RS-3 and RM-1 zoning, and approval of Z-6198 for a Type I (467' x 467') medium intensity node at the northeast and northwest corners of West Pine and North Union.

**Staff Recommendation: PUD 441**

The subject tract is located at the northeast corner of West Pine Street and North Union and is presently zoned RM-1. A CS zoning application (Z-6198) is pending at this location. Z-6198 also includes the northwest corner of this intersection. Staff has expressed support of Z-6198 per the Comprehensive Plan for District 11 which states:

- 4.4.1.2.5 The medium intensity designations at the northeast and northwest corners of West Pine and Union should be limited to ten acres (one 5-acre node at each corner).
- 4.4.1.2.6 Before release of any subdivision plats or building permits for the nodes at the northeast and northwest corners of West Pine and Union, a PUD shall be filed and approved. Uses permitted in the PUD should be limited to neighborhood-serving office and retail.
- 4.4.1.2.7 At such time as the West Pine/Union nodes are rezoned to a Medium Intensity classification, the CS-zoned property at the intersection of the Osage Expressway and West Pine should be down zoned to an R or an AG classification.

PUD 441 has approximately 365' of frontage on North Union and 1,135' of frontage along West Pine. The west Pine frontage is across from four blocks developed basically as single-family detached residential uses which mostly side into Pine Street. Two of the eight lots to the south of Pine across from PUD 441 are vacant. The topography of the subject tract causes it to be considerably higher than areas to the north (which are vacant) and residentially developed lots south of Pine.

The applicant has proposed a total of 47,510 square feet of floor area to be divided as follows: retail - 36,400 square feet; restaurant - 8,950 square feet; and convenience store - 2,160 square feet. The restaurant sites are located at the northwest corner of PUD 441 and also at the

extreme eastern boundary on Pine. Proposed uses per PUD 441 include CS uses permitted by right and special exception, including a restaurant with accessory bar, but excluding taverns, bars, and night club, sexually oriented business, automotive sales and repairs, and blood plasma donor establishments. The list of remaining uses permitted by right and special exception in a CS district would still include numerous other uses and even use units which are not of a neighborhood-serving office and retail nature. Staff recommends, at a minimum, that no special exception uses be permitted in PUD 441 as requested in the PUD Text.

Land use relationships and arrangement of proposed commercial uses as they relate to existing and planned residential uses is of concern to Staff. The pattern of CS zoning per Z-6195 is likely to have a frontage along Pine of approximately 560'. PUD 441, as proposed, would spread medium intensity uses more than 1,100' along Pine which Staff considers excessive. It would appear more logical to limit the commercial uses to only those areas west of the intersection of Santa Fe and Pine, with the balance of PUD 441 to be either light office uses or multifamily uses. The underlying zoning of this entire tract is presently RM-1. Further, it is suggested that the proposed 15' landscape buffer along Pine and Union also be required along any boundary of PUD 441 which is contiguous with a residentially zoned area and that the building setback along the north boundary be increased from 30' to 50'. It would appear that the PUD is oriented to Pine on the south and therefore the treatment of the north building facades of PUD 441 should be compatible with the front elevations and addressed in building elevations to be included with the Site Plan.

Staff would be supportive of PUD 441 based on the redesigns noted above and consider that based on that redesign it would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas; a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site and; consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 441 subject to the following conditions, which reflect amended standards as approved by the TMAPC during this public hearing (see Applicant's Comments & TMAPC Review):

1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be redesigned as modified herein.

2) **Development Standards:**

Land Area (Gross):	443,005 sf	10.33 acres
(Net):	331,927 sf	7.78 acres

Permitted Uses: As permitted by right in a CS District including restaurants, but excluding taverns, bars, dance halls and night clubs, and sexually-oriented businesses; also Use Unit 5 as it relates to an art gallery, children's nursery, church, cultural facility not elsewhere classified, library and private club or lodge, but excluding all other uses; and

Permitted Uses Cont'd: Use Unit 16 only for gasoline sales and a one bay car wash associated with convenience operations; and  
Use Unit 19 as it relates to billiard parlors, health club, slot car track and video games, but excluding all other uses; all subject to minor amendment and detail site plan review.

Maximum Building Height: 16' - 1 story or 35' if developed as apartments  
Maximum Building Floor Area: 47,510 sf commercial and office  
Minimum Off-Street Parking: As required by the applicable Use Units  
Minimum Building Setbacks:  
from Centerline of Pine 100'  
from Centerline of Union 100'  
from North Boundary 30'  
Minimum Landscaped Open Space: 10% of net area excluding landscaped right-of-way\*

\* 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.

3) That all trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view. A minimum 6' screening and/or decorative fencing shall be installed along all common boundaries between non-residential uses in PUD 441 and abutting residential areas. (Does not require screening fence on Union.)

4) That all parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas. No parking lot lighting standard shall exceed 8' in height within 50' of the north boundary.

5) 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 as follows:

**Ground Signs:** Ground signs other than monument signs shall be limited to two signs on Pine identifying the project and/or tenants therein, and each not exceeding 16' in height nor 180 square feet in display surface area. Other ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign for each building, not exceeding 8' in height nor 64 square feet in surface area.

**Wall or Canopy Signs:** The aggregate display surface area of the wall or canopy signs shall be limited to 1.5 square feet per each lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed. Wall or canopy signs shall not exceed the height of the building.

No portable or temporary signs are permitted, nor shall any flashing, animated or intermittently lighted signs be permitted.

- 6) That a Detail Landscape Plan 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. A landscaped area of not less than 10' wide shall be provided along Pine and Union, and 10' along the north boundary. Street frontage landscaping shall include berming or other decorative fencing as specified in the original PUD 441 Text, including planned setbacks for parking areas along West Pine.
- 7) Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
- 8) That a Detail Site Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit and shall include elevations of all building facades, and in particular the north building facade which shall be designed to be compatible with Pine and Union building facades.
- 9) 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 the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.
- 10) Existing site elevations, which are substantially above the grade of existing streets, and vacant residentially zoned areas to the north, shall be lowered with topographic relationships of final grades and building elevations shown as a part of the Detail Site Plan to properly evaluate land use relationships.
- 11) The applicant shall construct a sidewalk parallel to Union, subject to review by the City of Tulsa.

**Note:** The following was previously condition #11, and was deleted per TMAPC action. It remains in these minutes for reference purposes only: Phased development is permitted and actual floor area allocations may be made on a lot-by-lot basis, if needed, by a minor amendment with proper notice given to abutting owners and interested parties speaking of record during the review and approval process for PUD 441.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Johnsen stated he had a number of areas where he was not in agreement with the Staff recommendation. He reviewed the history of the Pine and Union area as to the PUD abandonment, rezoning, submission of a new PUD by the Gilcrease Hills Development Company, and their dedication of land for detention purposes.

Mr. Johnsen advised the applicant wished to amend the rezoning application to delete the northwest corner, which was previously under application for CS along with the northeast corner of Pine and Union. Further, the applicant also wished to withdraw the concurrent application for abandonment (PUD 232-A). Therefore, the tract will on the northwest corner of Pine and Union would remain unchanged.

Mr. Johnsen proceeded with the requested CS rezoning for the northeast corner, currently zoned RM-1, along with the submitted PUD 441. He pointed out that the area abutting the subject tract to the north was also owned by the Gilcrease Hills Development Company, and the area to the east was given to the City for a detention pond. Mr. Johnsen presented their concept plan which included development on the east and west sides of Santa Fe, and advised the applicant has committed to single-family/duplex lotting to the north; 10' width landscaped area to the north with the customary screening requirements; landscaped/bermed areas along the frontages of both Union and Pine; and imposed sign and use restrictions. He added that some of the commitments and restrictions in the concept plan came about through meetings with the neighborhood residents.

Mr. Johnsen stated he felt the Staff recommendation was unduly restrictive considering the circumstances existing with this property; i.e., the applicant owned the abutting properties and had dedicated the detention area at the east end of the tract which abutted an expressway. In regard to intensity, Mr. Johnsen commented that the PUD was very low in overall floor area, and as this was not a typical situation of being able to progress from commercial to multifamily and then single-family due to the mentioned detention area and expressway. Therefore, he did not feel cutting off the commercial at Santa Fe, as suggested by Staff, offered a meaningful opportunity to utilize the tract due to these physical facts, and this was the applicant's main objection or concern with Staff's recommendation. Mr. Johnsen advised that when the proposal to extend commercial across Santa Fe was presented to the district planning team, there was no opposition.

In regard to Staff's suggested 50' building setback from the north boundary, Mr. Johnsen stated that he did not see the reason for such a restriction due to the narrowness of the lot, nor could he see what might be achieved having a greater amount of parking on the north or backside of the buildings. Therefore, he suggested a 30' setback as a more realistic distance. Mr. Johnsen also suggested that condition #6 be revised to reflect a 10' landscaped area on the north boundary instead of 15', as he could not recall a standard that would dictate requiring 15'. He pointed out that the applicant had committed to a generous amount of landscaping on the frontage.

Mr. Johnsen advised that a correction was needed, by way of this record, to the land area figures. He explained that the legal description was originally filed with 10.17 acres gross and 7.62 acres net. However, the concept plan was drawn on 10.33 acres gross, and 7.78 acres net, and the application needed to be amended to reflect the correct figures.

In regard to the suggested Use Units under the Permitted Uses, Mr. Johnsen requested that gasoline service stations not be excluded under Use Unit 16. Mr. Gardner advised it was not Staff's intent to exclude gasoline sales or a one bay car wash with a convenience store. Mr. Johnsen inquired as to the other Use Units being excluded, as there were some uses that might be compatible to this PUD. Therefore, in order to prevent having to come back at a later date with a major amendment, he requested consideration be given to certain uses under Use Unit 5, 16 and 19 at this time. Mr. Johnsen requested that the PUD standards be written in a fashion so that if any of those use units permitted by right in a CS district occurred, that it be permitted by way of minor amendment and detail site plan review. Discussion followed among Staff, Commission and Legal as to this proposal.

In regard to condition #3 relating to screening/fencing on all common boundaries, Mr. Johnsen explained the applicant would be placing a screening fence on the north boundary and berming along Pine and Union to the south. In reply to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Johnsen commented the applicant had no objection to screening on the abutting single-family lots to the east. Discussion continued as to screening within the PUD.

Mr. Johnsen questioned the necessity of condition #11 requiring a minor amendment for floor area allocations. After further discussion, Mr. Johnsen stated that the applicant's PUD text contained language stating, "an allocation of floor area to each lot shall be made at the time of platting if the property is platted into more than one lot; and at the time of the first conveyance of any parcel not constituting an entire lot, an allocation of floor area to each resulting parcel shall be made." Therefore, the covenants would be so written that if there was a conveyance, there must be an allocation of floor area approved by the TMAPC, and no one would buy without knowing what the allocation was to be.

Mr. Johnsen advised that a copy of the applicant's PUD text for this concept plan was supplied to the Gilcrease Hill Homeowner's Association. Mr. Johnsen further stated that an interested party at the previous hearing, Mr. Curt Proud, had authorized him to convey his support of the project. Mr. Johnsen stated that Mr. Proud had indicated he would like to have notice at the time of Detail Site Plan review, and he requested the traffic circulation system of the project be reviewed at the time of platting. Mr. Johnsen commented on his meetings with the homeowners association.

Interested Parties:

**Mr. Larry Duke** (1919 West Seminole), General Manager of the Gilcrease Hills Homeowner's Association, spoke in favor of the applicant's proposal. Mr. Duke submitted a letter from the Association's board supporting the rezoning and PUD. He mentioned the positive efforts extended by the applicant to work with the neighborhood, and he encouraged the TMAPC to support the rezoning as it would benefit the community.

Ms. Kathy Hinkle (1730 West Virgin), Chairman of District 11, commented there were several meetings with the residents and the Homeowners Association members as to the covenants. She stated that although there was not unanimous support, the consensus of the residents was in support of the proposal. She added that some residents south of the Pine and Union intersection expressed they preferred this area not be developed at all.

Mr. Johnsen asked that the record reflect that the applicant agreed to construct a sidewalk along the west boundary of the project parallel to Union Avenue, if permitted by the City of Tulsa.

TMAPC Review Session:

Mr. Carnes commented that the type of configuration proposed has been very successful in metropolitan areas such as Chicago and Dallas. Therefore, he moved to approve applicant's amended zoning request and the PUD configuration as proposed in the concept plan, which deleted any reference to the centerline of Santa Fe.

In response to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Gardner stated that Staff never questioned the 47,000 square feet, only how far it would be spread. Mr. Gardner acknowledged this was a unique situation as this was not a typical node. He agreed that the TMAPC had to look at the physical facts and consider the Planning Teams statements.

Mr. Gardner pointed out that the Staff recommendation recognized the pattern of the underlying CS zoning would have a frontage along Pine of approximately 560'. He suggested addressing the zoning issue first with proper wording to address the five acres on the northeast corner, and then proceed with with a motion for the PUD standards. Therefore, Mr. Carnes withdrew his motion.

Mr. Doherty moved approval of the zoning request for five acres to run from Union as far east as five acres would take if given the north boundary as the boundary shown in the PUD 441 Concept Plan.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, Parmele, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6198 Johnsen** for five acres of CS zoning on the northeast corner of Pine and Union, as indicated in the Concept Plan for PUD 441.

Legal Description: Z-6198

CS Zoning: The west 560.0' of a tract described as follows: A tract of land in the N/2 of the SE/4 of Section 27, T-20-N, R-12-E, Osage County, State of Oklahoma, being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: BEGINNING at the southwest corner of the N/2 of the SE/4 of said Section 27; thence S 88°44'06" E along the south line a distance of 1,188.83' to a point; thence N 01°15'54"E a distance of 100.81' to a point; thence N 00°23'24" E a distance of 88.80' to a point; thence S 88°44'06" E a distance of 112.09' to a point; said point being the southwest corner of Lot 5, Block 21 of GILCREASE HILLS VILLAGE II, a Subdivision of Part of the E/2 of Section 27, T-20-N, R-12-E, Osage County, Oklahoma; thence N 19°41'19" W a distance of 133.62' to the northwest corner of said Lot 5; thence S 82°16'35" W a distance of 128.85' to a point; thence N 84°18'00" W a distance of 374.22' to a point; thence N 64°34'06" W a distance of 173.23' to a point; thence N 88°48'01" W a distance of 325.25' to a point; thence N 65°58'38" W a distance of 189.93' to a point; thence N 89°35'54" W a distance of 100.0' to a point on the westerly line of the N/2 of the SE/4 of said Section 27; thence S 00°24'06" W along said westerly line a distance of 465.76' to the POB.

Mr. Carnes moved to approve PUD 441 with the boundaries and square footages as indicated on the applicant's submitted Concept Plan. Mr. Doherty commented that the issue of the permitted use units should be resolved before voting on the motion. Discussion followed with a review of each permitted use under Use Units 5, 16 and 19.

On motion of Mr. Doherty, the TMAPC voted unanimously to amend the main motion regarding permitted uses under Use Units 5, 16 and 19, as follows: Use Unit 5 as it relates to an art gallery, children's nursery, church, cultural facility not elsewhere classified, library and private club or lodge, excluding all other uses; Use Unit 16 only for gasoline sales and a one bay car wash associated with convenience operations; and Use Unit 19 as it relates to billiard parlors, health club, slot car track and video games, and excluding all other uses; all subject to minor amendment and detail site plan review.

In regard to the applicant's request to amend the north boundary setback from 50' to 30', Mr. Gardner commented Staff's thinking was that the additional 20' would allow an area for employee parking. He acknowledged the applicant owned the abutting lots and this was a consideration for the Commission. Some Commission members remarked on the changing trend to move employee parking to the front of a commercial center for safety purposes.

On motion of Mr. Doherty, the TMAPC voted unanimously to amend the main motion to add a condition indicating the applicant's willingness to install sidewalks parallel to Union.

Mr. Doherty confirmed that original motion was for the application as presented, which included the 30' setback from the north boundary and the 10' landscape area on Pine, Union and the north boundary.

On motion of Mr. Doherty, the TMAPC voted unanimously to amend the main motion to include all of Staff recommendations not previously discussed with the exception of condition #11. Chairman Kempe, upon suggestion from Mr. Gardner, directed that notice be given to the interested parties of record, as condition #11 which dealt with notification was to be stricken.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, Parmele, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD 441 Johnsen**, as amended and reflected in these minutes.

**Legal Description: PUD 441**

A tract of land in the N/2 of the SE/4 of Section 27, T-20-N, R-12-E, Osage County, State of Oklahoma, being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: BEGINNING at the southwest corner of the N/2 of the SE/4 of said Section 27; thence S 88°44'06" E along the south line a distance of 1,188.83' to a point; thence N 01°15'54" E a distance of 100.81' to a point; thence N 00°23'24" E a distance of 88.80' to a point; thence S 88°44'06" E a distance of 112.09' to a point; said point being the southwest corner of Lot 5, Block 21 of GILCREASE HILLS VILLAGE II, a Subdivision of Part of the E/2 of Section 27, T-20-N, R-12-E, Osage County, Oklahoma; thence N 19°41'19" W a distance of 133.62' to the northwest corner of said Lot 5; thence S 82°16'35" W a distance of 128.85' to a point; thence N 84°18'00" W a distance of 374.22' to a point; thence N 64°34'06" W a distance of 173.23' to a point; thence N 88°48'01" W a distance of 325.25' to a point; thence N 65°58'38" W a distance of 189.93' to a point; thence N 89°35'54" W a distance of 100.0' to a point on the westerly line of the N/2 of the SE/4 of said Section 27; thence S 00°24'06" W along said westerly line a distance of 465.76' to the POB, and containing 450,108.14 square feet or 10.333 acres, more or less.

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: Z-6199 Present Zoning: CS  
Applicant: INCOG Proposed Zoning: RS-3  
Location: West side of the Osage Expressway at West Pine Street  
Date of Hearing: August 10, 1988  
Presentation to TMAPC by: INCOG Staff, 201 West 5th, #600 (584-7526)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 11 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use and Development Sensitive.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested RS-3 District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately 13.7 acres in size and located on the west side of the Osage Expressway at West Pine Street. It is nonwooded, gently sloping, vacant, and is zoned CS.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north and west by vacant property zoned RM-1; on the east across the Osage Expressway by single-family dwellings, zoned RS-3 and RM-1; and on the south by single-family dwellings, zoned RS-3.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Zoning for the subject tract was established by study map in 1970.

**Conclusion:** Z-6199 is a housekeeping application stemming from property donated to the City for a stormwater detention area. In order to clean up the official zoning maps, Staff supports the downzoning from CS to RS-3. Since the property will not be used for commercial purposes it is desirable to rezone the property to a designation more consistent with neighboring properties to the south.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of RS-3 zoning, based on the zoning and land use to the south.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Doherty commented this was an example of an area where some type of zoning for green belt space other than AG or RS-3 might be applicable. He suggested some type of "conservation" category that would preserve the space since structures could never be built on the tract.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **DRAUGHON**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, Parmele, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6199 INCOG**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description: Z-6199

A tract of land situated in the NE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 27, together with a part of Lot 3, Section 26 (which Lot 3 is sometimes described as being a part of Section 27), all in T-20-N, R-12-E of the IBM, Osage County, Oklahoma, being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: The south 700' of the east 650' of said NE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 27; the southeast diagonal half of the west 350' of the east 1,000' of the south 100'; and the north 620' of the south 700' of said Lot 3, Section 26 which Lot 3 is sometimes described as being a part of Section 27).

OTHER BUSINESS:

**PUD 267-5: Minor Amendment for a Sign**  
SE/c of East 101st Street & South Sheridan

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 267-5** until Wednesday, September 7, 1988 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

Date Approved August 24, 1988  
Cheryl Kempe  
Chairman

ATTEST:

Kevin C. Coutant  
Secretary

