

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1736
Wednesday, **March 8, 1989**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

| MEMBERS PRESENT | MEMBERS ABSENT | STAFF PRESENT | OTHERS PRESENT |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Carnes | Kempe | Brierre | Linker, Legal |
| Coutant, Secretary | Randle | Gardner | Counsel |
| Doherty | Wilson | Kane | |
| Draughon | | Setters | |
| Paddock, 2nd Vice Chairman | | Stump | |
| Parmele, 1st Vice Chairman | | | |
| Rice, County Designee | | | |
| Woodard | | | |

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, March 7, 1989 at 11:20 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of February 22, 1989, Meeting #1734:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Draughon, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of February 22, 1989, Meeting #1734.**

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Paddock announced the INCOG Staff would conduct a briefing on the Infill Development Study to the TMAPC and BOA members on Wednesday, March 15th, upon adjournment of the regular TMAPC meeting that date.

Mr. Parmele reminded the Commissioners of the Budget & Work Program Committee's work session to begin review of the FY 89-90 TMAPC work program with the INCOG Staff and TMAPC members on Thursday evening, March 9th.

Director's Report:

--- BRIEFING ---

**Proposed Creek Bypass (formerly called the South Tulsa Bypass)
by representatives of the Oklahoma Turnpike Authority**

Mr. Tom Kane, INCOG, introduced the speakers from the Oklahoma Turnpike Authority (OTA): Dewey Bartlett, Jr., representing Tulsa and District 4, and Mr. Richard Ridings, Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. Bartlett spoke on advantages to the City of Tulsa supporting the turnpike as the tax monies from the turnpike would be used for construction costs, upkeep and maintenance of the turnpike, and Highway Patrol services. He updated the Commissioners on the recent bond issue sale. In regard to the route selection for the bypass, Mr. Bartlett advised that eleven route alternatives were evaluated and compared for construction costs, traffic generation, etc. He stated the 96th route was "the most utilized route of the eleven routes studied". Further, the costs involved for the 96th Street route were approximately equal to that for either the 111th Street or 121st Street alternatives. Mr. Bartlett commented that the OTA was very aware of the property owners concerns and they would be conducting a series of meetings to address these concerns. He advised of an upcoming meeting with representatives of the Mayor's Ad Hoc Committee and members of the Tulsa Trails to discuss proposals for a trail system in conjunction with the bypass.

Mr. Bartlett reviewed the proposal for connecting with the Mingo Valley Expressway, as well as future plans for connecting with the turnpike gates east and west of the City. In regard to environmental considerations, he advised that the engineers for this project were very experienced in urban expressway construction, and had recently finished a similar turnpike in North Dallas. Further, the engineers would be following the federal guidelines in regard to sound and air pollution. Mr. Bartlett reiterated the intent to work closely with, and include in the process, the Mayor's Ad Hoc Committee and the appropriate neighborhood association representatives.

In regard to the toll plaza, Mr. Bartlett advised that it was not true that this would be 14 lanes wide. He stated that, although the exact amount of lanes had not yet been determined, six to ten lanes was a more realistic figure. Also, the exact location of the toll plaza was yet to be determined, and the OTA was exploring the possibility of locating this farther east. Mr. Bartlett remarked that one problem he had observed during this process, and a bit of advice he might be able to pass on, involved the city's inability to acquire the appropriate right-of-way where the loops around the City were located. The sooner this could be remedied, the better.

BRIEFING: Creek Bypass - Cont

Mr. Richard Ridings briefed the TMAPC on the construction process and gave a project overview regarding the status of the functional plans. He stated OTA should have some purchases and some of the negotiated sales completed within six weeks. Mr. Ridings pointed out the bypass, formerly referred to as the South Tulsa Bypass, was now called the Creek Bypass. He advised that, as a part of the bond agreement, OTA agreed to have the bypass substantially complete by December 31, 1991; and totally completed and open to traffic no later than June 1992. Mr. Ridings echoed comments by Mr. Bartlett that OTA, as directed by the Governor, does intend to work to make the design process environmentally sensitive and protect the scenic vistas along the turnpike. Mr. Ridings reviewed the construction costs presented in the brochure distributed to the TMAPC, INCOG staff and interested parties in attendance. Mr. Ridings then opened the briefing for questions from the TMAPC members.

Mr. Paddock asked if the OTA presently incorporated into their designs any allowance for eventual widening of bridges/overpasses on existing arterials, specifically Yale and Sheridan Avenues, in order to avoid additional costs to the taxpayers in the future. Mr. Ridings answered the present designs for overpasses were based on the existing conditions. He added that the OTA has approached the cities involved, as well as the state where state projects were involved, to request that the opportunity for future widening be reviewed instead of spending funds later. He commented that it may be timely to do this with the City of Tulsa since a bond election in the near future was a consideration.

Mr. Paddock inquired as to reasons why the OTA proposed to move the alignment recommended by the TMAPC further to the south rather than to the north (between Yale and Sheridan). Mr. Ridings stated the current alignment would abut the existing property lines. He recalled there was a plan calling for a proposed linear park to be constructed between the highway and the adjacent residences. He stated OTA has met with groups concerning this situation and have offered, if they are willing to look at opportunities, to let them participate in the construction if they care to assist in the acquisition of additional right-of-way or additional parks. Mr. Ridings added that OTA tries to minimize the overall construction costs, as well as operation and maintenance costs, and their job assignment was to complete the facility in a timely fashion so as to maximize revenues and minimize overall costs. However, OTA was not prohibited from participating with cities, states and other agencies in trying to enhance the overall system, and the OTA has offered to consider participation, trades, etc. in trying to maximize the overall linear park/jogging trail proposal. In this regard, Mr. Paddock asked if the linear park and trails would be within the right-of-way to be acquired by the OTA. Mr. Ridings replied it was not currently planned for the OTA to acquire the right-of-way since funds do not exist for this acquisition. However, the possibility existed for these plans to still be developed through a participatory process between OTA, the City of Tulsa, and other agencies wishing to participate.

BRIEFING: Creek Bypass - Cont

With respect to Hunter Park, Mr. Paddock verified that the OTA planned to acquire about six acres in the right-of-way, and he then asked if the State would be giving back six acres for this acreage taken for the toll road. Mr. Ridings answered that discussions have begun with the City as the current proposal stipulates that, if this property was acquired, the OTA would pay the City for that property. He added that the City may decide to acquire additional right-of-way along the south side of the turnpike and participate in some of the construction, if they so desire. He reiterated that the OTA intended to pay fair market value for that property.

In response to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Ridings advised the right-of-way varied between 200' and 300' coming into Sheridan, depending on the amount of cut; (i.e., the deeper the depression of the roadway), the wider the right-of-way would need to be. He added that the OTA did not acquire any more right-of-way with turnpike funds than necessary to complete the project.

In order to provide some background and explain the directness of the questions from the TMAPC, Mr. Doherty commented that a concern of the TMAPC was, at the time of the initial hearings on this matter, and continued to be, that proper land use and planning in this area be accommodated in the interest of all of the city. Further, many of the TMAPC members felt, and feel, the bypass would be acceptable so long as the impact on the surrounding community was minimized. He added the TMAPC had reaffirmed the alignment with this thought in mind, and was very careful to include in all the TMAPC deliberations and recommendations that a true linear park, not just a jogging trail, be included not only as a buffer, but as an amenity to soften the impact of the bypass. Mr. Doherty stated that, in looking at the OTA's proposal, there was nothing to accommodate in any way, shape or form a linear park. He added that, considering the short six week response time for a municipality to present a proposal, it would appear the OTA was eliminating, for all time, the possibility for that linear park. Mr. Doherty remarked that the OTA came into an alignment that was on the plans, examined it and found it to have merit in terms of traffic capacity, but at the same time for economic necessity, the OTA discarded a significant aspect of the plan. Therefore, a concern of his and others on the TMAPC, was that an important part of the plan they had recommended was not included.

More directly, Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Ridings if, within the next six weeks, the OTA was going to eliminate the linear park from the turnpike with their current functional plan. Mr. Ridings stated the OTA had no provisions in the current budget for a linear park or jogging trail. He stated the OTA had made offers and provisions if the City and/or the Parks Board cared to participate in the project, and he felt time existed for this to be considered. Mr. Doherty stated he understood the economic necessity and responsibility to the bond holders to not expend extra

BRIEFING: Creek Bypass - Cont

funds; however, his concern remained with the fact that six weeks was not enough time for a municipality to respond to a problem such as this. Mr. Doherty asked if there was any way the functional plans could include a provision for this matter, regardless of who might "pick up the tab". Mr. Ridings replied that the functional plan could include this as an alternative. Mr. Doherty requested that the engineers be asked to provide this alternative. Mr. Ridings stated he would take care of this request. Mr. Bartlett reiterated that the OTA would soon be meeting with various representatives of the City, and that the six week period offered time to consider this. He added that he felt this could be approached as a partnership with the City of Tulsa, INCOG, the Parks Department, etc., and that a workable compromise could be reached, as it was not the OTA's intent to "shut the door"; however, the OTA had budget constraints. He stated that they would make allowances for alternative plans and wanted to work to come up with a consensus that would be acceptable to all parties.

Mr. Draughon stated the OTA proposed a design to accommodate a 50 year frequency flood in their plans. He pointed out that the City's Department of Stormwater Management (DSM) used the 100 year frequency flood for planning and development, and he asked if the OTA's engineers could design the bypass to these same standards in order to control run-off from the elevated portions of the bypass. Mr. Ridings replied that, to the best of his knowledge, no final plans have been reached with regard to pavement type, drainage, etc. He assured the TMAPC that OTA would construct to the highest standards possible within the constraints of their budget. Mr. Draughon inquired as to who would be making the final decision on the 50 year versus 100 year flood criteria. Mr. Ridings stated the ultimate decision on the design would rest with the OTA. Mr. Parmele advised Mr. Ridings that a homeowner had previously spoken to the TMAPC on this issue, and it was his understanding the bypass was being designed on a 50 year frequency flood, while all the other arterials in Tulsa and the Major Street and Highway Plan were based on a 100 year frequency flood. Mr. Ridings repeated that he had not been approached with a final design decision on this matter.

In reply to Mr. Carnes, Mr. Ridings stated the final alignment of the route from Memorial Drive to Highway 169 should be completed within the next week. Mr. Carnes then inquired as to the anticipated dates for the other turnpikes shown on the OTA maps (extensions to the Turner and Will Rogers Turnpikes). Mr. Ridings stated the OTA studies indicated that these were currently not financially feasible. However, depending on traffic growth, these future turnpikes could be brought forward at any time. He advised the OTA was experiencing a 7% average annual increase on the state roadways, which compared to a national average of less than 4%. Mr. Ridings indicated that, if this type of growth continued in the state, then it would not be unreasonable to see this brought forward for additional studies within the next ten years.

BRIEFING: Creek Bypass - Cont

Mr. Paddock commented that, since it seemed OTA would be spending so much money, it would be a good idea and a great cost savings to take care of flooding issues and anticipated widening of arterials at this time by heeding the advise of the DSM consultants, Traffic Engineers, etc.

Mr. Parmele thanked Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Ridings for making themselves available to answer questions from the TMAPC members. He added that, after hours and hours of public hearings, some of the questions raised were not only their concerns, but concerns raised by interested parties at the TMAPC public hearings.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|-----------|
| Application No.: | PUD 448 | Present Zoning: | CS, RM-1 |
| Applicant: | Norman (Carroll) | Proposed Zoning: | Unchanged |
| Location: | NE/c of 91st Street & Memorial Drive | | |
| Date of Hearing: | March 8, 1989 | | |
| Presentation to TMAPC by: | Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571) | | |

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract contains approximately 32 acres and is located at the northeast corner of East 91st Street South and South Memorial Drive. The tract has approximately 1100' of frontage on the east side of Memorial Drive and 1,260' of frontage on the north side of 91st Street. Ten acres of the tract at the intersection of Memorial Drive and 91st Street is zoned CS, the remainder is zoned RM-1. The tract currently contains a residence and farm out buildings. The northeast corner of the property is within the 100 year floodplain.

The property to the north of the PUD is zoned RM-1 and PUD 396 which proposes an office building complex which has not been built. Immediately south of the tract the land is zoned CO and is vacant except for a Texaco station on the corner. Across 91st Street at the southeast corner of the PUD is Oak Leaf subdivision zoned RS-3 with perhaps half of its lots containing houses. The lots immediately across 91st Street from the PUD are vacant. The property to the east is zoned AG and is vacant. Across Memorial to the west is PUD 360 which is zoned CS and RM-0 and is planned to be a shopping center. At the northwest corner of the property is an Oklahoma Natural Gas pumping station zoned AG. At the southwest corner of 91st Street and Memorial Drive is Joe Marina Motors which is zoned CS and is part of PUD 406.

PUD 448 Norman (Carroll) - Cont

The applicant's proposal is composed of two development areas:

| | |
|--------|---------------------------------------|
| Area A | Shopping Center (21.03 acres) |
| Area B | Multifamily Residential (10.73 acres) |

Access to Development Area A will be from both Memorial Drive and 91st Street. The main entrance on Memorial Drive will be at an existing break in the median. Access to Development Area B would be from one entrance on 91st Street with an emergency access point provided from the truck and service drive to the rear of the retail buildings in Development Area A.

After review of PUD 448, Staff finds the uses and intensities proposed to be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code. Based upon the following conditions, Staff finds that PUD 448 is: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site and; (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 448 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- 2) **Development Standards:**

Development Area A

| | | |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Land Area (Gross): | 23.92 acres | 1,041,932 sf |
| (Net): | 21.03 acres | 915,835 sf |

Permitted Uses: Use Units 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16; business signs, retail sales and installation of automotive equipment and accessories such as lubricants, tires, parts, batteries and the performing of minor automobile repairs not to include engine overhauls, body work or painting, and accessory uses allowed by right in the CS District.

Maximum Building Floor Area: 217,800 sf

Maximum Building Height: 35'

Off-Street Parking: As required by the applicable Use Unit in the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

Minimum Building Setbacks:

| | |
|--|------|
| from the Memorial Drive R/W: | |
| Buildings > 450' north of 91st Street R/W | 100' |
| Buildings < 450' north of 91st Street R/W: | 50' |
| from the 91st Street R/W: | |
| Buildings > 200' east of Memorial Drive R/W | 90' |
| Buildings < 200' east of Memorial Drive R/W | 50' |
| from the Internal boundary of Area B | 35' |
| from the north boundary of Area A | 75' |

Landscaped Area:

A minimum of 7% * of the net land area shall be improved as internal landscaped open space which shall include at least a 10' wide landscaped area (outside the right-of-way) along both street frontages. In addition, at least a 25' wide landscaped area along the north boundary of the development area will be provided and planted with trees spaced a maximum of 35' apart which will grow to a mature height of at least 50'. If Development Area A is subdivided each lot shall have a minimum of ^{10%}~~7%~~ internal landscaped open space.

* Amended from 10% by the TMAPC; and the requirement, "landscaped and irrigated parking islands shall be provided" was also deleted. See TMAPC Review Session.

Internal landscaped open space includes landscaped areas outside of street rights-of-way, landscaped parking islands, landscaped yards and plazas and pedestrian areas but does not include any parking, building, or driveway areas.

Signs:

Ground Signs: Shall be limited to one for each arterial street frontage with a maximum of 280 square feet of display surface area and 25' in height, except that within 200' of the southern boundary of the PUD one additional ground sign may be placed on the Memorial Drive frontage with a maximum display area of 160 square feet and height of 25'.

Wall Signs: Shall be permitted not to exceed 2.0 square feet of display surface area per linear foot of building wall to which attached except only 1.5 square feet of display surface area per linear foot of building wall within 100' of an arterial street. The length of a tenant wall sign shall not exceed 75% of the frontage of the tenant space.

No wall signs shall be permitted to face in a northerly direction within 300' of the north boundary of the development area, nor in an easterly direction within the east 400' of the development area.

Internal directional signs shall be limited to 10 square feet of display surface area and 8' in height.

One monument sign shall be permitted at each arterial street entry, with a maximum of 60 square feet of display surface area and 6' in height.

Lighting:

Light standards shall be equipped with deflectors directing the light downward and away from residential areas and the street curb lines adjacent to Area A. Building mounted lights shall be hooded and directed downward to prevent spill-over lighting into residential areas.

Required Screening:

A screening fence shall be provided along the northern boundary of the development area to within 75' of the right-of-way of Memorial Drive. A screening fence shall be provided along the boundary with Development Area B when development occurs in Development Area B.

Development Area B

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|------------|
| Land Area (Gross): | 11.05 acres | 481,423 sf |
| (Net): | 10.73 acres | 467,262 sf |
| Permitted Uses: | Use Units 7, 7a, and 8 and accessory uses allowed by right in the RM-1 District and stormwater detention and drainage facilities serving Development Areas A and B. | |
| Maximum Number of DU's: | 282 | |
| Maximum Building Height: | 39' [Amended from 35' by TMAPC] | |
| Off-Street Parking: | As required by the applicable Use Unit of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code. | |
| Minimum Building Setbacks: | | |
| from 91st Street R/W | 100' | |
| from the east property line | 35' | |
| from the north property line | 20' | |
| from Development Area A | 35' | |

Off-Street Parking Setbacks:

from the east property line 10'
from the 91st Street R/W 35'

Minimum Livability Space Per DU: 600 sf

- 3) That a Detail Landscape Plan for each development area shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval. A landscape architect registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify that all landscaping and screening fences have been installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan for that development area prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The landscaping materials required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continuing condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit.
- 4) That no Building Permits in a development area shall be issued within the Planned Unit Development until a Detail Site Plan for that Development area which includes all buildings and required parking has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
- 5) No building permits shall be issued for erection of a sign within a development area of the PUD until a Detail Sign Plan for that development area has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
- 6) 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.
- 7) That all trash and mechanical equipment areas shall be screened from public view, provided however that roof-mounted mechanical equipment located more than 50' from the nearest roof edge need not be screened. [Stated as amended; see TMAPC Review Session.]

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman, representing Robinson Property and Wal-Mart Stores, stated agreement with the Staff's recommendation except in four areas. He requested the maximum building height in Area B be amended to 39', as a three story wood frame building, as permitted by the Code, required 39' (three levels with a pitched roof).

Mr. Norman stated he had originally proposed that trash and mechanical facilities be screened from 91st Street. However, in condition #7, Staff has required these be screened from public view. He clarified they had no problem screening the trash areas from public view. However, in Area A, he requested an amendment to the screening requirement so as to exclude mechanical equipment as this was to be roof-mounted and would most likely not be visible from the street since the equipment was usually set back from the edge of the structure.

In regard to the landscaping requirement, Mr. Norman originally proposed landscaping of 6% based on the gross land area of the site, which included the unpaved portions of the adjacent right-of-way on Memorial Drive. He commented the applicant had no objection to the 25' wide landscaped area long the north boundary. However, the 10% of net suggested by Staff would be very difficult on a project of this size. Mr. Norman pointed out that Wal-Mart stores usually provide far more parking spaces than required by the Zoning Code, which produces more paved area. He added that two other PUD's in this corridor were approved by the TMAPC at 7% of net. The applicant could achieve 6.6% of net or 11.35% of gross, and he requested the Staff recommendation be amended to 6.5% of net or 11% of gross area.

Mr. Norman commented that Staff has recommended landscaped and irrigated parking islands in the development standards. He stated it was very difficult to locate landscaped parking isles within the interior of a major parking area, as the success was dependent on running water lines under large areas of asphalt, and any break in the line was a major problem for maintenance. He stated Wal-Mart's concept was to provide landscaping on the perimeter and not interrupt the parking area with landscaped islands. Mr. Norman commented the applicant would try to accommodate some of this in the Detail Landscape Plan, but he did not want this as a condition of approval.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Jim Pardee (7706 East 85th Street), President of the Chimney Hills Homeowners Association, requested more time be given for review of this application. He stated concern with the lack of turning lanes to the project considering the traffic speeds along Memorial, and the possible traffic hazard that could exist without a turning lane. Staff clarified that Chimney Hills being 600' away, was outside the 300' notification range. Mr. Parmele commented that the required zoning was already in place and this application was for the PUD only.

Mr. Lee Garrett (8604 South 68th East Avenue) also requested time to review the proposal. He stated they may not necessarily have any objections but would like to have some time for review to provide input. Mr. Parmele advised that this would be forward to the City Commission, and as an interested party on the record at this hearing, he would be notified of the City Commission hearing date. Mr. Doherty added that the traffic concerns would be more properly handled by the City Commission. It was also pointed out that the District 18 Chairman, who does receive notice of the TMAPC agenda items, should have notified the homeowners association groups.

Mr. Michael Merrick (8736 South 68th East Avenue), a resident in Chimney Hills, commented that he felt the standards that needed to be met should be dictated by the standards in the area. Therefore, he felt 10% landscaping should be met as the residents in Chimney Hills had extensive

landscaping in their neighborhoods. Mr. Doherty advised that the TMAPC would be reviewing the Detail Landscape Plan and the Detail Site Plan in the future, and he was interested in assuring the quality, more than the quantity, of landscaping.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Norman offered to meet with the interested parties prior to the City Commission hearing to review the proposal, and reviewed the types of landscaping proposed for the site. He also pointed out there was presently a left turn stacking lane on Memorial Drive which should address some of the traffic hazard concerns.

In reply to a question from Mr. Paddock regarding the screening of mechanical equipment, Mr. Norman stated the applicant was prepared to screen from ground level view, as the roof-mounted equipment would not be visible from the street. Mr. Norman agreed to Mr. Doherty's suggestion for additional wording to condition #7, "provided that roof-mounted mechanical equipment located more than 50' from the nearest roof edge need not be screened".

TMAPC Review Session:

In regard to landscaped and irrigated parking islands, Mr. Doherty commented that these were not always an advantage but sometimes an impediment, and if ample perimeter landscaping was provided, these were not always necessary. Mr. Doherty submitted a motion for approval of the PUD per the Staff's conditions, with the following modifications:

- 1) Amend the maximum building height in Area B to 39';
- 2) Amend the minimum internal landscaped open space in Area A to 7%;
- 3) Delete the sentence requiring landscaped and irrigated parking islands in Area A; and
- 4) Add the wording to condition #7, "provided that roof-mounted mechanical equipment located more than 50' from the nearest roof edge need not be screened".

Mr. Gardner agreed that mechanical equipment 50' or more from the roof edge would probably not be visible. In regard to the suggestion for deleting the landscaped and irrigated islands, Mr. Gardner commented that it appeared the applicant was not objecting to some landscaping islands, they just didn't want a provision stating a specified amount. Mr. Norman pointed out the applicant was proposing some landscaping around the two out parcels as indicated on the illustration, and the Detail Landscape Plan would provide their final proposal on this.

In response to Mr. Draughon, Staff confirmed this PUD would not be affected by the proposed south Tulsa bypass.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD 448 Norman (Carroll)**, as recommended by Staff, with the following amendments:

- 1) Amend the maximum building height in Area B to 39';
- 2) Amend the minimum internal landscaped open space in Area A to 7%;
- 3) Delete the sentence requiring landscaped and irrigated parking islands in Area A; and
- 4) Add wording to condition #7, "provided that roof-mounted mechanical equipment located more than 50' from the nearest roof edge need not be screened".

Legal Description:

A part of the SW/4 of the SW/4 LESS the N/2 of the N/2 of the N/2 of the SW/4 of the SW/4 of Section 13, T-18-N, R-13-E, of the IBM, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: Commencing at the southwest corner of Section 13, T-18-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; thence N 0°17'09" E, along the west line of said Section 13 a distance of 90.0' to a point; thence due east and parallel with the south line a distance of 60.0' to the POB; thence N 0°17'09" E and parallel with the west line a distance of 758.87' to a point; thence N 4°34'30" E a distance of 200.56' to a point, said point being 75' east of the west line; thence N 0°17'09" E a distance of 106.27' to a point on the south line; thence N 89°59'54" E a distance of 1,243.57' to the southeast corner; thence S 0°15'29" W a distance of 1,155.10' to the southeast corner ; thence due west along the south line a distance of 813.27' to a point; thence due north a distance of 60.0' to a point; thence due west a distance of 415.56' to a point; thence N 44°51'26" W a distance of 42.32' to the POB, and containing 1,423,765.63 square feet or 32.685 acres, more or less.

* * * * *

Application No.: PUD 449 Present Zoning: IL, RS-3
Applicant: Swimmer Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: NW/c of 33rd Street & North Lewis Avenue
Date of Hearing: March 8, 1989
Requested Continuance to: March 22, 1989

Staff explained that the applicant requested a continuance in order to provide additional information to allow a proper evaluation.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Draughon, Kempe, Randle, Wilson"absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 449** until Wednesday, **March 22, 1989** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

Application No.: Z-6232 Present Zoning: RS-2
Applicant: Goudarzi Proposed Zoning: CS
Location: West of the SW/c of Easton Street & North 87th East Avenue
Date of Hearing: March 8, 1989
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Mehrdad Goudarzi, 1506 N. Memorial (838-9500)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 16 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property low intensity - residential.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested CS District is **not** in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .5 acres in size and is located west of the southwest corner of Easton Street and North 87th East Avenue. It is partially wooded, gently sloping, vacant and is zoned RS-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property zoned RS-2; on the east by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2; on the south by the I-244 Expressway zoned RS-3; and on the west by vacant property zoned AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: None

Conclusion: Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing development, Staff cannot support the requested rezoning. Staff finds both the commercial zoning and proposed billboard use incompatible with the abutting residential uses.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of CS zoning for Z-6232.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Mark Goudarzi advised the requested zoning was to accommodate a sign directing customers to his airport parking business, and the sign would be restricted to this use. Mr. Goudarzi outlined the current problems patrons were having locating his airport parking business (Park, Ride, Fly), as most of his customers ended up following the van to the site.

Mr. Richard Anderson (PO Box 725, Tulsa), a van driver for the business confirmed the problems with inadequate directional signs. He commented that 60% - 70% of the patrons were coming from outside the Tulsa area, and by the time they saw the sign on the building from the highway, they had already driven past the Pine Street exit to the site. He added that many of the customers have suggested some type of sign be constructed so others could avoid the same frustrations.

TMAPC Review Session:

Mr. Carnes commented he could sympathize with the applicant's situation, but he would have to agree with the Staff recommendation; therefore, he moved for denial. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Staff confirmed a billboard type sign would be required to setback 150' from a residential area. Mr. Parmele also sympathized with the applicant, but stated he did not feel this was the proper location for the requested sign.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of CARNES, the TMAPC voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to DENY Z-6232 Goudarzi, as recommended by Staff.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 179-R: Detail Site Plan & Detail Landscape Plans for Development Area A SE/c of South 92nd East Avenue & East 71st Street South

Staff Recommendation:

Staff has reviewed the proposed Detail Site Plan and Landscape Plan for a convenience store with gasoline pumps in Development Area A of PUD 179-R and finds them to be in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards, with the condition that the Bradford Pear Trees and Austrian Pine tree shown in the Detail Landscape Plan should have trunk diameter measured one foot above the ground of at least 2" and be at least 6' to 8' in height when planted.

PUD 179-R Quik Trip - Cont

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan & Detail Landscape Plan subject to the staff conditions for Development Area A of PUD 179-R.

Comments & Discussion:

The applicant stated agreement with the conditions of the Staff recommendation.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to APPROVE the Detail Site Plan and the Detail Landscape Plan for Development Area A of PUD 179-R (Quik Trip), as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD-179-P: Detail Site Plan & Detail Landscape Plan
for Lot 2, Block 1 and Lot 1, Block 2 of Randall Plaza
SE/c of East 74th Place & South Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation:

Staff has reviewed the proposed Detail Site and Landscaping Plans for Ryan's Family Steak House (Lot 1, Block 2) and the remote parking lot (Lot 2, Block 1) in PUD 179-P (Randall Plaza) and finds them to be in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Detail Site and Landscape Plans for Lot 1, Block 2 and Lot 2, Block 1 of Randall Plaza as presented.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Stump advised he has talked with the applicant who was in agreement with the Staff recommendation.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the TMAPC voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to APPROVE the Detail Site Plan and Detail Landscape Plan for PUD 179-P (Cox), as recommended by Staff.

SUBDIVISIONS:

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:

Fairway Park Amended (PUD 347-2)(382) West 65th St & So 27th W Ave (RS-3, RT)

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Final Plat of Fairway Park Amended and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

NEW BUSINESS:

The TMAPC members reviewed a letter drafted to the Mayor and City Commission regarding a recommendation for increased code enforcement as relates to sign regulations. The memo advised "the TMAPC has received and concurs with recommendations from the City of Tulsa Sign Advisory Board and the Greater Tulsa Sign Association that staff should be added for increased enforcement of zoning code provisions related to signs."

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.

Date Approved March 22, 1989
Robert J. Dey
Vice Chairman

ATTEST:

Kevin C. Coutant
Secretary

