

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1759
Wednesday, September 6, 1989, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Carnes, 2nd Vice Chairman	Draughon	Gardner	Linker, Legal Counsel
Coutant	Kempe	Setters	
Doherty, Chairman	Parmelee	Stump	
Paddock	Randle	Wilmoth	
Selph			
Wilson, 1st Vice Chairman			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, September 5, 1989 at 11:11 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Doherty called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of August 16, 1989, Meeting #1757:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmelee, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of August 16, 1989, Meeting #1757**.

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Coutant advised a **Comprehensive Plan Committee** was scheduled for September 13, 1989 for review of amendments to the District 2 and 18 Plans.

Mr. Paddock announced the **Rules & Regulations Committee** had scheduled meetings for September 20th and 27th to continue their review of amendments to the Sign Code.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL:

Sweetbriar South (PUD 250-A)(1183) East 79th St & So 77th E Ave (RS-3)

The TAC reviewed this plat on 6/15/89 and recommended approval, subject to the conditions listed in the minutes of that date. Since a major amendment was pending approval by the TMAPC and the City Commission, the plat was not transmitted for preliminary approval. During the hearings for the PUD amendment on 7/12/89, the TMAPC approved the amendment, but made two additional requirements, both of which affected the plat. One requirement was to reduce the number of lots along the north side of the plat in Block 1, providing a minimum width of 55 feet. The other requirement was to show the emergency access easement to Wood Niche Addition along the south 18' of Lot 1, Block 1 or an alternative acceptable to TMAPC.

Since the TAC had not seen these changes, the plat is presented again this date with the changes as recommended in the PUD hearings. A copy of the previous recommendations of the TAC on 6/15/89 was provided for information, and is still applicable as a condition for approval.

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Joe Donaldson.

Staff advised applicant that PUD 250-A had not yet been set for hearing by the City Commission, so this plat would not be forwarded to the Planning Commission until the City approves the PUD amendment.

The TAC received the revisions and had no objections, and noted the previous recommendations made on 6/15/89 still apply, including the following summary:

1. All conditions of PUD 250-A shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat. (Also see #4c below regarding information to include in covenants.)
2. Some underlying easements will need to be vacated in accordance with current legal practices. (This is not a condition of approval of this plat, but it is mentioned for the record. The vacating process is not a part of this platting procedure.)
3. On face of plat show:
 - a. Update the location map with new subdivisions.
 - b. Include bearings/distance on easement on Lot 4, Block 3. (See previous plat.)
 - c. In title block show that this is "PUD 250-A".
4. Covenants:
 - a. Omit last line before "Section I" since it is repeated in the next paragraph.

Sweetbriar South - Cont

- b. Section II-(J) Add... "... In accordance with the City of Tulsa standards."
- c. Section III should be expanded to include the exact details of the PUD as approved for PUD 250-A. (See Staff for sample or help).
- 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. Check fire hydrant locations to assure they relate to lot lines.
- 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 topo map shall be submitted for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (Subdivision Regulations). Submit with drainage plans as directed.
- 10. 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.
- 11. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations.
- 12. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Sweetbriar South**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

PRELIMINARY PLAT & RELATED PUD:

College Parke (PUD 306)(2083) 9300 Bik So College Place (RM-2, RM-1, RS-3)

This plat covers an area designated in the PUD as "Development Area C" and two other proposals that have been reviewed previously, including a plat titled Woodside Village II. Summary of approvals is as follows:

- 01/12/83 TMAPC approved PUD 306
- 10/05/83 Minor amendment to PUD 306; site plan review included Area C with private streets and 95 dwelling units.
- 09/07/83 Woodside Village II, preliminary plat approved. (Private streets, as per PUD)
- 11/09/83 Woodside Village II, final plat approved (plat expired and was not completed).
- 08/28/86 Woodside Village II resubmitted and sketch plat approved. (Public streets)
- 10/01/86 Woodside Village II, preliminary approval.
- 10/01/86 Minor amendment (PUD 306-3) approved for Area "C" with public streets and reduced number of dwelling units from 93 to 79.
- 10/01/87 Woodside Village II, preliminary plat expired. Project on hold.
- 12/03/86 Minor amendment approved to reduce density because of loss of land in expressway (PUD 306-4). (Did not affect Development Area "C".)

The plat and site plans submitted for current review include a private street system with detached single-family homes on individual lots, as originally approved in the PUD before it was amended. There is some variation in the street layout. There are 96 dwelling units in three phases with the third phase overlapping into Development Area "D". The density is still under the original allowance of the PUD, but since it currently has an amendment approved for public interior streets, another minor amendment may be necessary to approve the development plan as submitted. (An application for the amendment and site plan review is also pending TMAPC approval.)

In reviewing the overall plan, staff noted that:

- a) Second points of access should be provided for Phases I and II. Phase I could be provided from several points without changing the design of the layout. Phase II shows two points as per plan. Phase III should provide another point for emergency access in the vicinity of Lots 5, 6, or 7. Some shifting of the buildings would be necessary for this change. Access and circulation also subject to review and comment from the Fire Department and Traffic Engineering.
- b) Since no specific easements are shown on the overall plan, care should be taken to allow for adequate easements to serve the lots. Loop water lines will be required in Phases II & III.

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Clayton Morris.

College Parke & PUD 306-6 - Cont

Water and Sewer Department advised applicant to review the way the lots on the ends of the streets would be served. A "panhandle" was suggested. A 4" main extension or stub would not be satisfactory. A minor redesign of those end lots is required. The lot must abut the water line serving that lot.

PSO advised that some additional easements would be required. Check to make sure there are no conflicts with utility easements and drainage easements.

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

1. All conditions of PUD 306 as amended shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat. Include PUD approval date and references to Section 1100-1170 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
2. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property lines and/or lot lines.
3. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat. Include language for Water and Sewer facilities in covenants.
4. 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).
5. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
6. 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.
7. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer (if required).
8. Street names shall be approved by City Engineer and shown on plat (as "private").
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineer during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)

College Parke & PUD 306-6 - Cont

11. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
12. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
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. Restrictive covenants need to be revised to reflect amended PUD conditions. References to the drainageway should be same as shown on plat. (Lot # shown on plat and Reserve referenced in covenants.) Include revisions in easement grant. LNA is required along lots backing or siding to College, consistent with the PUD conditions.
15. Although the Creek Turnpike is to the south of this plat, in accordance with policy of the TMAPC, show the following note on face of plat: "An expressway is shown on the Tulsa City/County Major Street and Highway Plan as passing through property adjacent to this subdivision. Further information as to the status of this planned expressway may be obtained from the TMAPC".
16. 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.
17. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Presented in conjunction with the above Preliminary Plat:

**PUD 306-6: Minor Amendment for Bulk and Area and Street Requirements
and Detail Site Plan Review**
Southeast of South College Place & East 91st Street South

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant wishes to amend the bulk and area requirements for Development Area "C" of PUD 306 and change the type of street system from public to private. The southern portion of Development Area "C" was thought to potentially be needed for right-of-way for Creek Expressway, but recently prepared functional plans for the Creek Turnpike show the right-of-way to be south of this development.

Staff finds the proposal to generally be compatible with the originally approved Outline Development Plan which had designated Development Area "C" for single-family dwelling on private streets. A subsequent minor amendment changed to public streets. If the following conditions are imposed on Development Area "C", staff finds the request to be minor in nature and in keeping with the purposes and intent of the original Development Plan for PUD 306.

College Parke & PUD 306-6 - Cont

Therefore Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Minor Amendment and Detail Site Plan for PUD 306-6 as revised by the staff conditions.

1) **New Standards for Development Area C:**

Land Area (Gross) 16.66 acres
 Permitted Uses: Detached Single-Family Dwelling Units and Customary Accessory Uses

	<u>Recommended</u>	<u>Existing</u>
Maximum No. of DU's	66	79
Minimum Lot Width	50'	45'
Maximum Building Height	35'	same
Minimum Landscaped Open Space per Lot	2,100 sf	2,000 sf
Minimum Landscaped Common Open Space	15% of gross area	none
Minimum Parking Spaces per DU	4*	2
Minimum Lot Area	5,500 sf	6,900 sf
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
Front yard from lot line	15'	20'
Rear yard from lot line	10'	15'
Side yard from lot line	5'	10' & 5'
from the north, south & east boundaries	11'	15' & 11'
from College Place R/W	15'	15'

- 2) All private roadways shall be a minimum of 20' in width for two-way roads and 18' on one-way loop roads, measured face of curb to face of curb and have curbs, gutters, base and paving materials of a quality and thickness which meets the City of Tulsa standards for a minor residential public street. All communal access driveways and private driveways to garages shall be a minimum of 16' in width.
- 3) One monument sign no greater than 5' in height with a maximum display surface area of 32 sq. ft. with no illumination shall be permitted at each of the two entrances from College Place.
- 4) That a Detail Landscape Plan of the common open space 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 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.

* 2 vehicles in two-car garage and 2 vehicles in driveway

College Parke & PUD 306-6 - Cont

- 5) That no Building Permits shall be issued within the Planned Unit Development until a Detail Site Plan which includes all buildings and required parking has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD requirements.
- 6) No building permits shall be issued for erection or installation of a sign in the PUD until a Detail Sign Plan has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
- 7) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have 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.
- 8) The 13 dwelling units not used in Development Area "C" should be transferred to Development Area "H".

Comments & Discussion:

Staff advised the additional emergency access points were now shown on the exhibited copy of the plat, and the method of water service to the lots at the ends of the short private drives met Water Department requirements.

In reply to Chairman Doherty, the applicant stated agreement to the Staff recommendation and listed conditions.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-1-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Coutant, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for College Parke, and the Minor Amendment and Detail Site Plan for PUD 306-6**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

Homeland #0102 (PUD 360-A)(1438) NW/c of 91st St & Memorial Dr (CS, RM-0)

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **CONTINUE** Consideration of the **Preliminary Plat for Homeland #0102** until Wednesday, **September 20, 1989** at 1:30 p.m. In the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:

All-Star Sports Complex (3194)

10309 East 61st Street

(IL)

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

REINSTATEMENT OF FINAL PLAT; EXTENSION OF APPROVAL:

7000 Riverside Drive (182)

NW/c of South Peoria & Riverside Dr

(CH, CS)

This plat was processed, approved and released for filing. However, the owner had not yet filed it of record and the approval expired 8/17/89. Since it had already been processed, no changes have occurred, it is not a PUD, and the majority of the tract is zoned CH, nothing would be accomplished by reprocessing the plat. Therefore, Staff recommends the Final Plat Approval be reinstated, and the new expiration date be 8/17/90, a one year extension from the previous expiration date.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Coutant, "abstaining"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Reinstatement of Final Plat and Extension of Approval (to 8/17/90) for **7000 Riverside Drive**, as recommended by Staff.

REQUEST FOR WAIVER (Section 260):

Z-6230 Guy Cook Addition (3194)

9909 East 61st Street

(OL)

This is a request to waive plat on Lot 7, Block 2 of the above named plat at the northeast corner of 61st Street and South 99th East Avenue. The existing house will remain and be used as an office. The only changes would be erection of a privacy fence as required by the Zoning Code, and the addition of three parking spaces. Since the tract is already platted and right-of-way meets the Major Street and Highway Plan, Staff has no objection to the request, subject to the following:

Z-6230 Guy Cook Addition - Cont

- a) Grading and drainage plan approval by the Department of Stormwater Management through the permit process. Any development will require a Watershed Development Permit, a \$25.00 stormwater connection permit, and fees-in-lieu of detention for the increase in imperviousness. Drainage must go to 61st Street.
- b) Approval of an access point as recommended by Traffic Engineering. (An access limitation agreement is required.)
- c) Increase rear (east) 5' utility easement to total 11'.
- d) Provide 17.5' utility easement along 61st Street, except where existing house is located.

The applicant was not represented at the TAC meeting.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend APPROVAL of the Waiver of Plat on Z-6230, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and the TAC.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock stated that he was opposed to any access to the residential area since this was being converted to office use; Ms. Wilson agreed. Mr. Wilmoth explained that this application was in keeping with what has occurred with an abutting tract which also has two accesses. Mr. Gardner added this application was not changing the residential character, and the major parking would be off of 61st Street, as the other two parking spaces were the existing drive and garage to the structure.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for Z-6230 Guy Cook Addition**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

Z-6254-SP-1 Union Gardens (684)

6235 South Mingo Road

(C0)

This is a request to waive plat on the south 79' of the west 236' of Lot 5, Block 4 of the above named subdivision. The Board of Adjustment approved a day care center in the existing house at this location under case #14324. A lot split was approved 3/14/56, #4377 wherein additional right-of-way was to be dedicated on Mingo Road. Nothing was to physically change for the day care center and the TMAPC waived the plat requirement for that use on 1/21/87 with no special conditions.

Z-6254-SP-1 Union Gardens - Cont

The current request is also to utilize the existing building without any major changes therein. However, since the zoning is also being changed to a Corridor District, additional requirements must apply, including site plan review by both TMAPC and the City Commission. Restrictive covenants must be filed which include the Corridor District site plan requirements. The staff recommended approval subject to the following conditions:

- a) Verify (book/page) that right-of-way was dedicated on Mingo. If not this will be a requirement.
- b) Provide 17.5' utility easement parallel to Mingo Road. The east 17.5' of the west 27.5' of tract under application.
- c) Grading and drainage plan approval by Department of Stormwater Management through the permit process. (Fee-in-lieu may be paid for increase in imperviousness.)
- d) Access approval subject to review and approval of Traffic Engineering. (24' driveway width)
- e) Corridor District provisions to be filed of record by separate instrument, containing the conditions set forth by TMAPC in the review process.

The applicant was not represented at the TAC meeting.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the waiver of plat on Z-6254-SP-1, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Wilmoth advised that all conditions have been met except condition "c", which will be met through the permitting process, and he noted the documentation for the CO District requirements is also included in this approval, subject to approval of the format by City Legal Department. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Wilmoth confirmed right-of-way has been dedicated.

Mr. Paddock inquired if it was correct that all of the properties to the north and south of the subject tract would qualify for CO. Mr. Gardner confirmed this to be correct, and added that Mingo Road was classified as a Secondary Arterial. Mr. Paddock commented that Mingo Road should be reviewed as to making it a Primary Arterial.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for Z-6254-SP-1 Union Gardens**, subject to condition "c" as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

BOA 15092 (Unplatted)(1383)

9400 East 81st Street

(AG)

This is a request to waive plat on a small portion (2.1 acres) of the Meadowbrook Country Club. The facility had been in place long before any zoning or platting requirements, but the owners filed a BOA application on the property so it would have an approval. The existing clubhouse is being remodeled over an existing patio, so the waiver request only includes the area where the clubhouse is located along with the driveway out to 81st Street. Since this property has existed as a golf facility for many years and nothing is changing other than the remodeled building, Staff has no objection to a waiver on the building. Should the use of the property change or any major expansion take place, including any subdivision of the land, then platting requirements will apply.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to grading and drainage plan approval by Stormwater Management through the permit process.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for BOA 15092 (Unplatted)**, subject to grading and drainage plan approval by Stormwater Management through the permit process.

CHANGE OF NAME ON RECORDED PLAT:

Harvard Manor to Harvard Estates (1683)

88th Street & South Harvard (RS-3)

This is a name change only and does not duplicate another name. All of the owners of the lots in the subdivision will execute the final document to be filed of record. This is not a PUD and nothing else has changed. Therefore Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to approval of format by the City Legal Department.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Change of Name on Recorded Plat for Harvard Manor to Harvard Estates**, as recommended by Staff.

CHANGE OF ACCESS:

Walnut Creek Mall (1783)

8230 South Harvard Avenue

(CS)

The purpose of the request is to show a change that reflect actual existing access driveways and to amend plat to fit actual drives.

Staff and Traffic Engineering recommend APPROVAL as requested.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the TMAPC voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to APPROVE the Change of Access for Walnut Creek Mall, as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-17214 Gerald Snow (1482)

819-33 West 91st Street South

(AG)

This is a request to split approximately 2.5 acres into three tracts, with two lots of 100' width and approximately 28,159 square feet and one lot with approximately 101.54' in width with approximately 28,586 square feet (excluding right-of-way). The tract is zoned AG with a 200' minimum width requirement and 2 acres. An adjacent tract was approved for two lots in 1984, L-16183. Since a previous adjacent tract has been approved, Staff had no objection to approval of this application, subject to:

1. Dedication of additional right-of-way to total 50' from centerline of 91st Street in accordance with the Major Street Plan.
2. Provide utility easement of 11' on the west, north and east, and 17.5' on the south, parallel to 91st Street.
3. City-County Health Department approval of septic systems. (Percolation tests #89-147, 148, 149)
4. Grading and drainage plan approval by Department of Stormwater Management in the permit process. Fee-in-lieu of detention will be acceptable. Fees must be paid prior to issuance of building permit.
5. Subject to approval of the Board of Adjustment for the waiver of the lot width and area.
6. Access points subject to approval of Traffic Engineering. (See discussion and comments).

The applicant was represented by Gerald Snow.

PSO had advised staff that they have an underground primary line in this vicinity. Locate and make sure this split does not interfere with said line. Provide easements if required. Applicant indicated that the line was outside this lot split in an easement approximately parallel to the east boundary. Therefore, this condition would not apply.

There was some discussion regarding the number of access points on 91st Street. Traffic Engineer was concerned that the three 100' lots would result in three additional driveways. After discussion, applicant indicated that one lot could access along with the existing driveway to the west. A "Mutual Access Easement" parallel to 91st Street was also a possibility. Applicant would work with Traffic Engineering for the locations of the proposed driveways.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of L-17214, subject to the six conditions outlined by Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE L-17214 Snow**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-17217 (1783) William/Walker
L-17218 (1793) Spencer/Walker

L-17221 (3602) TDA

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **COUTANT**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Above Listed Lot Splits for Ratification of Prior Approval, as recommended by Staff.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: PUD 413-A Major Amendment Present Zoning: RS-3, RM-1, CS
Applicant: Johnsen (Isaacs) Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: NE/c of Gilcrease Museum Road and the Keystone Expressway
Date of Hearing: September 6, 1989 (Continued from August 9, 1989)
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Roy Johnsen, 324 Main Mall (585-5641)

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends a continuance due to lack of information being submitted by the applicant.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Johnsen, representing the applicant, commented he was not anticipating a final determination from the TMAPC today, but he wanted to cover some additional or amended information. Mr. Johnsen added he had no objection to any comments by interested parties at this hearing.

The Commission members discussed the procedure to follow for this continued hearing; i.e. reopen the public hearing versus continuing the TMAPC review session only.

On motion of Mr. Paddock, the TMAPC voted 6-0-1 (Selph, abstaining) to reopen this item and proceed with a public hearing.

Mr. Johnsen advised the application has been amended so as to leave the Braum's and Mazzio's restaurant uses as proposed, and to change the third restaurant site to office use. He stated this modification should accomplish and address the key concerns previously expressed by the TMAPC, as the office use would provide a buffer to the residential area.

In regard to the alignment of Cameron Avenue, Mr. Johnsen referred to the Subdivision Regulations which stipulate that two streets intersecting the same street should either be aligned or separated by 125 feet (Cameron intersecting Gilcrease Museum Road on two sides). Mr. Johnsen added that the Subdivision Regulations also state that, if a private street or a driveway was across from a public street, there was no requirement for offset. Therefore, if Cameron was made a private street into the subject development tract, this would become moot and would avoid the issue, which was not his desire. Mr. Johnsen stated he felt it more important to keep in mind that Cameron was not a collector street, was only a few blocks in length serving very few properties on the western side of Gilcrease, and served only the subject tract on the eastern side. Mr. Johnsen commented that he thought this case presented a distinguishable circumstance from what the Subdivision Regulations was trying to establish for a uniform standard across the city. He advised of meetings with the Traffic Engineering Department and presented notice (by John Eshelman) indicating no objection to the applicant's suggested alignment of Cameron Avenue.

Mr. Johnsen stated he wanted to bring the alignment issue before the Commission at this hearing, and if the TMAPC accepted Traffic Engineering's response, then a redesign would not be required. He added that the project as presently designed would work very well with the two restaurants and office use. Mr. Johnsen agreed the applicant still needed to meet with Staff in regard to signage, etc. In response to Mr. Coutant, Mr. Johnsen confirmed a Detail Site Plan would be presented to the TMAPC in the future.

In regard to the Children's Home structure, Mr. Paddock commented he did not have a problem with removing or relocating this building, but he did learn that the District 10 Plan, depending on interpretation, referred to the property and not the building itself. Therefore, the Plan would not have to be amended if something was done to the structure. Mr. Johnsen agreed with Mr. Paddock's comments as the Children's Home was not on a historical register, but he added that he felt the clear intent of the Plan was to preserve the Children's Home, and most of the residents concurred.

Mr. Gardner commented that, at the previous hearing, Staff interpreted the Commission's feeling that no traffic be allowed on Easton Avenue, and this should be part of the modification. A concern remaining with the Staff involved the northern tract which was the development area for the amended office use. Mr. Gardner stated this tract should be completely isolated from the two restaurant uses, and have its own curb cuts and access. Therefore, this would prevent any future use of this portion of the tract for commercial purposes.

Interested Parties:

Ms. Audra Buthod (2520 West Easton) advised of discussions with the applicant and she agreed the revised proposal appeared to be feasible for the neighborhood. Ms. Buthod also agreed with Staff that measures should be imposed to isolate the office use and not allow shared access or parking with the commercial uses. She spoke on existing traffic problems along Gilcrease Museum Road during peak hours and requested some type of safeguards be considered to assist with this problem, including consideration of sidewalks for pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Charles Holderman (1527 West 2nd Place) submitted a petition to the TMAPC supporting the PUD as presented by the applicant.

Mr. Carnes advised that, as a former District 10 representative, he has received several calls from local residents in favor of the requested use.

TMAPC Review Session:

Ms. Wilson stated agreement with Staff's suggestion to limit access and curb cuts for the office use in order to restrict access between the restaurant and office uses.

PUD 413-A Johnsen (Isaacs) - Cont

Mr. Paddock commented that, hearing the plea for sidewalks, he felt this was a good suggestion, and a PFPI might possibly accommodate this request. Chairman Doherty agreed and added this was something that could be worked out with Staff, and he expressed his views concurring with Staff's recommendation to separate the office/commercial uses. Ms. Wilson requested Staff provide information regarding sidewalks at the next hearing on this case as to what might be appropriate.

Commissioner Selph agreed with Mr. Carnes' comments as to the resident's desire to see this tract developed, and he stated he was much more receptive to this amended proposal. Commissioner Selph remarked that he also felt something was needed in regard to traffic, access and/or sidewalks at this location; i.e. signalization. Mr. Coutant concurred as to this proposal being an improvement over the initial presentation, and he stated he shared the concerns regarding access from this busy street (Gilcrease Museum Road).

Mr. Carnes stated it appears the consensus of the Commission was in support of the two restaurant uses with the office use, and he felt confident that engineering and Staff could work on the access concerns. Mr. Paddock summarized the main items for review by Staff involved the internal traffic circulation, parking, and the boundary between the two restaurants and office area. Therefore, he moved for a one week continuance.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **CONTINUE** Consideration of **PUD 413-A Johnsen (Isaacs)** until Wednesday, **September 13, 1989** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

Application No.: PUD 452 Present Zoning: RS-2 & RS-3
Applicant: Harkreader (Pennant Dev Co) Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: South of East 55th Street & and South Delaware Avenue
Date of Hearing: September 6, 1989
Presentation to TMAPC by: Gary Harkreader, 4834 South Knoxville (745-9702)

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is proposing a PUD consisting of 27 single-family homes on two private cul-de-sacs on a 5.2 acre tract bounded on the north by 55th Street at its intersection with Delaware Avenue and on the south by Joe Creek. The southwest side of the tract (41,818 square feet) is zoned RS-3 with the remainder zoned RS-2. The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject tract low intensity residential. The tract is surrounded by single-family homes zoned RS-2. The homes to the south are separated from the tract by the large drainageway of Joe Creek.

Access to the PUD, which is proposed to be 55th Street, is only a half street 12' - 13' wide with 25' of right-of-way on the west side of the tract. The City has no plans to widen this street. South Delaware Avenue also dead ends into the property from the north. Both 55th Place and 56th Street terminate on the west side of the property, but the PUD does not anticipate using either of these streets for access.

A major drainageway runs through the western portion of the PUD in a north to south direction and empties into Joe Creek at the southwest corner of the property. Only the southern most portion of the property adjacent to Joe Creek is within the regulatory flood area, but the area of the tract proposed for development was inundated with approximately 1' to 3' of water during the 1984 flood. The Department of Stormwater Management will require that the creek running through the property be studied to determine if it is large enough to carry flows from the 100 year flood. If it has insufficient capacity the developer will be required to improve it so that it does.

Since the rezoning request from RS-2 to RS-3 which accompanied the PUD application was recommended for denial by TMAPC at their August 23, 1989 meeting, the applicant has revised his request to include 27 dwelling unit. This is the maximum number of dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning when the special exception duplex density is used for the existing RS-3 zoned area. Staff feels the duplex density in this area is not in keeping with the surrounding development. Using the maximum single-family density, but not the duplex density, would permit 22 dwelling units on the tract.

Staff generally finds the proposal with a maximum of 22 dwelling units to be compatible with the surrounding development. Based upon the following conditions, Staff finds PUD 452 is: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas; (3) a unified treatment of 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 452 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:**

Land Area:	5.23 acres (gross)
	4.37 acres (net)
Permitted Uses:	Single-family dwellings and customary accessory uses
Maximum Number of DU's:	22
Minimum Lot Width:	50'
Maximum Building Height:	35'
Minimum Off-Street Parking/DU:	4 (2 spaces in two-car garage and 2 in driveway)
Minimum Lot Area:	4,000 sf
Minimum Common Open Space:	10%
Minimum Building Setbacks from:	
Exterior Boundaries of PUD,	
except north side	20'
North side from C/L of 55th St	40'
Minimum Building Setback from Lot Line:	
Front yard	15'
Rear yard	10'
Side Yard	5'
- 3) All private roadways shall be a minimum of 20' in width for two-way roads and 18' on one-way loop roads, measured face of curb to face of curb or edge of paving to edge of paving if center drained streets are used. All roadways shall have a minimum of a 30' right-of-way. All curbs, gutters, base and paving materials used shall be of a quality and thickness which meets the City of Tulsa standards for a minor residential public street.
- 4) One monument sign no greater than 5' in height with a maximum display surface area of 32 square feet with no illumination shall be permitted at each of the two entrances from 55th Street.
- 5) That a Detail Landscape Plan of the common open space 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 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.

PUD 452 Harkreader - Cont

- 6) That no Building Permits shall be issued within the Planned Unit Development until a Detail Site Plan which includes all buildings and required parking has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD requirements.
- 7) 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.
- 8) That a homeowners association is required to be established with sufficient authority and sources of revenue to maintain the private streets and common open space.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Gary Harkreader, applicant, advised he has met with Staff and agreed to a number of their recommendations, but the number of dwelling units remained a point of difference. Mr. Harkreader requested 27 dwelling units, which he said was allowed by the underlying zoning. He felt this would be compatible with the existing development in the area. He emphasized that the negative comments made at the previous hearing dealt with streets and traffic control which were city service concerns and something outside of his control. Mr. Harkreader added there were no negative comments made as to the specific proposals of the PUD, except the number of dwelling units which was still being discussed. He requested approval of the PUD for the 27 dwelling units allowed by the underlying zoning.

Mr. Doherty and Ms. Wilson initiated discussion in regard to density and private streets.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Gary Lahman (5507 South Columbia Avenue) stated support for the Staff's recommendation for a maximum of 22 units. Mr. Lahman expressed concern as to access along the one-laned 55th Street. He requested the Commission take into account the impact of adding any additional traffic to this 12' wide street. Mr. Lahman commented on the increased safety hazards to the neighborhood children and pedestrians as this very narrow street did not have curbs or sidewalks.

Mr. J. C. Brown (5341 South Delaware Avenue) repeated concerns expressed at the previous hearing in regard to the severe flooding history of this area of the City, and his concerns that the proposed development would add to this situation. Mr. Brown echoed concerns as to safety to the residents due to the additional traffic and the condition of 55th Street.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Harkreader reiterated that the primary arguments were back to city services. He pointed out that, along the entire north side of the property, 55th Street was totally developed for two lane traffic as it did not become a one lane street until Columbia Avenue. In regard to flooding concerns, Mr. Harkreader stated that since improvements to Joe Creek have been made, he did not think this area had flooded anywhere near the amounts in 1984 or prior years. In response to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Harkreader advised that he proposed to block off access to 55th Place.

TMAPC Review Session:

Mr. Carnes commented that he has field checked the area and was in agreement with Staff's recommendation for 22 units, as he felt the space not utilized for the extra five units would most likely be needed for detention or drainage. Therefore, he moved for approval of the Staff recommendation.

In reply to Mr. Paddock concerning the access mentioned in condition #4, Mr. Gardner clarified Staff was not restricting access from 55th Place. After discussion, Mr. Carnes amended his motion to include a revision to condition #4 so as to delete reference to "two entrances from 55th Street".

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Coutant, "abstaining"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD 452 Harkreader (Pennant Development Company)**, as recommended by Staff for 22 dwelling units, with the following revisions:

Amend Condition #4: One monument sign no greater than 5' in height with a maximum display surface area of 32 square feet with no illumination shall be permitted at each of the entrances.

Legal Description:

A tract of land commencing 990' east of the NW/c of the S/2 of the SE/4 of the NW/4, Section 32, T-19-N, R-13-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, for a point of beginning; thence east 330'; thence south 747' to a point in the center of a creek; thence west along center of said creek 285' to a point which is in the center of a ravine; thence north 417' to a point which is 330' north of the south line of said S/2 of the SE/4 of the NW/4; thence west 45'; thence north 330' to the point of beginning, containing 5.2 acres, more or less, according to the US Survey thereof.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Z-5773-SP-1-1: Minor Amendment to Corridor Site Plan & Detail Sign Plan
6217 South Mingo Road

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is proposing to add to the permitted uses in the approved Corridor Site Plan, aerobic exercise classes. Presently only Indoor Soccer and related accessory uses are allow under the approved Site Plan. The applicant is also requesting approval of a 4' X 4' ground sign advertising the aerobics classes.

Staff feels the aerobics classes is a similar type of use to Indoor Soccer and would not have a different impact on the surrounding area. Even though adding aerobic exercise classes to the permitted principal uses would be classified as a major amendment according to the TMAPC'S General Policies, its impact would be very minor in fact. Therefore Staff can support the minor amendment proposed and recommends **APPROVAL** of Z-5773-SP-1-1.

If the minor amendment is approved by the TMAPC, Staff can support approval of the Detail Sign Plan, but only as a temporary solution. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the ground sign for only 1 year or until a new ground sign advertising the various businesses in the sports center is erected, which ever comes first.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Chairman Doherty, the applicant stated agreement to the Staff recommendation.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Coutant, "abstaining"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan for Z-5773-SP-1-1**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 446: Detail Landscape Plan - 7370 East 71st Street

Comments & Discussion:

Staff advised the applicant had called to request a two week continuance on this application.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **CONTINUE** Consideration of **PUD 446 (Percefull)** until Wednesday, **September 20, 1989** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

PUD 179-C: Detail Sign Plan for a Portable Sign
SW/c of East 71st Street & Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is proposing a 4' x 8' portable sign to advertise Maggie's Restaurant be placed approximately 385' south of the centerline of 71st Street and 330' east of the centerline of Memorial Drive. Staff cannot support the addition of a permanent portable sign because of its appearance and precedent it would set. If allowed, staff feels other store owners would then be entitled to their own portable sign; this would produce a quite unattractive shopping center.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the Detail Sign Plan for a portable sign in PUD 179-C.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Jim Williams (1326 South 122nd East Avenue) stated the sign was requested to attract traffic as the business was not visible from 71st Street or Memorial.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Draughton, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **DENY** the **Detail Sign Plan for PUD 179-C**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 379-A-5: Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan
North of the NW/c of East 71st Street & South Memorial Drive
"The Village at Woodland Hills", Lot 1, Block 1

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting a minor amendment to the sign requirements of PUD 379-A, specifically concerning the signage for the Movies 8 Cinema on the south side of The Village at Woodland Hills Shopping Center. The requested amendments apply only to the 352' of building frontage occupied by the motion picture theaters in PUD 379-A and are pursuant to the accompanying Detail Sign Plan. The amendments are as follows:

- 1) Increase the aggregate display surface area of wall and canopy signs from 1-1/2 square feet to 2 square feet for each lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed.
- 2) Permit a projecting, roof and flashing sign as a part of a motion picture theater marquee.
- 3) Permit motion picture theater signage which is consistent and compatible with the architectural theme of the shopping center and the architectural design of the motion picture theater spaces.

The need for the increase in display surface area is due to the incandescent and neon lights covering the face of the canopy being considered a sign even though there is no text displayed on the canopy.

The second amendment requested could only be granted contingent upon a variance being granted by the Board of Adjustment because roof, projecting and flashing signs are all prohibited by the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code. Staff feels this amendment is warranted due to the style and location of this specific projecting roof sign and its historical use on theater marquees. We cannot, however, support allowing flashing lights on any of the signage or marquee.

The final amendment deals with a requirement of PUD 375-A which states, "The design of signs shall be uniform throughout the center". Since the architectural style of the shopping center is compatible with the style of the theater's signs, staff feels even though the theater's signs are not "uniform" with the other signs in the shopping center, the signage will still be compatible.

Therefore staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the following Minor Amendment to PUD 379-A for the 352 feet of building frontage occupied by the "Movies 8 Cinema" in PUD 379-A, pursuant to the accompanying Detail Sign Plan.

- 1) Increase the maximum aggregate display surface area for wall and canopy signs to 2 square feet per lineal foot of building wall to which the sign is affixed.
- 2) Permit one projecting roof sign as part of the motion picture theater's marquee contingent upon a variance for such sign being granted by the Board of Adjustment.
- 3) Permit motion picture theater signage which is consistent and compatible with the architectural theme of the shopping center and the architectural design of the motion picture theater.

Staff has reviewed the Detail Sign Plan for the theater and finds it to be in compliance with the requirements of the PUD as amended above, with the exception that no sign should be allowed on the south side (back) of the building since the TMAPC has previously prohibited signs for other businesses on this side of the shopping center. Therefore Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan subject to the following conditions:

- 4) Deletion of the sign proposed for the south side of the building.
- 5) Approval by TMAPC of the minor amendment to PUD 379-A-5.
- 6) Approval of the necessary variances to the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code by the Board of Adjustment.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman, representing the applicant, reviewed the reconstruction to this center over the past year and the amendments made to the PUD to accommodate this reconstruction. Mr. Norman reviewed the proposal for the theater, pointing out the art deco styling of the center which was carried through for the theater. He remarked that the Zoning Code did not permit traditional movie type marquees, such as proposed for this theater. Mr. Norman then reviewed the Detail Sign Plan as to the specific styling of the proposed theater marquee/canopy as to height, materials, frontages, etc.

Mr. Norman requested permission to install the "tracking" bulbs around the theater box office, as proposed, keeping in mind the theater was 410' from Memorial and other commercial uses in the center further blocked vision of the box office. Therefore, Mr. Norman requested the TMAPC approve the Staff recommendation, but allow the applicant to restore the tracer element to the canopy; i.e. tracking bulbs.

Chairman Doherty commented the overall design appeared to be very compatible with the shopping center and the neon with the art deco was also compatible. He added that, in the past, he always opposed a flashing type sign, but he could see where this application could work as proposed.

In response to questions to Mr. Linker regarding concerns of setting a precedent, Mr. Norman pointed out the uniqueness and circumstances of this application would be emphasized at the follow up BOA hearing. In this regard, Mr. Paddock expressed concerns due to the work being done on the Sign Code by the TMAPC's Rules & Regulations Committee, as he felt this might set a precedent.

Mr. Coutant advised he shared concerns expressed in regard to the flashing sign, but this case "may be the exception to the rule", as he felt this was a truly unique and distinguishable application, offering a quality project. He reiterated the theater would be sitting back quite a distance from Memorial. Therefore, Mr. Coutant moved for approval of the Staff recommendation, amending the conditions to allow the "tracer" lights as requested by the applicant.

In response to Chairman Doherty, Mr. Norman advised the applicant was agreeable to no signs on the south side, as recommended by Staff.

After expressing hesitation as to the proposed sign/canopy, Mr. Paddock stated he could be agreeable after hearing the opinion of sign authoritarian, Daniel Mandelker, stating "rapid, flashing graphics may be displayed by motion picture theaters ..." as the exception to normal guidelines. [Mr. Mandelker is co-author of the book **Street Graphics.**]

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **COUTANT**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan for PUD 379-A-5 Norman (Movies & Cinema)**, as recommended by Staff, with an amendment to condition #2 to allow flashing tracer lights as proposed by the applicant.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Date Approved 9/20/89
James R. Doherty
Chairman

ATTEST:

Art Draughon
Secretary