

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1777
Wednesday, **January 24, 1990**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Carnes, 2nd Vice Chairman	Kempe Randle	Frank Gardner	Jackere, Legal Counsel
Coutant	Wilson	Setters	Linker, Legal Counsel
Doherty, Chairman	Woodard	Stump	
Draughon, Secretary			
Paddock			
Parmele			
Rice			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, January 23, 1990 at 11:05 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 3:28 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of January 10, 1990, Meeting #1775:

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Paddock, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Randle, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of January 10, 1990, Meeting #1775.**

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Coutant advised of a **Comprehensive Plan Committee** meeting held last Wednesday to review recommendations for the Park Plan and Open Space Plan. (See Director's Report)

Mr. Parmele announced the **Budget & Work Program Committee** would be meeting Wednesday, January 31st at the INCOG offices.

Director's Report:

Mr. Irving Frank, INCOG, briefed the Commission members on the presentation the Park Plan and Open Space Plan as reviewed by the **Comprehensive Plan Committee**. He stated a public hearing on this matter has been requested for February 28th. Hearing no objection from the Commission, Chairman Doherty directed Staff to proceed with the public hearing notice.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6275 Present Zoning: RT
Applicant: Norman (Brumble) Proposed Zoning: OL
Location: NE/c of East 91st Street & South College Avenue
Date of Hearing: January 24, 1990
Continuance Requested to: February 14, 1990

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of COUTANT, the TMAPC voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6275 Norman (Brumble) until Wednesday, February 14, 1990 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

Application No.: Z-6279 Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: Ledford (Southern Oaks Estate II) Proposed Zoning: RS-1
Location: East of Canton Avenue, between East 106th & 108th Streets
Date of Hearing: January 24, 1990
Presented to TMAPC by: Mr. Jerry Ledford, Tulsa Engineering 252-9621

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 26 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District 2 (sump area). The Special District allows RS-1 if conventional zoning is requested or RS-2 with accompanying PUD.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested RS-1 District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 20 acres in size and located east of South Canton Avenue, between East 106th Street and East 108th St. It is partially wooded, flat, vacant, and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property zoned RS-1, but with a subdivision plat having Preliminary Approval (Wexford Estates); on the east and south by vacant property zoned AG; and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-1.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Previous TMAPC and City Commission actions have approved RS-1 and RS-2 zoning in the area.

Conclusion: Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning pattern for the area, Staff finds the request to be compatible and can support the request.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of RS-1 zoning as requested.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6279 Ledford (Southern Oaks Estate II)** for RS-1 Zoning, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

Southern Oaks Estates II, an addition to the City of Tulsa, being a subdivision of the W/2 of the NE/4 of the SW/4, Section 27, T-18-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

* * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6280** Present Zoning: **AG**
Applicant: **Harris (Empire Construction & Materials)** Proposed Zoning: **IH**
Location: East of the SE/c of East Apache Street & North 129th East Avenue
Date of Hearing: January 24, 1990
Presented to TMAPC by: Mr. Gene Harris, PO Box 440, Jenks (299-5606)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 16 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District 2 (Industrial) and Development Sensitive.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested IH District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map. All zoning districts are considered **may be found** in accordance with Special Districts guidelines.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 19 acres in size and located east of the southeast corner of East Apache Street and North 129th East Avenue. It is nonwooded, gently sloping, contains an asphalt batch plant and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The subject tract contains an asphalt batch plant. It is abutted to the north across East Apache Street, by an Industrial business zoned IM, and two vacant single-family dwellings zoned AG and IL; to the east by a single-family dwelling zoned AG and an auto salvage operation zoned IM; to the south by vacant property zoned AG; and to the west by vacant property zoned AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The Board of Adjustment approved a special exception to permit the existing use subject to conditions.

Conclusion: Based on the Comprehensive Plan designation for industrial and surrounding land uses, Staff cannot support the requested IH zoning, but can support IM zoning on the subject tract. Staff would recommend the lower intensity industrial designation in order to provide a buffer for the single-family dwelling to the northeast and to be compatible with the IM zoning to the east of the subject tract.

Therefore, Staff recommends DENIAL of IH zoning and **APPROVAL** of IM zoning on the subject tract.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner remarked that concerns expressed to Staff regarding drainage may, in fact, have more to do with pollution than drainage.

Mr. Gene Harris, applicant, submitted photos of the subject property and current operation. Mr. Harris confirmed they have been working under a temporary permit and were now desiring to keep the operation at this location. Therefore, the need for a zoning change to maintain the operation on a permanent basis.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Arthur Brock (13712 East Apache, 74118) advised he has lived in this area for 30 years, clarifying he occupies the northeast corner of the subject tract. Mr. Brock commented that, if approved, he would be surrounded by industrial uses. He felt it would be a danger to children in the area to have this type of operation and equipment.

In response to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Gardner clarified that one of the BOA conditions imposed limited the operation to the westerly portion of the tract in order to keep it away from Mr. Brock's property. Mr. Doherty and Mr. Gardner then discussed the type of operation, refining versus manufacturing, and the uses applicable to each.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Harris explained there would be no fumes from this asphalt operation and he currently has the required permits and inspections. Mr. Harris stated he understood the operation would have to set back from Mr. Brock's property.

In reply to Mr. Draughon, Staff confirmed the TMAPC could approve IL on the easterly portion abutting the residential and restrict the IM to the westerly portion to protect the residential use on the northeast corner of the tract. Discussion followed on the possibility of an IL/IM zoning pattern with Staff commenting the applicant had suggested a lower intensity on the eastern 300' of the tract. Therefore, Mr. Parmele moved for approval of IM zoning on all but the eastern 300' of the tract which shall be zoned no greater than IL. This would create a IL buffer on the western and southern boundaries of the residential property in the northeast corner.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6280 Harris (Empire Construction & Materials)** for IM and IL Zoning, as recommended by Staff and in the configuration described below.

Legal Description:

IM Zoning: The N/2 of the NE/4 of the NW/4 LESS the east 509', Section 28, T-20-N, R-14-E, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

IL Zoning: The east 509' of the N/2 of the NE/4 of the NW/4 LESS the north 209' of the east 209', Section 28, T-20-N, R-14-E, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

* * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6281 & PUD 460** Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: **Norman (Raffkind)** Proposed Zoning: CS, RM-0, RS-3
Location: NW/c of East 81st Street & South Mingo Road
Date of Hearing: January 24, 1990
Presented to TMAPC by: Charles Norman, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property a five acre Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use node at the intersection and Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use on the remainder of the tract.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested CS, RM-0 and RS-3 Districts are in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-6281

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 150 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of South Mingo Road and East 81st Street South. It is nonwooded, gently sloping, vacant, and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property and a single-family subdivision zoned RS-3 and PUD 179; on the east across Mingo Road by vacant property zoned CS, CO and AG; on the south by Meadowbrook Country Club zoned AG; and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: A five acre node of CS was approved at the northeast corner of Mingo and 81st Street with CO zoning surrounding the node. RS-3 zoning with a PUD surrounds the subject property on the west and north.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of PARMELE, the TMAPC voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6280 Harris (Empire Construction & Materials)** for IM and IL Zoning, as recommended by Staff and in the configuration described below.

Legal Description:

IM Zoning: The N/2 of the NE/4 of the NW/4 LESS the east 300', Section 28, T-20-N, R-14-E, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

IL Zoning: The east 300' of the N/2 of the NE/4 of the NW/4 LESS the north 209' of the east 209', Section 28, T-20-N, R-14-E, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

all revised legal

* * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6281 & PUD 460** Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: **Norman (Raffkind)** Proposed Zoning: CS, RM-0, RS-3
Location: NW/c of East 81st Street & South Mingo Road
Date of Hearing: January 24, 1990
Presented to TMAPC by: Charles Norman, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property a five acre Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use node at the intersection and Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use on the remainder of the tract.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested CS, RM-0 and RS-3 Districts are in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-6281

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 150 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of South Mingo Road and East 81st Street South. It is nonwooded, gently sloping, vacant, and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property and a single-family subdivision zoned RS-3 and PUD 179; on the east across Mingo Road by vacant property zoned CS, CO and AG; on the south by Meadowbrook Country Club zoned AG; and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: A five acre node of CS was approved at the northeast corner of Mingo and 81st Street with CO zoning surrounding the node. RS-3 zoning with a PUD surrounds the subject property on the west and north.

Conclusion: The surrounding development and zoning support a rezoning request in conformance with the Development Guidelines.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of CS zoning on a five acre square at the intersection of Mingo Road and 81st Street; RM-0 zoning for a 300' wide strip wrapping around the CS zoned area; and RS-3 zoning on the remainder.

Staff Recommendation: PUD 460

The PUD request is accompanied by a concurrent rezoning request, Z-6281, for CS, RM-0 and RS-3 zoning. The proposal is for a commercial, office, multifamily and single-family project covering 150 acres. A ten acre tract on the western boundary of the PUD has been excluded, because the Union School District is acquiring that tract to be the site of a new elementary school. The northeast portion of the tract is in the upper reaches of Halkey Creek floodplain and that area is proposed to become a part of the open space and trail system contemplated by the Halkey Creek Master Drainage Plan.

Staff finds the uses and intensities of development proposed to be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code. Based on the following conditions, Staff finds PUD 460 to be: (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 460 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):	13.67 acres	595,434.13 sf *
(Net):	11.89 acres	517,937.38 sf *

Permitted Uses: Those uses permitted as a matter of right in Use Units 5, Community Services and Similar Uses; 11, Offices and Studios; 12, Entertainment Establishments and Eating Establishments Other Than Drive-Ins; 13, Convenience Goods and Services; and 14, Shopping Goods and Services.

* The internal boundaries of Development Area A may be adjusted by a minor amendment to PUD 460 approved by the TMAPC pursuant to the provisions of Section 1170.7 of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

Z-6281 & PUD 460 Norman (Raffkind) - Cont

Maximum Building Floor Area: 108,900 sf
Maximum Building Height: 35'
Off-Street Parking: As required by the applicable Use Unit of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

Minimum Building Setbacks:
from C/L of South Sheridan Road: 100'
from C/L of East 81st Street: 100'
from internal boundary of Area A: 20'

Landscaped Area: A minimum of 10% of the net land area shall be improved as internal landscaped open space which shall include at least 10' of street frontage landscaped area. Internal landscaped open space includes street frontage landscaped areas outside of the street right-of-way, landscaped parking islands, landscaped yards and plazas, and pedestrian areas, but does not include any parking, building or driveway areas.

Screening: Prior to issuance of occupancy permits in Area A, a screening fence shall be erected along the boundary with Area B which meets the requirements of Section 250 of the Tulsa Zoning Code. [Amended, see TMAPC vote.]

Signs:

- a) 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.
- b) Wall signs shall be permitted to exceed two square feet of display surface area per lineal foot of building wall to which attached. The length of a tenant wall sign shall not exceed 75% of the frontage of the tenant space.
- c) Internal directional signs shall be limited to three square feet of display surface area and 2.5' in height.
- d) 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:

- a) Light standards shall be equipped with deflectors directing the light downward and away from Area B.
- b) Building mounted lights shall be hooded and directed downward to prevent spillover lighting.

DEVELOPMENT AREA B

Land Area (Gross):	25.35 acres	1,104,182.27 sf *
(Net):	23.92 acres	1,041,932.27 sf *
Permitted Uses:	Those uses permitted as a matter of right in Use Units 5, Community Services and Similar Uses; 7, Duplex Dwellings; 7-A, Townhouse Dwellings; and 8, Multifamily Dwellings and Similar Uses. Those uses permitted in Use Unit 5 shall be subject to the use conditions of Section 1205 of the Tulsa Zoning Code and detailed site plan approval including the location of such uses within Area B, and such additional use conditions as are appropriate for each use as determined by the Detail Site Plan review and approval. [Amended, see TMAPC vote.]	
Maximum Number of DU:	485	
Maximum Building Height:		
Multifamily Dwellings:	3 stories or 39'	
Single-family Dwellings and Townhouses:	35'	
Off-Street Parking:	As required by the applicable Use Unit of the Tulsa Zoning Code.	
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
Internal Boundary:		
1 Story Buildings	10' from area boundaries	
Greater than 1 Story	50' from boundary with Area C plus 1' for every foot of height above 35'; 10' from boundary with Area A	
Setbacks From Public Streets:		
from C/L of South Sheridan:	85'	
from C/L of East 81st Street:	85'	
Minimum Off-Street Parking Setback:	5' from boundary with Area C	
Minimum Livability Space Per DU:		
Duplex Dwellings	2,000 sf	
Townhouse Dwellings	1,200 sf	
Multifamily Dwellings	60 sf	

* The internal boundaries of Development Area B may be adjusted by a minor amendment to PUD 460 approved by the TMAPC pursuant to the provisions of Section 1170.7 of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

- Screening: Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit in Area B for multifamily dwellings, a screening fence, meeting the requirements of Section 250 of the Tulsa Zoning Code, shall be erected between the multifamily development and Area C.
- Signs: 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.

DEVELOPMENT AREA C

Land Area (Gross): 102.98 acres 4,486,004.75 sf *
(Net): 100.61 acres 4,382,571.97 sf *

Permitted Uses: Those uses permitted as a matter of right in Use Units 5, Community Services and Similar Uses, except emergency and protective shelter, hospital, marina, residential treatment center and transitional living center; and 6, Single-family Dwellings. Those uses permitted in Use Unit 5 shall be subject to the use conditions of Section 1205 of the Tulsa Zoning Code and detailed site plan approval including the location of such uses within Area C, and such additional use conditions as are appropriate for such uses as determined by the Detail Site Plan review and approval.

- Maximum Number of DU: 343 **
- Minimum Lot Standards: As required in the RS-3 District
- Maximum Building Height: 35'
- Off-Street Parking: As required by the applicable Use Unit of the Tulsa Zoning Code.
- Minimum Building Setbacks:
Single-Family Dwellings: As required in the RS-3 District by Section 430 of the Tulsa Zoning Code.
- Community Services
and Similar Uses: As established by the Detail Site Plan review and approval.

* The internal boundaries of Development Area C may be adjusted by a minor amendment to PUD 460 approved by the TMAPC pursuant to the provisions of Section 1170.7 of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

** Permitted dwelling units which are not used in Development Area C may be transferred to Development Area B with the approval of a Detail Site Plan for Area B.

DEVELOPMENT AREA D

Land Area (Gross): 7.68 acres 334,452.70 sf *
(Net): 7.27 acres 316,464.78 sf *

Permitted Uses: Open space, storm water drainage and detention,
and recreational facilities and uses.

- * The internal boundaries of Development Area D may be adjusted by a minor amendment to PUD 460 approved by the TMAPC pursuant to the provisions of Section 1170.7 of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

Continued PUD Conditions:

- 3) No zoning clearance permit shall be issued for a development area within the Planned Unit Development until a Detail Site Plan for the development area has been submitted to the TMAPC, which includes all buildings and required parking (except in single-family or duplex development) and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
- 4) That a Detail Landscape Plan for Development Areas A and B shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval. A landscape architect registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify to the zoning officer all required 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 and screening fences required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continuing condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit.
- 5) No sign 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 all trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view in Area A.
- 7) All parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas. Light standards shall be limited to a maximum height of 20' in Area A and 12' in Area B.
- 8) The Department of Stormwater Management or a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify that all required storm water drainage structures and detention areas serving development Area A or B have been installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit in that development area.

- 9) 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 the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.
- 10) A collector street shall be provided from the existing East 79th Street South stub, eastward to South Mingo Road.
- 11) Pedestrian access shall be provided between the street system in Development Area C and the open space in Development Area D.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman, attorney for the applicant, reviewed the surrounding area, defining the access to the residential subdivision to the west and the nonresidential uses on the north side of the property. Mr. Norman reviewed a preliminary drawing of the layout for this tract to indicate street placement and connection to the school site and abutting residential subdivision. He reiterated the ten acre school site was not a part of this PUD or zoning request. Mr. Norman briefed the Commission on the specifics of the four development areas for commercial, multifamily, single-family and open space.

Mr. Norman requested an amendment to the application to permit Unit Unit 6 in Development Area B in order to allow the applicant the flexibility to move some of the single-family uses into the multifamily area. Therefore, if amended at this time a minor/major amendment would not be needed in the future. He also requested a modification to the language for screening, suggesting that screening along the boundary between Areas A and B be deferred until such time as the commercial was actually constructed. Therefore, screening would coincide with the commercial development rather than requiring a screening fence along the total boundary at this time, particularly if there was nothing to be screened. He suggested Staff insert a provision indicating the screening could be modified at the time of Detail Site Plan review. Mr. Norman also requested a reduction of the landscape requirement from 10% to 7%. He compared this to other PUD's where 10% of net land area was reduced or was based on the gross land area. Mr. Norman answered questions from the Commission members to clarify the development concept of the PUD and the requested amendments.

Mr. Gardner stated Staff had no problem with Mr. Norman's request in regard to review of the screening fence along the boundaries of Areas A and B, and had no problem adding Use Unit 6 to Area B. However, Staff would stand on their recommendation for 10% landscaped open space.

Interested Parties:

Ms. Sarah Wood (8603 East 77th Street, 74133) commented that she was merely in attendance on a "fact finding mission" and had no problem with the concept as presented.

TMAPC Review Session:

Mr. Norman suggested language be added to the screening requirement for Development Area A as follows: "Provided this requirement may be waived or modified as a part of the Detail Site Plan approval."

Mr. Carnes remarked "there should be a collector street from the east to get to the school, without having to do quite as much circling through the neighborhood" as shown in this concept. Mr. Norman stated agreement with the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in this regard, which involved two "breaks" or turns involving stops. Further, the school has agreed to build the first 660' of the 36' wide street from the south boundary of the school at their expense, and the applicant will provide the other 30' of right-of-way for the dedication when the school's plans were presented. Therefore, this would establish the collector on an east/west alignment which will be carried to Mingo Road. Mr. Gardner cautioned Mr. Carnes that the Commission would not want to establish a straight line "race track" through this area; therefore, the TAC's recommendation for the turns. Mr. Carnes commented he felt this presentation "went through a lot of neighborhood that was not quite necessary." Discussion followed on the street configuration concept.

Discussion ensued on 10% versus 7% open space requirement with statements being made in support of both figures. Mr. Norman commented he had no objection to a continuance to allow Staff time to review past PUD's as to the open space requirements and calculations as to gross and net land areas. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Norman stated he felt net land area should be used as a city-wide application for open space as the net was more ascertainable for certification by an architect. The state or city might widen a street or install a turn lane which, in turn, reduces the potential for gross land area.

Mr. Parmele moved for approval of the zoning request per the Staff recommendation, and the PUD with the modifications requested by the applicant to add Use Unit 6 to Area B, and additional wording to the screening requirements for Area A. However, his motion for approval included the Staff's recommendation for 10% of the net land area for open open space in Area A as he did not feel this was a burdensome amount. Mr. Parmele added that should this be a problem, it might be appropriate to consider a modification at the time of Detail Site Plan and/or Landscape Plan review.

As suggested by Mr. Paddock, Mr. Parmele amended his motion to include the following revision to the screening requirement for Area A: "Provided, however, the timing and extent of the screening is to be determined at Detail Site Plan review." Mr. Carnes and Mr. Draughon stated support of maintaining a 10% open space requirement.

Z-6281 & PUD 460 Norman (Raffkind) - Cont

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6280 & PUD 460 Norman (Raffkind)**, as recommended by Staff with the following modifications:

Add to Screening standards for Area A: "Provided, however, the timing and extent of the screening is to be determined at Detail Site Plan review."

Add to Permitted Uses for Area B: Use Unit 6, Single-Family Dwellings.

Legal Description:

Z-6281:

CS Zoning on a tract of land being described as the south 467' of the east 467' of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma;

RM-0 Zoning on a tract of land being described as the south 767' of the east 767' of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, LESS AND EXCEPT the south 467' of the east 467' of said Section 12;

RS-3 Zoning on a tract of land that is all of the SE/4 of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, LESS AND EXCEPT two tracts of land being described as follows: Tract 1 - starting at the southwest corner of the SE/4 of said Section 12; thence N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line of said quarter section for 1,191.74' to the POB; thence continuing N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line for 660.0'; thence S 89°57'13" E for 660.0'; thence S 0°02'47" W for 660.0'; thence N 89°57'13"W for 660.0' to the POB of said tract of land; AND Tract 2 - being the south 767' of the east 767' of said Section 12.

PUD 460: A tract of land that is all of the SE/4 of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, LESS AND EXCEPT a tract of land that is part of the W/2 of the SE/4 of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting at the southwest corner of the SE/4; thence N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line for 1,191.74' to the POB; thence continuing N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line for 660.0'; thence S 89°57'13" E for 660.0'; thence S 0°02'47" W for 660.0'; thence N 89°57'13"W for 660.0' to the POB of said tract of land.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6280 & PUD 460 Norman (Raffkind)**, as recommended by Staff with the following modifications:

Add to Screening standards for Area A: "Provided, however, the timing and extent of the screening is to be determined at Detail Site Plan review."

Add to Permitted Uses for Area B: Use Unit 6, Single-Family Dwellings.

Legal Description:

Z-6281: CS Zoning on a five acre square at the northwest corner of East 81st Street and South Mingo Road; RM-0 Zoning for a 300' wide strip wrapping around the CS zoned area; and RS-3 Zoning on the remainder of a tract described as follows: A tract of land that is all of the SE/4 of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, LESS AND EXCEPT a tract of land that is part of the W/2 of the SE/4 of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting at the southwest corner of the SE/4; thence N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line for 1,191.74' to the POB; thence continuing N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line for 660.0'; thence S 89°57'13" E for 660.0'; thence S 0°02'47" W for 660.0'; thence N 89°57'13"W for 660.0' to the POB of said tract of land.

PUD 460: A tract of land that is all of the SE/4 of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, LESS AND EXCEPT a tract of land that is part of the W/2 of the SE/4 of Section 12, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City and County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting at the southwest corner of the SE/4; thence N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line for 1,191.74' to the POB; thence continuing N 0°02'47" E along the westerly line for 660.0'; thence S 89°57'13" E for 660.0'; thence S 0°02'47" W for 660.0'; thence N 89°57'13"W for 660.0' to the POB of said tract of land.

see revised legal

SUBDIVISIONS:

ACCESS CHANGE ON RECORDED PLAT:

Eastgate Industrial Park Addition (594) Interstate 44 & South 129th East Ave.

Mr. John Eshelman, Traffic Engineer, reviewed a memo he submitted to Staff regarding this request, as follows:

"Attached is a copy of a Change of Access application which is being denied by this office. I have included a copy of the ODOT construction plans for the immediate area as well. You may be requested by the applicant to place this item on the TMAPC agenda in order to officially confirm the denial. This would be an unusual procedure, but the property is involved in court in condemnation proceedings with ODOT. I did confer with ODOT in the process of reaching this decision since I know of the court proceedings."

Mr. Doherty initiated discussions with Mr. Eshelman regarding right-of-way and access.

Mr. Parmele announced a conflict of interest, advising he would, therefore, be abstaining from discussion or vote on this case.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Ted Sack, representing the applicant, emphasized the existing service road allowed two-way traffic and provided good access to the tract. However, the new roadway would only provide one-way access going west, and without access on 129th East Avenue a person could not get off the property in a effective or efficient manner.

Mr. Doherty inquired if the TMAPC had the authority to approve a change of access with the Traffic Engineer's recommendation for denial. Mr. Linker recommended not going against their recommendation since the TMAPC had no other basis for approving the request.

After hearing a suggestion by Mr. Carnes that a continuance might be warranted in this case, Mr. Sack stated his client needed to know one way or another if access would be provided to 129th East Avenue.

Mr. Paddock moved to confirm the Traffic Engineer's recommendation for denial, and mentioned the possibility of ODOT providing two-way access as done with other service roads along I-44.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **5-0-1** (Carnes, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; Parmele, "abstaining"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **DENY** the **Access Change on Recorded Plat for Eastgate Industrial Park Addition**, as recommended by the Traffic Engineer.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 179-P: Amendment to Detail Sign Plan for Randle Plaza
SE/c of East 74th Place & South Memorial for Lot 1, Block 2

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting to amend the Detail Sign Plan for Lot 1, Block 2, Randle Plaza (Ryan's Family Steak House) by moving the location of the approved ground sign from the northwest corner to the southwest corner of the lot. The new location is in compliance with the development standards of PUD 179-P; therefore, Staff recommended **APPROVAL** of the sign relocation.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **5-0-1** (Carnes, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; Parmele, "abstaining"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Amendment to the Detail Sign Plan for PUD 179-P Cox (Ryan's Steak House)**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 417-B: Detail Sign Plan - St. John Medical Center
NE/c of East 21st Street & South Utica Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

PUD 417 is a 21.79 acre development that was approved for hospital, physicians offices and related uses by the TMAPC in May 1986 and by the City Commission in June, 1986. The PUD is unique in that it has developed in a campus concept with the hospital located on the northeast corner of East 21st Street and South Utica Avenue and other hospital related uses are scattered in various structures to the north and east. The applicant is requesting detail sign plan approval to permit three additional signs for the medical complex. Two signs are proposed to be located in Development Area "L" along South Wheeling Avenue with the remaining sign in Development Area "A". Minor amendment, PUD 417-2, approved by the TMAPC on October 5, 1988 permitted a number of wall and ground directional signs for the complex.

After review of the applicant's submitted sign location map and elevations, Staff finds the request to be consistent with the original PUD. The size of the signs is eight square feet, which is five square feet larger than the Code permits for a directional sign which is exempt from the ground sign regulations. Staff would recommend the TMAPC determine that for this and similar facilities, i.e., Laureate Psychiatric Clinic, directional signs larger than three square feet may be used and still not be considered and regulated as ground signs due to the size and campus concept of these developments.

PUD 417-B Detail Sign Plan - Cont

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan per the applicant's submitted plan and elevations and subject to the TMAPC determination the eight square feet directional sign is appropriate.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Coutant, Kempe, Randle, Wilson, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Sign Plan for PUD 417-B St. John Medical Center**, as recommended by Staff and after discussion regarding directional signs.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Date Approved

2/17/90

James R. O'Neil
Chairman

ATTEST:

Art Draughon
Secretary