TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1878
Wednesday, April 1, 1992, 1:30 p.m.
City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Ballard	Horner	Gardner	Linker, Legal Counsel
Broussard	Selph	Hester	
Buerge		Matthews	
Carnes		Stump	
Doherty, 1st Vice Chairman		Wilmoth	
Midget, Mayor's Designee			
Neely, 2nd Vice Chairman			
Parmele, Chairman			
Wilson, Secretary			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Tuesday, March 31, 1992 at 1:23 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of March 18, 1992, Meeting No. 1876:

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; Neely "abstaining"; Horner, Midget, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of March 18, 1992 Meeting No. 1876.

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report

Mr. Gardner reported that House Bill 1891 is the TMAPC proposed legislation. He advised that it passed the House, but the Senate is holding discussion on requiring changes in the makeup of TMAPC as to membership. Senator Long is proposing that members be appointed to the Planning Commission from each City Council District.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that such a move is ill-timed and ill-considered and possibly detrimental and harmful to the interest of regional planning and development. The Planning Commission agreed that representation seems to be adequate as it is. The Planning Commission asked that this be conveyed to the Senate's author and to the legislative delegation.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **EXPRESS** to Senator Long TMAPC's opposition to the proposed change to House Bill 1891.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Comprehensive Plan Committee

Mr. Neely announced the Comprehensive Plan Committee met today to discuss the update to the Tulsa Historic Preservation Plan. He advised a public hearing is scheduled for April 8, 1992 to consider adoption of the Tulsa Historic Preservation Plan as a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area.

Rules and Regulations

Mr. Doherty reported that at the last City Council meeting, regarding towers and antennae, the issue of setback from lot lines within an AG district was addressed and the possibility that an antenna or tower might damage the residential developability of the remaining AG zoned property. The Rules and Regulations Committee, at the request of City Council, will examine this issue at a future Committee meeting.

Budget and Work Program

Ms. Wilson reminded everyone of the TMAPC training workshop to be held this Saturday, April 4, 1992.

PUBLIC HEARING

This is a public Hearing on District 26 Plan Map and Text Amendments.

Chairman Parmele stated the Comprehensive Plan Committee has made a recommendation that the Plan Amendments be adopted as reviewed by the Committee and approved by staff. He asked that discussion be confined to the areas of difference that remain.

Staff Comments

Ms. Matthews reviewed the following remaining areas of difference:

* Whether to leave special District 2 ("sump area", Development Sensitive) as such, or to remove it.

  Comprehensive Plan Committee consensus: Leave as is, pending outcome of south Tulsa Basin Drainage Study.
* Whether to restrict development in designated Development Sensitive areas to Low Intensity uses.

Comprehensive Plan Committee consensus: Not to restrict to Low Intensity Uses.

* Whether to remove the Medium Intensity cross-hatching on the node at 101st and Yale.

Comprehensive Plan Committee consensus: Leave node cross-hatching as is currently on plan map.

* Whether to recommend that no further rezoning (commercial and otherwise) occur in this district until such time as the infrastructure is in place to serve it. (Relates to 4.1 and 4.4.1.6.)

Comprehensive Plan Committee consensus: To recommend this would not be in accord with the Development Guidelines, and so cannot support.

* Whether to insert the word *"environment"* under policy 4.1.

Comprehensive Plan Committee consensus: Not to insert the word "environment".

Doug Vincent **10530 S Urbana 74137**

Mr. Vincent, District 26 Chair, expressed his gratitude to Dane Matthews for her assistance in this update. He commended her professionalism and the pleasantness she displayed even during times of heated debate.

Mr. Vincent noted this effort has been ongoing for over a year. He expressed it was upsetting to him that towards the end of these efforts it was no longer residential community involvement, but lawyers living outside the district who became involved in the process. He asked the Planning Commission to consider the residents' requests and not just individuals from outside the area.

Mr. Vincent declared the residents are not against development, profit, or commercialization, but they desire to be part of the planning and development process of the area. A key point of concern is the environment. He stated the word *"environment"* seems to scare individuals. Mr. Vincent advised that the concerned residents are not requesting a set of environmental laws. They are merely asking that, with the development, the environment be considered and to include the word *environment* in the plan. He compared the uniqueness of this area to other areas of the city.

Mr. Vincent asked for consideration of the infrastructure within the development. Interested parties are not asking it definitely be in place and are not being restrictive, but that infrastructure be considered before development occurs.

Mr. Vincent requested that in any development when it is necessary to remove trees that they be replaced in other areas in an attempt to protect the environment and general area.

Mr. Vincent reported that residents do not feel it is necessary to have commercial development on every corner. He expressed strong support of the Parking Lot Landscape Plan being considered by TMAPC.

In closing Mr. Vincent asked the Planning Commission to consider the residents of the area, the input and time that has been put into this process.

Chairman Parmele asked Mr. Vincent how he thinks the planning process has worked and if he feels he was given opportunity for input, was he listened to, and if some of his recommendations are being considered.

Mr. Vincent replied that he feels very few of his recommendations were taken into consideration. He feels the attorneys should not be involved; for the public hearings and community involvement the community should be involved and not those who do not live in the area. He does feels some of the residents' recommendations were accepted, but feels that, had residents not been involved, more items would have been accepted that residents were opposed to.

Mr. Doherty commented that even though much of Mr. Vincent's suggestions won't be evident in the language of the Comprehensive Plan, he has made an impression on the Planning Commission and many of those things will be considered, even though they are not formally in the plan, when looking at development.

Roy Johnsen

Mr. Johnsen stated that he attended several of the District 26 meetings and understood the concept was not just for residential input, but other property owners in the district are appropriately included in some of the planning team efforts. Mr. Johnsen's clients, Dr. and Mrs. Torchia, own both commercial properties at 101st and Yale and 101st and Sheridan and live at 96th and Yale. He added that they have lived in the area and participated in the planning process for more than twenty years. Mr. Johnsen pointed out that the process began with a plan that had been adopted after extensive public hearings some years back with full citizen participation by numerous residents and land owners and was the product of extensive citizen participation. He reminded participants this was an effort to update that plan. Mr. Johnsen acknowledged participating in debate at the committee meetings and stated that not all of his suggestions were taken either, but believes the committee's position is a fair one and stated they listened to the arguments that were made and supported an adoption as recommended by the committee.

Kent Shobe **4115 E. 101st Pl 74137**

Mr. Shobe disclosed participating in the planning process over the fifteen years he has lived in the district. He expressed that citizens residing in the area have been concerned with the area because of the environment. Of particular concern are intrusions of commercial developments and the people primarily involved have been citizens and homeowners who are concerned about the planning process. He pointed out that while the Torchia's own property in District 26, they do not live in District 26. Mr. Shobe feels the issue is that citizens have designed a plan, been in favor of it, and want to keep the beauty of the area. The developers have primarily been on the sidelines observing the development of the plan and not really objected to most of what was developed, but have not really participated either. They have objected to a few details, and each time the developers and their attorneys object those objections are upheld. Mr. Shobe asked for more even-handedness. He realizes the residents are getting much of what they are asking for, but still when the attorneys object, they get their point of view to prevail.

Mr. Shobe commented that the 101st and Yale intersection has changed in that there is a school on the southwest corner. Mr. Shobe feels this increases the fact that residents want to keep the development in as low an intensity as possible. It is his opinion that we should deviate from the norm and that citizens be heard, more than they have been in the past. The reason for citizen involvement in the planning process is so they can have input, and the developers and attorneys do not necessarily have veto power and do not necessarily dictate by their objections what goes into the plan.

Charles Norman

Mr. Norman, an attorney, commented that District 26 has had the problem of wanting to be different from the rest of the community over the years and in not recognizing the applicability of the Development Guidelines and development standards to the entire community. He advised his client is an owner of property at 101st and Yale and when he and others appear on their behalf they are criticized by virtue of being an attorney rather than for the comments they make. He feels it is a disservice to the process for interested parties to not want to hear the lawyers and listen only to the people who live there. The purpose of this proceeding is to consider issues, policies and standards that are by law applicable uniformly to all of the property in the area. Mr. Norman explained that at meetings he attended it was explained at length how much the environment is considered in the development process. He expressed agreement with the tree replacement concept, but it was suggested the existing position be maintained, and if so it should be applicable to the entire city, not just in District 26. Mr. Norman declared that he and his clients support these efforts and those for parking lot standards. Mr. Norman remarked that the Planning Commission has never taken lawyers' positions as any kind of gospel, but have taken the history and concepts of the law very seriously. Mr. Norman declared support of the process and has

participated in it as an owner and attorney. Mr. Norman expressed support of the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, although the exact language is not, in every instance, what either he suggested or might prefer.

TMAPC Review
Chairman Parmele noted that the committee spent a considerable amount of time with interested parties and had much discussion on the various issues of environment, whether infrastructure should be in place before or after development, trees, nodes, etc.

Ms. Wilson commented that the Comprehensive Plan Committee has done a very good and fair job in hearing out the diverse view points and opinions. The idea of tree replacement is a city wide concern. She commented that this is an issue the City Urban Forester should be involved in. Ms. Wilson asked the Planning Commission to direct staff to put an inquiry in to the Urban Forester on behalf of District 26, looking at that issue city-wide. She stated that she is in favor of the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Mr. Neely reported the word *"environment"* was hotly debated at the meetings and it was the consensus of the committee the use of that word might increase additional standards by which to consider the requests and given the amount of input staff gives to the environment now, that the wording as it is, is satisfactory. On the point concerning 101st and Yale, two of the four corners are presently zoned medium intensity and without going against the citywide practice of having all four corners designated as cross-hatched, it was the consensus of the committee that it was important to maintain the medium intensity at that intersection.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **NEELY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Midget, Selph "absent") to **ADOPT** the proposed amendments to the District 26 Plan as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan Committee.

NOTE: Text that is underlined is proposed to be added, and text shown in [brackets] is proposed to be deleted.

2.1.1 Offer a low density option so that all residents of Tulsa have available a choice of lifestyles, and in order that future development will be compatible with existing development and with the physical environment.

2.1.2 Maintain a predominantly single-family residential [and industrial] zoning, and designate uses to areas suitable for them in respect to natural and manmade characteristics.

3.2.2 Development intensities shall be consistent with the ability of the sanitary sewer systems to accommodate them.

4.1 The natural physical assets, [and] the availability of public facilities and the existing development should be the primary determinants of appropriate land uses within the District.

The effect of any development in the District should be reviewed and considered.

4.3.1.1.3. Medium intensity residential development should generally occur within designated medium intensity nodes and/or [high intensity] corridors.

4.3.1.1.4. High Intensity uses should be restricted to the existing Corridor. However, it is anticipated that little or no High Intensity development will occur in this District.

4.3.1.1.5. Future residential development should be compatible with the existing low intensity residential character of the District.

4.3.1.1.6. Continued use of the Planned Unit Development process is encouraged for future developments in this District.

4.3.1.1.7. Residential development adjacent to the Creek Turnpike should be buffered from noise and other potentially adverse environmental impacts associated with the roadway.

4.3.1.1.8. Existing trees should be saved, where at all feasible, when future development occurs. Any trees removed should be held to an absolute minimum.

4.4.1.4. Future commercial development should be limited to those areas designated for Medium Intensity development at the intersections of arterials where compatible with the existing environment.

4.4.1.5. Use of the PUD is encouraged in future commercial or other Medium Intensity developments, to ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses.

5.2.1.3. Unless otherwise indicated, streets in District 26 designated as arterials on the Major Street and Highway Plan shall be so designated on the Plan Map. [However, they are not to be developed to those standards until such time as existing or proposed development demands it.]

[5.2.2.1. The potential for eliminating the requirement for curbs and gutters as a part of local street design in lower density subdivisions, as called for in the Tulsa Subdivision Regulations, should be investigated.]

5.2.2.1. The Major Street and Highway Plan should be amended to include the extension of Harvard (or a similar alignment in the vicinity) as a residential collector south from 91st Street District 26 to 101st Street. Note: This intersection does not qualify as a Medium Intensity node under the criteria set forth in the Metropolitan Development Guidelines.

5.2.2.2. Planning and design for the extension of Harvard should include measures to protect adjacent or nearby residential areas from potential adverse impacts, such as noise, air pollution and appearance. Measures that could be considered include landscaped buffering, open space, pedestrian/bicycle trails and parks. (This could also provide linkage with existing and proposed facilities at Hunter Park, the soccer fields and areas within the neighborhoods).

* (The Silver Chase Homeowners Association has submitted a letter with recommendations for linear park/buffering treatment along this portion of the roadway, and this will be transmitted to the City Council with the amendments.)

5.2.2.3. The city is encouraged to enforce the present zoning code which requires removal of existing billboards and other outdoor advertising not in a freeway sign corridor, and removal of such nonconforming billboards which do not meet city regulations on or before January 1, 1995.

5.3 Pedestrianways/Bikeways

A system of pedestrianways and bikeways is to be developed as indicated on the Plan Map. Timing is to be coordinated with overall development of each area (see Metropolitan-Wide Policies). Further extension of the Tulsa Trails system through this area, except in those environmentally-sensitive areas where such trails would be detrimental, is encouraged.

6.2.1 Augment the passive open nature of district development with appropriate active recreation areas to meet the needs of present and future residents of the District in accord with the adopted Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan.

6.2.1.1 Encourage the development of park and recreation facilities in conjunction with the extension of River Parks through the District. [River Park Project.]

6.2.1.2 The Plan Map indicates the system of parks and open space to be developed within District 26. The acquisition of additional park and open space land is encouraged, as feasible and appropriate.

6.2.1.3. Recreational facilities should be included as parts of additional stormwater management facilities to be developed in this District.

6.3.1.2 Proposals for new developments near the Jenks School at 101st and Yale should take into account the safety of the school children and impact on the surrounding residential nature of the area when determining circulation, access, and other similar issues.

6.3.1.3 Schools are important facilities in this District, and the planning team encourages their continued support and development.

6.5.1.1. Develop and maintain adequate drainage facilities, including detention facilities to be located as indicated in the City-Wide Master Drainage Plan and in the South Tulsa Basin Drainage Study.

Plan Map Amendments

* Remove Medium Intensity cross-hatching at node at 111th and Yale.

* Show extension of Harvard Avenue south from 91st Street to 101st Street as a residential collector. (See attached recommendations from Silver Chase Homeowners Association regarding preferred alignment and buffering).

* Show proposed parks as indicated in the adopted Park, Recreation and Open Space Plan. (See also Silver Chase HOA recommendation regarding buffering for Harvard alignment).

* Show extension of River Parks through the District.

Chairman Parmele commented to Mr. Vincent and Mr. Shobe that even though they feel they did not get everything they wanted their input and effort was very much appreciated. Mr. Parmele stated that he attended several of the committee meetings and the work of the District 26 planning team and residents of the district were helpful and their views were considered. Chairman Parmele also thanked Ms. Matthews for the role she played in the process.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY APPROVAL:

Ashton Woods (PUD 275-1) (2183) (PD-18) (CD-8) (RS-3)
Northwest corner of the Creek Turnpike and S. Yale Avenue

This plat has a "sketch plat" approval by TAC on 1/14/92 subject to the conditions as listed in the minutes of that meeting. Note that the name has been changed from Colton's Crossing to Ashton Woods. A copy of the TAC minutes of 1/14/92 was provided with staff comments in the margin.

The developers were not able to obtain access through the condominiums to the north except near the entry gate to Yale. (A letter from the Condo Homeowners Association was provided for the record.) TAC had recommended a second point of emergency access near the center or further back toward the rear (west) part of the development. The access shown between Lots 57 & 58, Block 1 is all that could be obtained. It was anticipated that this should have been resolved by the TMAPC in the hearing on the minor amendment to the PUD prior to this TAC meeting. However, applicants failed to appear at the 2/26/92 meeting and the item was struck from the agenda. Since it must be re-advertised, it is now scheduled for March 18, 1992, the same day this plat is also scheduled.

The plat meets the PUD conditions as per Staff recommendation 2/26/92. However, any changes made during the PUD hearing 3/18/92 applicable to the plat, are made a condition of approval. (See condition #1)

Fire Department has advised Staff that Fire Ordinances and/or policies require two points of access for 74 dwelling units or more (this plat has 68) or a maximum of 1000' from the primary point of access. (Measured from 94th and Winston it is approximately 940' to Urbana Avenue, but another 300' to the northwesterly quadrant of the subdivision, totaling 1240'.) Since the only 2nd point of access obtainable is shown as required, this appeared to be all that could be done towards a second access.

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Phil Smith and Adrian Smith (Hammond Engineering) and Greg Breedlove, Lindsay Perkins and Ed Schermerhorn, the developers.

There were no other comments and or objections other than the 2nd point of access as discussed. Waiver of scale was recommended.

On MOTION of HILL, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **APPROVAL** of the PRELIMINARY plat of *Ashton Woods*, subject to the following conditions including waiver of the drawing scale:

1. All conditions of PUD 275-1 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 1100-1107 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.

2. The private street system should include utility uses in the private streets. Paving in these private streets should be wide enough to accommodate the expected traffic and to provide an additional area for utilities. Street standards are specified in the amended PUD text and in the plat. However, make sure utilities have easements or rights in private streets.

3. Show limited access along the Turnpike boundaries. Other access shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Traffic) and shown on plat as directed. (Street location to Yale is OK as shown.)

4. 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. (Show 30' PSO easement)

5. Water plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat. Include language for Water and Sewer facilities in covenants.

6. 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 owners(s) of the lot(s).

7. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat. The Department of Public Works recommended that all sewers be located in back where possible. (Some lots in SW corner of plat may require additional study and location.)

8. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Stormwater Management and/or Engineering), including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by the City of Tulsa. (Fee-in-lieu permitted.)

9. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Engineering Division).

10. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Department of Public Works (Traffic) 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.)

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. Plat drawn at a 1" = 60' scale instead of 1" = 100' standard as required by the Subdivision Regulations. Due to detail required, Staff recommends approval of a waiver of scale.

13. Show tie dimension to 91st Street.

14. Make minor corrections and/or changes to PUD section of covenants as per Staff.

15. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations.

16. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

PUD 275-1 Minor Amendment to change the permitted use from multifamily residential to single-family residential -northwest corner of South Yale Avenue and the Creek Turnpike

The applicant is requesting that the subject tract which was previously designated for multifamily residential and attached single-family be allowed to develop as detached single-family residential on private streets. The present standards allow 311 dwelling units and the applicant is proposing to reduce this to 70. The tract is abutted to the north by a condominium development built as part of the original PUD. Staff can support the minor amendment with the following conditions now applying to this portion of the PUD.

1. The applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text for "Colton's Crossing" be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

2. **Development Standards:**

Site Area (Gross):	22.9 acres
Permitted Uses:	Use Unit 6
Maximum Number of Dwelling Units	70
Minimum Lot Width	
Interior lots	65'
Corner lots	70'

Minimum Required Yards	As required for the RS-3 District
Minimum Lot Size	7,500 SF
Minimum Livability Space per D.U.	4,000 SF
Maximum Structure Height	35′
Minimum Private Street Right-of Way	
Main street	32′
All other streets	27′
Minimum Private Street Pavement Width	
Main Street*	24′
All other streets*	22′
Cul-de-sacs* (diameter)	79′

*Measured from face of curb to face of curb

Minimum Off-Street Parking	Two enclosed and two in the driveway per dwelling unit.
Minimum Dwelling Size	None

3. The subdivision plat shall serve as the required Detail Site Plan.

4. A homeowners association shall be created and vested with sufficient authority and financial resources to properly maintain all common areas, including any stormwater detention areas and all private streets and drainage structures within the PUD.

5. No Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 1107E of the Zoning Code has been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City beneficiary to said Covenants.

6. Subject to review and approval of conditions as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.

Staff Comments

Mr. Wilmoth reviewed the discussion from the Technical Advisory Committee. He noted that waiver of drawing scale is being requested and advised staff is in agreement.

Mr. Doherty advised that he objected to the length of the cul-de-sac, which he does not like, but it appears the applicant has no choice.

Mr. Neely expressed concern over the lack of two viable points of access and declared he would be voting against the approval of the preliminary plat for that reason.

Chairman Parmele expressed that there appears to be no choice in this case since there is development to the north and the turnpike to the south and a mining quarry to the west, the only access appears to be to Yale.

Mr. Neely commented that there could be two points of access on Yale and he understands the dilemma, but the concern is having a house burn down and feels it is a legitimate concern in this instance.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-2-0** (Ballard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; Broussard, Neely "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 275-1 Minor Amendment to change from multifamily to single-family residential and the Preliminary Plat of Ashton Woods subject to conditions as recommend by staff.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

The Cloisters on Cherry Street (PUD 478-1)(1292) **(PD-6)(CD-4)**
East 15th Street & S. Owasso Avenue *(RS-4)*

This plat was reviewed as a "PUD Review" by TAC on 11/21/91 and a number of comments were made for the record. At that time it was thought that only the streets had been closed by Ordinance and the underlying platted lots of Broadmoor Addition still existed. It has been discovered that the plat was VACATED, so a new plat is being submitted, based on the alignment of the old streets and utilities in place. Therefor, instead of processing a waiver of plat, a plat has been submitted and it will go through the usual procedures. A copy of TAC minutes was provided as well as a copy of the Board of Adjustment approval of the variance in setback required on E. 15th Street.

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant not represented.

Utilities advised that when access driveways to the garages are built, underground gas, electric, telephone, and TV should be kept out from under paving except for crossings.

The Department of Public Works advises that an "as built" plan for existing water lines, storm, and sanitary sewers should be provided. An "on-site" (camera) inspection of existing facilities is also recommended.

Fire Department advises a turn-a-round at the north end of Owasso Avenue is recommended.

Staff advised that the PUD had been approved including the setbacks and right-of-way along 15th Street.

On MOTION of HILL, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **APPROVAL** of the PRELIMINARY Plat *of The Cloisters on Cherry Street*, subject to the following conditions:

1. On face of plat show: Address and phone number of owner; phone number of Engineer; number of lots and acres (near location map). Number pages in lower corner. Dimension to center of 15th Street. Dimension all building setbacks and easements. Provide detail of property line at northwest corner of 14th Place and Newport.

2. The PUD allows RS-4 standards, which include a 20′ setback from the front property line. This is 45′ from center line based on a standard 50′ right-of-way , but this plat has been drawn to coincide with the previously platted 60′ of right-of-way . Paving width is 26′. The setback is 45′ from centerline, but is only 15′ from property line. make sure this is clear and that the intent is a setback measured from centerline of private street.

3. Covenants:
   Section II: See Staff for PUD dates, etc.
   Section I, F: Move to the private restrictions since these are private easements, not utility easements, etc.
   Make other corrections and/or changes as needed by TAC or Staff.

4. All conditions of PUD 478-1 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 1100-1107 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.

5. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property lines and/or lot lines. Perimeter easements required. Utilities, including gas and underground electric and telephone should not be under paving except for crossings.

*6. Water plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat.

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 owners(s) of the lot(s).

*8. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat.

9. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Stormwater Management and/or Engineering), including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by the City of Tulsa.

*10. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Engineering Division).

11. A topo map shall be submitted for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (Subdivision Regulations). Submit with drainage plans as directed.

12. Limits of Access or (LNA) as applicable shall be shown on the plat as approved by the Department of Public Works (Traffic). (Show LNA at end of 14th Place.)

13. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Department of Public Works (Traffic) 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.)

14. 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.

15. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.

16. The key or location map shall be complete.

17. 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.

18. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Staff Comments
Mr. Wilmoth reminded the Planning Commission that they approved an amendment last week to allow a home occupation on the lot in the farthermost street to the west, Norfolk. This is basically the same plan that was submitted with the PUD and will be developed at the RS-4 standards in accordance with the PUD. He pointed out that 15th Street is an arterial street, but there were discussions as to where the setback, landscaping, fencing, etc. should be in relation to 15th Street. This is all part of the PUD. TAC realizes this, but there will not be the full 50' of right-of-way from the centerline of 15th and there are provisions in the PUD for landscaping, fencing, and setbacks.

The applicant was present and expressed agreement with the conditions.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") for **PRELIMINARY APPROVAL** of The Cloisters on Cherry Street subject to staff recommendation.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

FINAL APPROVAL AND RELEASE:

Trinity Park (33040 (PD-16) (CD-6) (IL)
NE corner of I-244 and N. 129th E. Ave.

Staff Comments
Mr. Wilmoth advised that all releases have been received and staff recommends approval.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Final Plat of Trinity Park and **RELEASE** same as having met all conditions of approval as recommended by staff.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

WAIVER REQUEST; SECTION 213:

Z-4085 Unplatted (PUD-272-A)(1583) **(PD-18)(CD-8)**
6130 East 81st Street *(CS, RM0)*

This is a request to waive plat on a portion of PUD 272-A abutting 81st Street. It will be used for a seasonal produce and fruit stand. This will consist of a 20' x 30' tent and three paved parking spaces, per applicant's plan. Staff has superimposed applicant's proposal on the concept site plan for PUD-272-A. This indicates the location falls within Development Area A, Retail Uses. The use is obviously not permanent, so Staff has no objection to a waiver to permit the produce stand, subject to the following conditions: (Which will require some action and/or input from the owner of the land. The applicant is only leasing the tract.)

1. Owner shall file a document, approved as to form by City Legal, incorporating therein the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said document. (The provisions of that document and the PUD requirements may be found in the TMAPC minutes of 11/21/84, pages 11-16.)
2. Provide dedication of right-of-way on 81st Street to total 50' from centerline in accordance with the Major Street Plan. (When this is platted under condition # 5 below, and 58' of right-of-way will be required, measured 388' from the centerline of Sheridan for a right turn lane as set forth in Appendix F-2 of the Subdivision Regulations.)
3. Provide utility easements and/or connections as required by the utilities. (Perimeter easement required.)
4. Provide an Access Agreement if required by the Department of Public Works (Traffic Engineering)
5. This waiver is limited to the proposed seasonal use as presented. A subdivision plat shall be submitted, processed and field of record prior to the issuance of a building and/or occupancy permit for any permanent building within this PUD.
6. Health Department requirements apply, including paving under the tent area and access to rest room facilities. (Required through the permit process.)

The applicant was not represented.

On MOTION of HILL, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **APPROVAL** of the **waiver of plat** on Z-4085 and PUD 272-A, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and TAC.

Staff Comments
Mr. Wilmoth explained there was a PUD approved on this tract just west of the Citgo station at 81st and Sheridan. He noted the waiver involves only a portion of the PUD, and staff has placed

several conditions on the application which we believe the applicant is agreeable to. Mr. Wilmoth advised the applicant is only leasing the property. He stated staff recommends the owner file documentation indicating the unplatted land is subject to a PUD. Staff has worked up documentation, consulted with legal, and they agreed to the format; this will be sent to the applicant. Mr. Wilmoth advised, however, that staff wants to obtain right-of-way dedication at this line. He pointed out that when TAC reviewed this, Traffic Engineering was not at the meeting. He later received a call from them advising the city does have this on their Capital Improvements Program, not for construction, but for utility relocation and other preliminaries to construction. Staff is therefore requiring 58', which includes the turn lane, at least 188' of this property. This will be included as a condition. Traffic stated they did not need a specific access limitation in the permit process, but will limit him to two 36' temporary driveways.

Applicant's Comments

Mark Rosenburger **4104 E. 111th St**

Mr. Rosenburger advised that he and the owner are in agreement with staff recommendations.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Midget, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Waiver Request for Z-4085 subject to staff conditions as amended.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

11. L-17125 (F & M Bank) Titus (1993) **(PD-6)(CD-7)** *RS-1*
[Yorktown Estates]

*L-17512 Oakley (873) **(PD-21)(County)**
1/2 mile E. of Lewis on 131st St. S *AG*

L-17527 Pond (3194) **(PD-18)(CD-6)** 5424 S. 107th St. *IL*

L-17528 Brookside Bank (3103) **(PD-3)(CD-3)** 2146 E. Pine St. *CS*

L-17529 Loughridge (894) **(PD-17)(CD-6)**
1130 Blk E. 19th St. S. East of *CS*

*BOA 1071 approved 3-17-92 necessary variances

Staff Comments

Mr. Wilmoth advised that the above listed items are in conformance with subdivision regulations and staff recommends approval.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Midget, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the above listed lot splits as being in conformance with subdivision regulations.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

PUD 237-1: Minor amendment to increase permitted signage. Located west of the southwest corner of South Lewis Avenue and East 73rd Street South

PUD 237 is a 3.2 acre office development which approved a multistory building in 1980. The PUD presently permits signage consisting of one ground sign, not to exceed 32 square feet and a maximum of 20' in height, and no wall signs. The applicant is requesting a minor amendment to add a wall sign of 220 square feet. The underlying OM zoning would permit only one sign with a display surface area of approximately 95 square feet. The 220 SF sign would, in staff's opinion, set an inappropriate precedent for both the number of signs permitted (more than one) and the display surface area allowed in an office development.

After review of the applicant's submitted plot plan and sign elevation, staff does not support the request and does not find it consistent with the PUD conditions or other buildings in the area.

Staff Comments

Mr. Stump advised the amount of signage being requested is over twice the amount an OM district would allow. He noted a quirk in the PUD Chapter which allows offices two to three times the amount of signage in PUDs. He reminded the Planning Commission that they have recommended to change this point in their sign code amendments to not allow more than is allowed in an OM district. Because this sign is so much larger than what would normally be allowed in an office district staff cannot support it and recommends denial.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Jones presented a picture of the proposed sign which has been computerized to scale size of how it would appear on the side of the building.

TMAPC Comments

Mr. Doherty remarked that staff is correct to recommend denial, but given the distance from the ground and the height of the sign, the 220 SF does not appear to be excessive.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Jones what prompted the need for the sign.

Mr. Jones explained it is for identification purposes and has become a problem for individuals to locate the bank building. This

is to aid the public in finding the building since it is not on a major street. He went on to explain the applicant will be removing the ground sign.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minor amendment to increase permitted signage and the Detail Sign Plan.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

PUD 202-B-3 Minor amendment to increase signage -- 7633 East 63rd Street South

The subject tract is located west of the southwest corner of South Memorial Drive and East 63rd Street South and contains a 5-story Office building known as "One Memorial Place". The applicant is requesting a minor amendment to permit one new wall sign of 84 square feet (4' x 21') to be located on the top floor with a northeast exposure. In order to comply with the sign limitations of the OM district, the applicant is proposing to remove one of the existing ground signs, the 3' high by 12' wide sign.

After review of the PUD standards, staff finds the request consistent with the original PUD. The new sign, with the removal of the existing sign, does not exceed the display surface area allowed for an OM District.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of Minor Amendment 202-B-3 as revised.

PUD 202-B-3 Detail Sign Plan --

If TMAPC approves minor amendment PUD 202-B-3, then staff would recommend approval of the Detail Sign Plan for the 4' x 20' 9" wall sign conditioned upon removal of the smaller existing ground sign

Applicant's Comments

The applicant's attorney expressed agreement with staff recommendation.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minor Amendment for 202-B-3 to increase signage and the Detail Sign Plan Review.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

PUD 272A Detail Site Plan for portion of Development Area "A"- Southwest corner of East 81st Street and South Sheridan Road

The applicants' site plan proposes a 20' X 30' tent to be used as a fruit stand facing 81st Street. The development area allows commercial uses as proposed. The applicant is also proposing an 8' X 8' ground sign in front of the tent. Staff finds the site plan to be in accordance with the PUD conditions and recommends **APPROVAL.**

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **NEELY**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Detail Site Plan for a portion of the southwest corner of East 81st Street and South Sheridan Road.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

PUD 196 Detail Sign Plan for two temporary signs
Southeast corner of South Memorial Drive and East 71st Street

The applicant is requesting sign plan approval for two temporary 4' X 8' signs, one on 71st Street and one on Memorial Drive. There are three time periods which are requested:

May 25 thru 31, 1992
September 7 thru 13, 1992
November 8 thru 15, 1992

Previously the TMAPC has approved these temporary signs for a predetermined amount of time. Therefore, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan for the time periods listed above.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Detail Sign Plan for two temporary signs on the southeast corner of South Memorial Drive and East 71st Street.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

PUD 206 Detail Landscape Plan - South of the Southwest corner of East 91st Street and South Sheridan Road

Staff has reviewed the proposed Detail Landscape Plan and finds it to be in conformance with the PUD design standards subject to the following conditions:

1. The shrubbery proposed on the east side of the parking lot should be setback sufficiently from the curb to prevent damage from car overhangs.

2. The gates to the dumpster areas shall provide visual screening of these areas.

3. The trees proposed south of the loading dock are not on the subject tract and some assurance should be provided that the owner of that tract has agreed to the planting and maintenance of these trees.

4. The two hydromulched areas east of the southeast and northeast corners of the building should have a tree in each.

With these conditions staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan for the Food Lion store.

TMAPC Comments

Ms. Wilson asked if the trees stated in condition #3 are on the subject tract or the adjoining property.

Mr. Stump replied that they would be on the subject tract.

Ms. Wilson expressed concern over the trees being removed in development of the adjoining property.

Mr. Stump explained that if the southern property is developed commercially, which it is zoned for, the need for those trees would be mitigated by an additional screening fence along the south property line of the southern tract. At that time they could be removed because of the possible conflicting development plan for that tract. Mr. Stump advised there is an interested party considering developing the southern tract and there is a possibility they will present an amended landscape plan which may delete some of this landscaping.

Applicant's Comments

Michael Clark **JEM Development**

Mr. Clark advised he transmitted boundary surveys of the sites and their attorneys have been asked to prepare the necessary easement documents.

The applicant expressed agreement with staff recommendations.

Interested Party

Jan Stafford **9229 South Norwood**

Ms. Stafford expressed agreement with staff recommendation; however, she would not like to see anything done to the trees the applicant has agreed to plant on the other tract.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-1** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; Neely "abstaining "; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Detail Landscape Plan for PUD 206 for the Food Lion store.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

PUD 441 Detail Landscape Plan - Northeast corner of Pine and Union Avenue

Staff has reviewed the proposed Detail Landscape Plan and finds it to be in conformance with the PUD design standards subject to the following conditions:

1. The shrubbery proposed on the south side of the parking lot should be setback sufficiently from the curb to prevent damage from car overhangs.

2. The gates to the dumpster areas shall provide visual screening of these areas.

3. The location of the ground sign is not part of this approval.

With these conditions staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan for the west 660' of PUD 441.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Broussard, Buerge, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Neely, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Horner, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the Detail Landscape Plan for the west 660' of PUD 441.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Review of Final TMAPC Training Workshop Program for April 4, 1992
Ms. Matthews updated the Planning Commission on the changes in the agenda for the workshop. There was discussion as to substitutions made and set up of panels.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Date Approved: 4/15/92

Chairman

ATTEST:

Secretary