

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting No. 1964
Wednesday, February 16, 1994, 1:30 p.m.
City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present

Ballard
Carnes, 2nd Vice
Chairman
Doherty, Secretary
Harris
Horner
Midget, Mayor's
Designee
Neely, 1st Vice
Chairman
Pace
Parmele, Chairman

Members Absent

Broussard
Wilson

Staff Present

Gardner
Hester
Jones
Stump

Others Present

Linker, Legal
Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Tuesday, February 15, 1994 at 1:20 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 1:33 p.m.

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of February 2, 1994, Meeting No. 1962:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of February 2, 1994 Meeting No. 1962.

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Parmele referred to a letter received from Mike Case of Case and Associates regarding his company's cube signs in residential areas being in violation of existing sign codes. Mr. Case is requesting that the Planning Commission consider changing the wording of the code to increase square footage to over 8 feet.

Chairman Parmele referred this matter to the Rules and Regulations Committee.

Committee Reports:

Comprehensive Plan Committee

Due to the lengthy TMAPC meeting the Comprehensive Plan Committee Work Session was rescheduled to February 23, 11:30 a.m., in the INCOG conference room.

Director's Report:

Mr. Gardner announced that Staff will be mailing Draft "F" to the Planning Commissioners and interested parties regarding homeless centers and other residential treatment facilities for review before the March 9 Committee meeting.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT:

Yale Cleaners Addition #101 (PUD-364-A)(1984) (PD-26)(CD-8)
North of the northeast corner of East 101st Street South and South Mingo Road.

Jones presented the plat with Dwayne Wilkerson in attendance at the TAC meeting.

Edwards recommended that page 4 of the Deed of Dedication, Paragraph F be amended as: "...cable television or electric facilities within the restricted water line, sewer line or utility easement areas depicted upon the ...".

Jones stated that within the same paragraph the Legal Department recommends "*installation and*" be added before "*maintenance*".

Penquite recommended a fire hydrant on the subject property.

The subject tract is 0.99 acres in size, contains one lot and is part of PUD-364-A. The Planning Commission approved Use Unit 11, office, and Use Unit 5, church and school uses, with the City Council approving the additional use of a dry cleaners.

Staff would offer the following comments and/or conditions:

1. All conditions of PUD-364-A 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 of 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 Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) 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 owners(s) of the lot(s).
5. A request for creation of a Sanitary Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Water & Sewer) prior to release of final plat.
6. 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.

7. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Engineering Division).
8. A topo map shall be submitted for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (Subdivision Regulations). Submit with drainage plans as directed.
9. Street names shall be approved by the Department of Public Works and shown on plat.
10. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
11. Bearings, or true north-south, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by Department of Public Works (Engineering).
12. All adjacent streets, intersections, and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
13. Limits of Access or (LNA) as applicable shall be shown on the plat as approved by the Department of Public Works (Traffic). Include applicable language in covenants.
14. 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.)
15. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
16. 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.
17. The restrictive covenants and deed of dedication shall be submitted for review with preliminary plat. Include subsurface provisions, dedications for storm water facilities and PUD information, as applicable.
18. This plat has been referred to Bixby and Broken Arrow because of its location near or inside a "fence line" of that municipality. Additional requirements may be made by the applicable municipality. Otherwise only the conditions listed apply.
19. 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.
20. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

On the MOTION of HILL, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **APPROVAL** of the PRELIMINARY PLAT for YALE CLEANERS #101, subject to all conditions listed above.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present:

On MOTION of CARNES, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** the PRELIMINARY PLAT of Yale Cleaners Addition #101 subject to conditions recommended by Staff.

FINAL APPROVAL AND RELEASE:

Eagle Ridge (690, 790)
West 11th Street at Coyote Trail

(PD-23) (County)

Staff Comments

Mr. Jones informed that the Deed of Dedication is still being reviewed. He advised that all releases have been received and Staff was recommending approval subject to approval by the District Attorney's office of the Deed of Dedication and Restrictive Covenants.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **NEELY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Homer, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** the Final Plat of Eagle Ridge and **RELEASE** same as having met all conditions of approval as recommended by Staff and subject to approval by the District Attorney's office.

WAIVER REQUEST: SECTION 213:

BOA-16211 (Original Town of Tulsa)(292)
415 West Archer

(PD-1)(CD-4)

Jones presented the request with Scott Sanditen in attendance at the TAC meeting.

Considerable discussion was made in regard to the sidewalk, with French recommending it due to existing sidewalks in the area and the anticipated amount of foot traffic.

Sanditen asked that this requirement be waived due to the cost and the lack of need.

The subject tract is 1.6 acres in size, zoned IM and was approved by the Board of Adjustment for a day center for the homeless. The applicant is requesting to waive the platting requirement and construct a facility as per the attached plan.

Staff would recommend **APPROVAL** of the PLAT WAIVER for BOA-16211, subject to the following conditions:

1. Grading and/or drainage plan approval by the Department of Public Works in the permit process.
2. Access control agreement, if required by the Department of Public Works (Traffic Engineering).
3. Sidewalk extension along Archer.
4. Utility extensions and/or easements if needed.

On the MOTION of MATTHEWS, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to waive the platting requirements for BOA-16211, subject to all conditions listed above.

The applicant expressed agreement with Staff recommendation.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On MOTION of NEELY, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to APPROVE the Waiver of Plat for BOA #16211 Addition as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

CHANGE OF ACCESS ON RECORDED PLAT:

Campbell-66 (3403)

(PD-16) (CD-3)

NE/c of North Yale Avenue & East Archer Street

Staff Recommendation

Mr. Jones presented the plot plan indicating existing access and proposed limits of access and no access. He disclosed that the plan has been approved by the Departments of Public Works and Traffic Engineering. Mr. Jones informed that Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to the plot plan as presented.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On MOTION of CARNES, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to APPROVE the CHANGE OF ACCESS ON RECORDED PLAT for Campbell-66 as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

LOT-SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| <u>L-17817 Target Corporation (1093)</u> | (PD-5)(CD-4) |
| E. 15th St. S. (E. of Yale) | IM |
| <u>L-17824 James S. Torchia (2783)</u> | (PD-26)(CD-8) |
| SW/c of E. 101st St. S. & S. Sheridan Rd. | CS |
| <u>L-17826 Kishor Mehta (1903)</u> | (PD-2)(CD-3) |
| NW/c of E. Apache & N. Lewis | CS/OL |
| <u>L-17840 Tru-Pat Investments (3403)</u> | (PD-16)(CD-3) |
| NE/c of Yale & Archer | CH/OL |
| <u>L-17841 Lessley Co., Inc. (292)</u> | (PD-1)(CD-4) |
| Between Archer & Brady on Elwood | IM |
| <u>L-17842 Alven & Shirley Miller (1763)</u> | (PD-21)(County) |
| Between Harvard & Lewis on E. 211th St. S. | AG |
| <u>L-17843 Unison International Life Insurance (2983)</u> | (PD-26)(CD-2) |
| Between Evanston & Florence on E. 101st St. S. | RS-3 |
| <u>L-17845 Robert & Ouida Merrifield (1993)</u> | (PD-6)(CD-9) |
| 4012 S. Yorktown | |
| <u>L-17846 Zeligson Trustees</u> | (PD-5)(CD-3) |
| E. of the NE/c of Sheridan & Admiral | IL |

Staff Comments

Mr. Jones announced that Staff has found the above-listed lot-splits to be in conformance with the lot-split requirements.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to **RATIFY** the above-listed lot-splits having received prior approval.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING

Application No.: **PUD 508**
Applicant: Charles Norman
Location: Northwest corner of East 21st Street South and South Yorktown Avenue.
Date of Hearing: February 22, 1994
Presentation to TMAPC: Charles Norman

The applicant is proposing a drive-in bank facility on two lots. The lot fronting 21st Street contains a bank building zoned OL. The second lot, which is immediately to the north, contains a single-family dwelling and is zoned RS-3. Both existing structures would be removed. This is the same tract as contained in PUD-471 which was recommended for approval by the TMAPC but was denied by the City Council. That PUD proposed to retain the existing bank building and add new drive-in lanes to the west side of the building. PUD-508 would be exclusively for drive-in banking and building floor area would be limited to 1,200 SF. Only one access point on Yorktown and one on 21st Street are proposed. The

Yorktown access point would be on the OL-zoned portion of the PUD. Decorative screening walls and extensive landscaping are proposed for the north side of the PUD where it abuts residential zoning. Also a seating area and landscaping at the northeast corner of the PUD are proposed. Use of a retaining wall to lower the grade of the drive-in lanes would also provide additional buffering of the residential area to the north.

In Staff's opinion, this PUD is an excellent example of how good design can be used to protect residential neighborhoods and still provide an efficient non-residential facility which will be an asset to the City.

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-508 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-508 subject to the following conditions:

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

2. **Development Standards:**

Land Area (Net): 24,909 SF

Permitted Uses: Drive-in banking facility

Maximum Building Floor Area: 1,200 SF

Maximum Building Height: 24 Ft

Minimum Building Setbacks:

From the center line of East 21st Street 53 Ft

From the center line of South Yorktown 80 Ft

From the north property line

Building wall 120 Ft

Drive-in canopy 40 Ft

From the west property line 25 Ft

Off-Street Parking Spaces: 5 Spaces

Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space: 30%*

*Internal landscaped open space includes street frontage landscaped areas, landscaped parking islands, landscaped yards and plazas, and pedestrian areas but does not include any parking, building or driveway areas.

Signs:

As permitted in the OL-Office Light District

Directional and informational signage for the drive-in banking facility entrance and lanes may be erected as permitted by the TMAPC in the detailed site plan review.

3. No Zoning Clearance Permit shall be issued within the PUD 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 Development Standards.
4. A Detail Landscape Plan 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 that all required 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 continuing condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit.
5. No sign permits shall be issued for erection of a sign within 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.
6. All trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view by persons standing at ground level.
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 12 feet.
8. The Department of Public Works or a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify to the zoning officer that all required stormwater drainage structures and detention areas have been installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.
9. 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.
10. Subject to review and approval of conditions as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.

Applicant's Comments

Charles Norman

Mr. Norman, attorney for the applicant, Bank IV, distributed photographs of the subject property detailing existing conditions at the drive-in bank facility. He commented on concerns from area residents to ensure no further intrusion into the neighborhood. Mr. Norman displayed a drawing of the existing facility giving a detailed description of the property and surrounding area. He called attention to the lack of stacking space causing excessive traffic congestion in the area. Mr. Norman informed that the proposal converting this facility for drive-in banking is expected to eliminate the problem of walk-in banking

customers parking along the residential street. He gave a detailed description of the proposed structure, drive-in lanes, traffic access, landscaping, screening, etc. He declared that the proposal will create the capacity required for maximum operational efficiency and avoid off-site stacking. Mr. Norman described the landscaping and fencing which will buffer the residence north of the proposed development. He declared that the proposal will improve and possibly eliminate existing conflicting traffic movements. Mr. Norman informed that representatives from Bank IV are present to answer questions from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Norman answered questions from the Planning Commission and noted that the bank will close at 6:00 p.m. Responding to a question from Mr. Stump, Mr. Norman disclosed that an automatic teller machine (ATM) will remain at this location for drive-up customers.

Mr. Stump advised that Staff recommends a 100' setback from the north boundary of the PUD for the ATM.

Interested Parties

| | |
|---|---|
| Susan Chilcoat | 2235 East 19th Street 74104 |
| President Yorktown Neighborhood Association | |
| Martin R. Steinmetz | 1763 South Xanthus 74104 |
| Officer in the Yorktown Neighborhood Association | |
| W.N. Tuttle | 1915 South Yorktown Avenue 74104 |
| Bryan Craig | 2004 South Yorktown 74104 |
| David England | 1817 South Yorktown 74104 |

The above-listed individuals made the following comments expressing opposition to the proposal.

Area residents declared that of foremost concern is to halt further commercial encroachment into their neighborhood.

Further encroachment will cause property values to decrease when they have only recently begun to increase.

The proposal will dangerously increase unnecessary traffic already traveling above the speed limit, creating potential danger to area children on residential streets. One resident detailed existing problems with speeders and cut-through traffic. It was noted that surrounding businesses use the residential streets for direct access to their businesses.

There was opposition to demolishing the existing home on the northern lot.

Some individuals advised that they could support a bank with five or six lanes, but eight was excessive.

There was concern over additional traffic, noise and pollution which will be created by the proposed project. Of particular concern was the effect from idling cars and increased detrimental effect on the ozone levels and pollutants.

It was noted that the proposed design forces all traffic onto Yorktown, a residential street.

Residents voiced concern that the proposed five parking spaces will be insufficient for bank personnel, causing them to park on the street.

There was concern expressed that glow from parking lot lighting will be disruptive to nearby residences.

It was noted that adjacent residences will have to contend with excessive noise from the ATM on a 24-hour basis.

Residents expressed reservation that the proposal would cause deterioration to a neighborhood which is rejuvenating.

Residents described existing problems, i.e. litter, lack of street parking for visitors, etc. due to on-street parking which overflows from the building's parking lot and other area businesses, This causes further narrowing of the navigable width of Yorktown.

One individual was opposed because it would involve the destruction of the house north of and adjacent to the bank property.

Residents urged that the bank design a more acceptable facility, such as building on the existing two lots without further encroachment into the neighborhood, and that ingress and egress be located on 21st Street to alleviate traffic problems.

Residents feel they are entitled to quiet, peaceful enjoyment of their property, and approving this application will deny them this right. Residents want to maintain the integrity of their neighborhood.

Mr. Steinmetz presented a letter from Anita McCollum, who resides out of state and was unable to attend today's meeting. In her letter she expressed opposition to the encroachment of business into this residential area. She was concerned that traffic in front of adjoining homes will be a nuisance to residents making it impossible to park in front of their homes; noise and lights will be disruptive and annoying; and increased traffic will present a danger to children in the area. It will be a less desirable place to live and the environmental impact of engine exhaust emissions from cars waiting in line with running engines are of concern, as is the probability of property value decreases in the area.

A petition was presented to the Planning Commission expressing opposition to PUD 508.

Sharry White

1518 South Gillette 74104

Ms. White, Board of Adjustment (BOA) member, disclosed that the subject property has been before the BOA several times and has been consistently denied due to encroachment into the adjacent neighborhood. She declared that this is not a neighborhood in transition, as evidenced by increasing property values in the area. Ms. White pointed out that Yorktown is the only through street, except for Lewis and Utica, from 15th to 21st Streets to Utica Square. She informed that the street is narrow, old and not designed for the traffic load it is carrying. She declared that the size of the structure and parking is not the issue, but rather the traffic, and she maintains that a drive-in bank will generate much more traffic than a walk-in facility. She discerns that razing the single-family structure on the north lot and constructing a smaller building and larger drive-in facility will be detrimental to the streetscape of a residential character. Ms. White declared that to maintain the quality of life in the city, there must be viable inner-city neighborhoods and encroachment must be stopped.

Mr. Doherty asked what the principal influences and concerns of BOA were in denying earlier projects in the subject area.

Ms. White disclosed that traffic and encroachment were of primary concern.

Pam Deatherage

1516 East 36th Street 74105

Planning District 6 Chair

Ms. Deatherage disclosed that the Planning District Team feels the applicant has tried to devise an adequate solution to meet the needs of the neighborhood, and believes that with the added turn lane, traffic congestion will improve. She conceded that there is a problem with traffic in the neighborhood and with encroachment as stated by interested parties. She suggested that no additional encroachment be added to the PUD as presented. Ms. Deatherage believes the PUD would be better served if ingress and egress were from 21st Street. She expressed support of the landscaping and separation of height and elevation change. She urged that this be the maximum penetration of nonresidential uses.

There was discussion over holding the zoning line with this PUD.

Mr. Gardner informed that Staff could not have supported this application if it were not already a drive-in banking facility and an existing problem was being solved. He declared Staff would not be recommending approval of encroaching on the lot across the street under any circumstances because the physical facts would not warrant it.

Mr. Deatherage informed that her concern is that if the proposed encroachment is allowed then others may follow.

Interested Parties in Attendance

Charlie Mills

2015 East 20th Street 74104

Letters from Interested Parties

Paul Dougherty

2124 East 19th Street 74104

Jeffrey and Mary Erb

1526 South Yorktown Avenue 74104

Carolyn Farrar

1919 South Yorktown 74104

Ginger Gibson

2119 East 17th Place 74104

Ben Harmon

2135 East 18th Street 74104

Charles G. Ingram

1811 South Yorktown Avenue 74104

Jane and Mike Ives

1530 South Yorktown Place 74104

Carol F. La Rose

1660 East 71st Street, Suite R 74136

Anita McCollum

13411 Barryknoww, Houston, TX 77079

Carla Murphy

1531 South Yorktown Avenue 74104

Alan & JoAnn Margaux Will

2211 East 19th Street 74104-5605

Denny and Bonnie Williams

1903 South Yorktown Avenue 74104

Applicant's Rebuttal

Mr. Norman characterized this as a matter of transition rather than encroachment. He explained that the applicant proposes dealing with existing conditions and making it a more efficient, effective and more attractive banking facility than presently exists. This has been addressed by eliminating inside transactions, which eliminates on site conflicts between pedestrian and vehicles conflicts, drive-in lane conflicts and parking in the neighborhood caused by walk-in banking customers. He explained attempting to work with a topographical change to create a physical barrier to further expansion or transition to the north. He explained the point of having more lanes is to reduce the time customers must wait in line, thereby decreasing the period of time vehicles idle. He explained why it was not possible for ingress and egress to be solely on 21st Street. Mr. Norman advised that Bank IV would not have objection to the Planning Commission placing a restriction in the covenants, which cannot be changed without Planning Commission approval, that the PUD will not be expanded farther to the north. Mr. Norman concluded that there is no zoning

change being proposed, but rather a use change extending 24', hardly an encroachment which will establish precedence for further changes in the future.

TMAPC Comments

There was discussion over the limited number of parking spaces available for employees and concern was expressed over insufficient parking for additional personnel, i.e. repairmen, auditors, etc.

Mr. Doherty expressed concern over the impact of the facility on existing street parking problems. He asked Mr. Norman if he would be opposed to restricting the number of personnel in the facility as a condition of the PUD. Mr. Norman voiced no objection.

Ms. Pace questioned the necessity of an ATM at this location since there are many scattered throughout the City and considering the number of robberies associated with ATMs.

Mr. Norman explained that an ATM is necessary in order to be competitive. He noted that avoiding use of detached ATMs is a means of avoiding criminal activities.

Mr. Doherty shared Ms. Pace's concern over the ATM and noted that Staff recommends the ATM be set back 100' from residential, which is reasonable given its 24-hour nature. He asked if the ATM could be located in another lane, an interior lane rather than the outside lane.

Mr. Norman explained that the blank lane could be confusing to customers during regular banking hours.

TMAPC Review

Mr. Doherty advised that at a previous hearing for this site, the Planning Commission recommended approval which was denied by the City Council. He perceives that the proposed PUD addresses the difficulties City Council found with the previous PUD. Mr. Doherty perceives the problems stated by area residents, speeding, stacking problems, and parking, are not being generated by the bank use. He expressed sharing concerns over ozone exceedence, but does not believe this proposal will impact that unless it is in a positive way. Regarding street parking, Mr. Doherty suggested that limiting parking during certain hours might address the problem. He agrees that a zoning line must be adhered to.

Mr. Doherty made a motion for approval with the condition that personnel be restricted to no more than five employees on site. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carnes.

Mr. Midget informed that he voted against the PUD when it was presented previously because of encroachment. He conceded that the present proposal is improved and believes the abundance of landscaping is an asset. However, he advised that he will be voting against the motion, but should the Planning Commission approve this PUD, they should ensure that no further encroachment be allowed into the neighborhood.

Mr. Horner expressed concern over encroachment and failed to see how this proposal will delete any traffic, but rather move it more efficiently than at present. He stated support of the proposal.

Mr. Carnes assured area residents that trees to be planted will be mature trees and feels the right-turn lane will alleviate the traffic problem.

Ms. Pace voiced objection to the plan and feels the project has outgrown the lot. She feels that eight drive-in lanes is an excessive number and expects that pollution will be excessive

and encompass the neighborhood. She explained that she could support the proposal with six lanes and the entire lot being used as a buffer.

Mr. Parmele believes that the proposal is solving an existing problem, and without the additional northern lot, the applicant can still remove the existing structure to construct a drive-in facility with six lanes and a minimum amount of landscaping.

There was discussion over where the 100' setback for the ATM would place it.

Mr. Norman informed that bank officers disclosed that the ATM lane could be the first lane next to the building and would like the option of having more than five employees on-site, provided that there are more than five parking spaces available.

Mr. Doherty amended his motion to the same number of employees on site not to exceed the number of parking spaces provided. Mr. Carnes seconded the amended motion.

TMAPC Action; 7 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **4-3-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Horner Parmele "aye"; Harris, Midget Pace, "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 508 as recommended by Staff with the condition that the ATM is to be in the first or second lane and the number of personnel is not to exceed the number of available parking spaces.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Lots 3, 4, and 5, Block 9, Woodward Park Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD-244-2: Minor Amendment to increase signage - southwest corner of East 51st Street South and South Yale Avenue.

The applicant is proposing to amend the sign standards for the PUD to allow a wall sign not to exceed 100 SF in display surface area. Currently, only two ground signs not exceeding 4' in height and 32 SF in area are permitted. Since this building is zoned CS and facing commercial uses across 51st Street, Staff can support the request if limited to the north facing walls of the building. Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-244-2, with that condition.

DETAIL SIGN PLAN

If PUD-244-2 is approved, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan for a 75 SF wall sign for Hanover Insurance to be placed near the top of the building on the north side.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 244-2 MINOR AMENDMENT and **DETAIL SIGN PLAN** as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD-489 Detail Sign Plan for Lot 1 - Tulsa ICE Arena - north and east of the northeast corner of East 71st Street South and South Mingo Road.

The applicant is proposing a 133 SF (3.5' X 38') wall sign on the east wall of the Tulsa ICE Arena in Lot 1. The sign complies with the PUD conditions; therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **NEELY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 489 **DETAIL SIGN PLAN** for Lot 1 as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD-468: Detail Sign Plan - Development Area 3 - north of the northwest corner of East 71s Street South and South Mingo Road.

The applicant is proposing an additional wall sign on the east face of the building. The new 26 S sign is still within the limits of the PUD; therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of , the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Midget, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 468 **DETAIL SIGN PLAN** for Development Area 3 as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Housekeeping Amendments to the 11th Street Corridor Plan - Urban Development Department (no amendments to District 4 Plan required).

Dane Matthews informed that these are three minor amendments to the 11th Street Corridor Study resulting from the City Development work with the Planning Team. She reported that the amendments have been reviewed and approved by the Comprehensive Plan Committee.

Greg Warren, Urban Development Department, was in attendance.

Interested Parties

Fred Kumpf

1221 South Newport 74120

Mr. Kumpf reported results of a survey he conducted, along with Thomas Jones, of residents on the east side of Owasso Avenue, between 11th and 13th Streets. These are residents who will be the most affected by the most controversial part of this proposal, which is the extension of Tracy Park. Fourteen of the seventeen property owners were contacted. Three of the owners rent their homes and he was unable to contact them, ten were in favor of the plan, three favored the plan subject to conditions, and one individual was opposed to the plan. The three who supported the plan conditionally suggested that business owners along Peoria be treated fairly and the City make the park more usable by discouraging individuals who use the park for purposes other than what it was intended. Mr. Kumpf advised of a Tracy Park Homeowners Association meeting where the majority expressed support of the plan as proposed.

Interested Parties

Linda Lichty

1135 South Owasso 74120

Aliene & Robert Murdock

1131 South Newport 74120

The above-listed individuals were present, but did not wish to address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Carnes made a motion to approve the Housekeeping Amendments. The motion was seconded by Mr. Neely.

Mr. Neely explained that the amendments allow for a five-year plan to assist businesses along Peoria and the second option is to review extending Tracy Park should the first option not work. He advised that this will be reviewed in 1998 to determine its effectiveness.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Midget, Neely, Pace, Parmele "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Broussard, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE HOUSEKEEPING AMENDMENTS** to the 11th Street Corridor Plan.

* * * * *

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Linker for a report on his findings regarding status of the District Planning Teams regarding their status, legal basis, and governing.

Mr. Linker informed that a resolution was passed by the Board of City Commissioners advising that the Planning Districts are an extension of the Planning Commission and that the Planning Commission and INCOG is to supply support staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Date Approved: 3/2/94

Jack Neely
1st Vice Chairman

ATTEST:

James P. Doherty
Secretary