TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting No. 2156

Wednesday, April 29, 1998, 1:30 p.m.
City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Boyle	Horner	Dunlap	Linker, Legal
Carnes	Ledford	Huntsinger	Counsel
Gray	Midget		
Harmon	Pace		
Jackson			
Selph			
Westervelt			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Monday, April 27, 1998 at 1:40 p.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk at 1:36 p.m., as well as in the office of the County Clerk at 1:31 p.m.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Boyle called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Reports:

Committee Reports:

Special Residential Facilities Task Force:
Mr. Westervelt reported that there will be a meeting at 3:30 p.m. on April 30. He explained that the task force will be touring two facilities. He encouraged the TMAPC members to join the tour.

Mr. Westervelt commented that he is still showing up on the Community Participation Committee and he believes he was to be removed once Mr. Harmon was appointed. In response, Mr. Boyle stated Mr. Westervelt is to be removed from the Community Participation Committee. He verified that the Community Participation Committee members will be Ms. Gray, Mr. Harmon and Ms. Pace.

Director's Report:
Mr. Dunlap stated there will be five items on the City Council Agenda for Thursday evening, April 30th. He indicated that Mr. Stump will be attending the City Council meeting.

Mr. Boyle stated Mr. Westervelt will be attending the City Council meeting to represent TMAPC.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-18592 Roger Eldredge (2592) (PD-6) (CD-9)
East 45th Place and Owasso Avenue

L-18620 Andrew Bielawski (874) (PD-19) (County)
12221 East 132nd Street South

L-18631 Sack & Associates (2793) (PD-18B) (CD-7)
6120 East 41st Street South

L-18635 Tulsa Development Authority (2502) (PD-2) (CD-1)
556 East Reading Street

L-18636 Tulsa Development Authority (3602) (PD-2) (CD-1)
537 East King Street

L-18637 Tulsa Development Authority (3602) (PD-2) (CD-1)
1101 North Elgin

L-18639 City of Tulsa (2293) (PD-18) (CD-7)
6355 East 41st Street

L-18640 City of Tulsa (1984) (PD-18) (CD-8)
Southeast corner 91st and Mingo

L-18641 City of Tulsa (684) (PD-18) (CD-8)
6301 South Mingo

L-18648 Steven Stecher (1783) (PD-18) (CD-2)
2488 East 81st Street

Staff Comments:
Mr. Dunlap stated that staff has reviewed these requests and they are in order.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:
On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT** the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Boyle, Carnes, Gray, Harmon, Selph, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Pace "absent") to **RATIFY** these lot-splits given Prior Approval, finding them in accordance with Subdivision Regulations.

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

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

PUD-586/Z-5888-SP-2 – Roy D. Johnsen **CO to CO/PUD**
Northeast corner Mingo Valley Expressway and (PD-18) (CD-8)
East 91st Street South
(Corridor Site Plan for proposed Medical Complex and
Retail/Shopping Development)

Staff Recommendation:
Planned Unit Development 586/Corridor Site Plan Z-5888-SP-2 encompasses 137 acres. It extends from the Mingo Valley Expressway on the west to Garnett Road on the east, and from 91st Street on the south 2640 feet north.

The subject tract is abutted on the north by a 53.48 acre parcel that is being planned for single-family houses; to the west by U.S. Highway 169 right-of-way; to the south by vacant land, zoned CS, RM-0 and RS-3/PUD-506 and to the east by scattered single-family dwellings within the city limits of Broken Arrow. The Broken Arrow Comprehensive Plan proposes commercial and office uses on this property.

Saint Francis Health System proposes the development of a medical complex in a campus setting, which will include related office and residential facilities within adjoining development areas. An area of approximately 29 acres (net) located at the intersection of East 91st Street South and South Garnett Road is designated for future retail/shopping development.

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-586 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-586 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:**

DEVELOPMENT AREA A

Net Land Area 76 acres

Permitted Uses:

Hospital and uses included within Use Unit 2, Area-Wide Special Exception Uses but limited to nursing home, residential treatment center, and helipad; uses included within Use Unit 4, Public Protection and Utility Facilities but limited to ambulance services and antenna and supporting structures; uses included within Use Unit 8, Multifamily Dwelling and Similar Uses but limited to elderly/retirement housing, life care retirement center and community group homes; uses included within Use Unit 10, Off-Street Parking Areas; uses included within Use Unit 11, Offices, Studios and Support Services; uses included within Use Unit 12, Eating Establishments Other than Drive-Ins; hospital affiliated health club, fitness and wellness center; hotel; Business signs only within Use Unit 21; uses included within Use Unit 22, Scientific Research and Development; and uses customarily accessory to permitted principal uses.

MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO OF ANY LOT (Nonresidential): .60

MAXIMUM LAND COVERAGE BY BUILDINGS: 30%

MAXIMUM NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS/LOT: 30 dwelling units per acre

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT: 160 feet

MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACKS:

From the north development area boundary	75 feet
From Expressway right-of-way	25 feet
From the centerline of East 91st Street	110 feet
From the centerline of Garnett Road	100 feet
From the centerline of Collector	55 feet
From the development area boundaries	25 feet
From other internal lot lines and streets	As established by Detail Site Plan review and approval

OFF-STREET PARKING: As required for the applicable use.

MINIMUM LANDSCAPED OPEN SPACE PER LOT: 15% of net area

BUSINESS SIGNS:

A. Business signs shall be subject to the general use conditions set forth in Section 1221, Use Unit 21, C and D and the following requirements;

B. The number of ground signs in the Development Area shall not exceed:
(1) two on East 91st Street South
(2) three on South Garnett Road
(3) six on internal collectors
(4) four on Mingo Valley Expressway

C. Ground signs shall not exceed 12 feet in height when adjacent to a collector street or private street.

D. Ground signs adjacent to 91st Street and to Garnett and outside the freeway sign corridor shall not exceed an aggregate display surface area of 1 SF for each lineal foot of arterial street frontage nor more than 25' in height.

E. Ground signs within a freeway sign corridor oriented toward the Freeway shall:
(1) not exceed an aggregate display surface area of one square foot for each lineal foot of freeway frontage;
(2) not exceed 40 feet in height.
(3) be spaced at least 1200 feet from any other ground sign when it has a display surface area of greater than 250 square feet and in no case shall these signs regardless of size be closer than 300 square feet from any other sign.

F. Business signs on lots abutting a public or private interior street shall not exceed an aggregate display surface area of two-tenths of one square foot for each lineal foot of street frontage.

G. Wall and canopy signs shall not exceed an aggregate display surface area of two-square feet for each lineal foot of building wall to which the sign is affixed.

DEVELOPMENT AREA B

LAND AREA (Net): 25 acres

PERMITTED USE:

Uses included within Use Unit 8 Multifamily Dwelling and Similar Uses including but not limited to elderly/retirement housing, life care retirement center, and assisted living facilities; nursing homes, uses included within Use Unit 10 Off-Street Parking Areas; uses included within Use Unit 11 Office, Studios and Support Services; and uses customarily accessory to permitted principal uses.

MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO OF ANY LOT (Nonresidential)	.45*
MAXIMUM LAND COVERAGE BY BUILDINGS WITHIN A LOT:	30%
MAXIMUM NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS/LOT:	30 dwelling units per acre*
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:	
Use Unit 11 Uses	60 feet
Other Uses	3 stories
MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACKS:	
From the north development area boundary	
Use Unit 11 Uses	As required in the OM District
Other uses	As required in the RM-1 District
From the centerline of Garnett Road	100 feet
From Expressway right-of-way line	25 feet
From other development area boundaries	25 feet
Minimum Landscaped Open Space Per Lot (Nonresidential):	15% of net area
Minimum Livability Space Per Dwelling Unit:	300 SF
Off-Street Parking:	As required by the applicable use unit.

*[The permitted intensity of residential/care facilities shall be determined by applying the floor area ratio of .45]

SIGNS:

A. Signage within Developed Area B shall comply with the provisions of the RM-1 District in regard to residential or residential care facilities.

B. And shall comply with the provisions of the OL district in regard to nonresidential uses subject to the following modifications and limitations:
   (1) Permitted display surface area may be computed on private street frontage of the lot within which the principal uses is located.
   (2) A ground sign shall not exceed 12 feet in height.
   (3) No ground sign shall be located within 150 feet of the north boundary of the development area.

DEVELOPMENT AREA C

LAND AREA (Net):	29 acres
PERMITTED USES:	As permitted by right within a CS District
MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA RATIO/LOT:	.30
MAXIMUM LAND COVERAGE BY BUILDINGS:	30%
MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:	45 feet

MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACKS:

From centerline of East 91st Street	120 feet
From the centerline of South Garnett Road	108 feet
From other development area boundaries	25 feet

Off-Street Parking: As required by the applicable use unit.

MINIMUM LANDSCAPED OPEN SPACE PER LOT: 10% of net area

SIGNS:

A. Ground signs shall be limited to three for each arterial street frontage with a maximum of 160 square feet of display surface area and 25 feet in height.

B. Wall signs shall be permitted not to exceed 2.0 square feet of display surface area per lineal feet of building wall to which it is attached. The length of a tenant wall sign shall not exceed 75% of the frontage on the tenant space.

C. In addition to the ground signs permitted by A above, a monument style ground sign, identifying the development, shall be permitted not to exceed 16' in height and 200 square feet of display surface area.

STORAGE:

There shall be no outside storage of recyclable material, trash (outside a screened receptacle) or similar material and trucks or trucks trailers may only be parked in the PUD while they are actively being loaded or unloaded. Truck trailers shall not be used for storage.

VEHICLE PARKING:

The parking of commercial vehicles shall not exceed 12 hours at any one time.

3. The principal access to all development shall be from a corridor collector street. A private collector must be a minimum of 24 feet wide. There shall be no parking on the private collector and no parking spaces shall access directly from the private collector. Collector streets, which are private, must be open to the public.

4. No Zoning Clearance Permit shall be issued for a lot within the PUD until a Detail Site Plan for the lot, which includes all buildings and requiring parking and landscaping areas, has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.

5. A Detail Landscape Plan for each development area shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval. A landscape architect registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify to the zoning officer that 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 required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continuing condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit.

6. 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.

7. All trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view by persons standing at ground level.

8. All parking lot lighting shall be hooded and directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas. No light standard nor building-mounted light shall exceed 25 feet in height and all such lights shall be set back at least 75 feet from a single-family dwelling.

9. The Department 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 serving a development area have been installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.

10. No Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 1170F 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 and making the City beneficiary to said covenants.

11. Subject to conditions recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee during the subdivision platting process which are approved by TMAPC.

Staff recommends, if PUD-586 is approved, that Z-5888-SP-2 be approved subject to the conditions in the applicant's corridor site plan and the PUD-586 development standards.

Applicant's Presentation:
Mr. Roy Johnsen, 201 West 5th Street, Suite 440, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 74103, stated he is representing St. Francis Health System. He explained that the areas along the Mingo Valley Expressway have been identified in the Comprehensive Plan as Corridor Districts that are suitable and acceptable for higher intensity of development. This is the pattern that has occurred, particularly the property on the east side of Highway 169, which is approximately 137 acres zoned Corridor in 1984.

Mr. Johnsen indicated that the staff recommendation is acceptable to his client and requested the TMAPC to approve this application.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:
On **MOTION** of **CARNES** the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Boyle, Carnes, Gray, Harmon, Selph, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Pace, "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of PUD-599/Z-5888-SP-2 as recommended by staff.

Legal Description for PUD-586/Z-5888-SP-2:
A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION-18, T-18-N, R-14-E, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT: "BEGINNING AT A POINT" THAT IS THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE SE/4 OF SAID SECTION-18; THENCE S 88°58'03" W ALONG THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SECTION-18 FOR 1,668.99'; THENCE N 01°01'57" W FOR 50.00'; THENCE ALONG THE EXISTING MINGO VALLEY EXPRESSWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY AS FOLLOWS: N 78°46'03" W FOR 117.69'; THENCE S 88°58'03" W AND PARALLEL WITH THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION-18 FOR 350.00'; THENCE N 83°48'43" W FOR 397.81'; THENCE N 20°04'56" E FOR 0.00' TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT WITH A RADIUS OF 5,979.58' FOR 440.80'; THENCE N 06°42'05" E FOR 832.37'; THENCE N 07°51'21" E FOR 0.00' TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT WITH A

RADIUS 0F 5,904.58' FOR 1,044.54' TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE N 02°16'48" W ALONG SAID TANGENCY FOR 230.60' TO A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION-18; THENCE N 89°01'17" E ALONG SAID NORTHERLY LINE FOR 2,197.42' TO A POINT THAT IS THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION-18; THENCE S 01°16'31" E ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SECTION-18 FOR 2,635.75' TO THE "POINT OF BEGINNING".

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

PUD-306-13 – Michael Dodson (PD-18) (CD-8)
East of Northeast corner 101st Street and South Delaware
(Minor Amendment for an oil and lube service.)

Staff Recommendation:
The applicant is requesting Minor Amendment approval to permit the splitting of a portion of Lot 2 into a 125-foot by 220-foot lot to permit the development of an oil and lube facility (Use Unit 14). No site plan was submitted with the request but the applicant provided a site plan for a similar facility at South 116th Street and 31st Street indicating a 1320 square foot facility on a lot of approximately the same size as the current request.

Staff has reviewed the request and finds that the west 113 feet of the proposed 125 feet of frontage on East 101st Street is designated as "limits of no access" on the approved plat (LNA). Staff also finds that no mutual access drives are designated on the plat. Staff notes that an attachment provided in the application incorrectly reflects a 105-foot LNA.

Lot 2 is allocated 80,500 square feet of floor area or 23,132 square feet per acre; the applicant's proposal would create a .63 acre lot within the 3.48 acres of Lot 2. Based on a proportion of lot area to allowed floor area, a .63 acre parcel within Lot 2 would be allocated a maximum of 14,603 square feet of floor area.

Based on the information submitted and the approved plat for River Creek Village, staff finds that the 12 feet of access available is inadequate for an entry drive to East 101 Street. Staff also notes that the site example provided by the applicant indicates multiple points of ingress and egress to the facility on South 116th and 31st Street. No such access points exist within Lot 2 of the River Creek Village Plat.

Staff believes the proposed lot-split will alter the character of the PUD and the recorded plat by creating the need for additional points of access and creating potentially unusable portions of Lot 2 with frontage along East 101st Street. The proposal counters the intent and findings of the platting process.

Staff, therefore, recommends **DENIAL** of the Minor Amendment as submitted.

Brandon Jackson in at 1:42 p.m.

Staff Comments;
Mr. Dunlap stated that no site plan has been submitted at this time. He explained that this case went before the Board of Adjustment on April 28, 1998, which was tabled until after Planning Commission action. He stated the Board of Adjustment felt that it would be more appropriate if the Planning Commission looked at the entire PUD before making a decision.

Mr. Dunlap stated the owner of the remainder of the subject tract has a site plan that is ready to file. Mr. Dodson would like a continuance until the adjacent owner files his site plan and it is reviewed by staff, TMAPC and Board of Adjustment.

Interested Party:
Mr. Roy Gann stated he owns property at the intersection of 101st where this project is proposed. He commented that he has no problem with Mr. Dodson's project; however, he requested the Planning Commission to keep the integrity of the Comprehensive Plan.

TMAPC Comments:
Mr. Boyle asked Mr. Gann if he had problem with PUD-306-13 being continued for thirty days. In response, Mr. Gann stated he had no problems with the continuance request.

TMAPC Action; 7 members present:
On **MOTION** of **CARNES** the TMAPC voted **6-0-1** (Boyle, Carnes, Gray, Harmon, Selph, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Jackson "abstaining"; Horner, Ledford, Midget, Pace "absent") to **CONTINUE** PUD-306-13 to May 27, 1998.

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

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Z-6634 – Kevin Coutant **OM to CS**
South of southeast corner East 45th Street and South Yale Avenue (PD-6) (CD-7)

Staff Recommendation:
Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 6 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject tract as Medium Intensity – Office.

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

Staff Comments:

Site Analysis: The subject property is approximately .41 acres in size and is located south of the southeast corner of East 45th Street South and South Yale Avenue. The property is flat, non-wooded, contains two single-story office buildings, and is zoned OM.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The subject tract is abutted on the north by an office complex, zoned OM; to the west by a service station, zoned CS; and to the south by I-44 right-of-way, zoned RS-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The most recent rezoning in this particular area was the approval of CS zoning for a hotel on the south side of I-44 but there has been no rezoning on the north side of I-44 for many years.

Conclusion: The Comprehensive Plan does not support CS zoning for the subject tract; therefore, staff recommends **DENIAL** of the CS zoning for Z-6634.

Applicant's Presentation:
Kevin Coutant, 320 South Boston, representing Greg Wilson, stated the existing photography studio and photography supply retail facility has been in operation for over a year without incident. He commented that his client was advised that the subject property was properly zoned for the facility.

Mr. Coutant stated that there is a sale pending on the subject property to Ritz Camera and the zoning issue was discovered at this time. He explained that the subject property is zoned office and the existing uses require Use Unit 17-type uses, which require CS zoning. He commented that the subject parcel is a small parcel measuring .4 acres. He described the subject property as having an irregular shape.

Mr. Coutant stated he thought it was appropriate to tie the CS zoning requested on the westerly boundary to the existing CS zoning (northeast corner of South Yale Avenue and the Skelly Bypass). He recited the surrounding uses in the immediate area.

Mr. Coutant commented that he did make an effort to canvass and talk with everyone abutting the subject property. He stated the existing office building provides a buffer, which is amply satisfied and is already in place. The existing office building shelters the single-family residential properties to the north from the subject retail operation. He explained that there is some commercial zoning at the intersection on the north side of the Skelly Bypass and a large quantity of commercial zoning on the other side of the bypass. He stated this is a modest increase of CS zoning and is justifiable to level out the commercial zoning to more in line east/west. He reminded the Planning Commission that his client is maintaining the office buffer entirely along the northerly property line and adding to the easterly side of the commercial zoning already in existence.

Mr. Coutant stated his surveyor indicates that there are 94 parking spaces in this project. The parking requirement for the current office uses are 66 parking spaces and if the application is approved the required number of parking spaces will be 70.

TMAPC Comments:
Mr. Westervelt asked Mr. Coutant why he did not file a PUD, because if the CS zoning is approved, any CS uses will be acceptable for this property. In response, Mr. Coutant stated the reason he did not bring in a PUD application is because of time and expense.

Mr. Westervelt asked staff how they reviewed the size of the node and the commercial zoning across the street. In response, Mr. Dunlap stated staff reviewed the Comprehensive Plan and that is what the recommendation is based on. He further stated that there were concerns with parking and Mr. Coutant has submitted information on the parking today.

Mr. Dunlap stated the Comprehensive Plan follows the zoning patterns and the applicant makes some good points; however, the Comprehensive Plan will have to be amended if this request is approved. He concluded that the Comprehensive Plan was written to fit the existing situation and if the subject property had been CS at the time than it would have been reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Westervelt asked staff if the Comprehensive Plan had to be amended before the zoning can be changed. Mr. Dunlap stated that it is preferred to amend the Comprehensive Plan first and then change the zoning. However, it has been done in this fashion before.

Mr. Carnes stated that the use is not changing and no one is protesting this application.

TMAPC Action; 7 members present:
On **MOTION** of **CARNES** to recommend **APPROVAL** of CS zoning for Z-6634 and amend the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the zoning change.

Mr. Linker stated the TMAPC can direct the staff to initiate an amendment in the Comprehensive Plan; however, staff cannot amend the Comprehensive Plan.

TMAPC Action; 7 members present:
On the amended **MOTION** of **CARNES** the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Boyle, Carnes, Gray, Harmon, Jackson, Selph, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Horner, Ledford, Midget, Pace "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of CS zoning for Z-6634.

Legal Description for Z-6634:
A tract of land that is part of the W/2, W/2, SW/4, Section 27, T-19-N, R-13-E, of the IBM, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government survey thereof, said tract of land being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: starting at the Northwest corner of the W/2, W/2, SW/4 of said Section

27; thence S 89°55′00″ E along the Northerly line of the SW/4 of Section 27 for 50.00′; thence due South and parallel with the Westerly line of Section 27 for 118.03′; thence due East for 150.00′ to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land; thence N 56°23′48″ E for 89.08′; thence due East for 70.00′; thence due South for 111.57′ to a point on the Northerly right-of-way line of U. S. 66 (Skelly Drive) thence S 49°08′53″ W along said right-of-way line for 20.15′; thence S 70°22′35″ W along said right-of-way line for 121.18′; thence N 07°15′59″ W for 117.09′ to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land.

Additional TMAPC Comments:
Mr. Boyle asked staff to initiate the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the change in zoning to CS for the subject property.

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

Z-5110-SP-2 – Larry McCool (PD-17) (CD-6)
West of Southwest corner I-44 and South 129th East Avenue
(Corridor Site Plan to expand existing facility and related parking area)

AND

AC-033 – Larry McCool (PD-17) (CD-6)
West of southwest corner I-44 and South 123rd East Avenue
(Alternative Landscape Compliance)

Staff Recommendation:
The applicant is requesting Corridor Site Plan approval for a 7.14-acre site with a total of 70,605 square feet of warehouse and office space in a single-story building. The site abuts large-lot residential uses on the south and east. The eastern 330 feet of the site received Corridor Site Plan approval in 1995.

The current request combines the eastern and western portions of the CO District into a single site and proposes an expansion of the existing facility and related parking and landscaped areas. The entire site has received Final Plat and TAC approval.

Staff has reviewed the request and finds conformance with all Corridor District requirements and those of the 1995 approval relating to permitted uses, height, setback, access, circulation, site screening, parking, total landscaped areas and signage. The detail landscape plan, however, does not contain the number of required street yard trees along the Skelly Drive access road or South 123rd East Avenue. In a separate request (AC-033), the applicant is proposing that, in the alternative, ten required streetyard trees be planted as a buffer between the loading dock of the new building and the abutting residential lots to the south. The eight-foot screening fence would remain to provide a further buffer along the entirety of the southern property boundary.

Based on the current site plan and the prior approval of development on the eastern portion of the site the overall site specifications can be summarized as follows:

Corridor Development Specifications

Use:	Uses restricted to those allowed under Use Units 11 and 23; manufacturing and retail sales are not permitted.
Lot Area:	308,981 net square feet
Building Area:	70,605 square feet
Maximum Building Coverage:	23%; FAR 1.23
Minimum Landscaped Area:	39%
Building Height:	35 feet
Exterior Building Surfaces:	painted and textured concrete; light stone color
Off Street Parking:	68 spaces
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
From property line abutting Skelly Drive Access Road	70 feet for office buildings and 77 feet for warehouse buildings
From property line abutting South 123rd East Avenue	115 feet
Parking Setback:	10-foot minimum parking setback from westerly property boundary.
Signage:	One 45-foot high bottle shaped ground sign with 489.5 square foot of display area located on the Skelly Drive Access frontage and at least 200 feet west of the residential area to the east.
Site Screening:	An eight-foot screening fence shall abut each residential lot (entire eastern and southern property boundary).
Operating Hours:	Warehousing (truck traffic) from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. only.
Lighting:	Security, building, loading area and parking lot lighting to be directed downward into the space to be secured and away from residential areas.

Based on review of the Corridor Site Plan and conformance to previously approved development specifications or those stated in this recommendation, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of Z-5110-SP-2 with the following condition:

Approval of Alternative Landscape Compliance request AC-033

Note: Corridor Site Plan approval includes Landscape and Sign Plan approval

AND

AC-033 – Larry McCool (PD-17) (CD-6)
West of Southwest corner I-44 and South 123rd East Avenue
(Alternative Landscape Compliance)

The applicant is requesting Alternative Landscape Compliance approval to place ten required streetyard trees on the southern property boundary abutting a residential district. The Code requires a total of 55 streetyard trees within the South 123rd East Avenue and Skelly Drive access road streetyards.

The Corridor Site plan indicates a loading dock for a warehouse use abutting a residential area. The ten trees will be placed outside the South 123rd East Avenue streetyard but will form part of a contiguous strip of 14 sawtooth oak trees planted in a 60-foot grassed strip. The applicant desires to provide greater site buffering in addition to the required eight-foot screening fence. The applicant also would like to facilitate a greater degree of building visibility for the Skelly Drive frontage by eliminating a small number of required streetyard trees as well as locating trees at either end of the Skelly Drive frontage.

Staff has reviewed the request and finds the rearyard placement of ten of the 55 required streetyard trees is equal to or exceeds the requirements of the landscape chapter. In addition, the larger variety of tree species in a double row abutting the residential uses will provide substantial site screening and buffering.

Staff, therefore, recommends **APPROVAL** of AC-033 as submitted.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

The applicant was present and indicated his agreement with staff's proposal.

TMAPC Action; 7 members present:
On **MOTION** of **CARNES** the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Boyle, Carnes, Gray, Harmon, Jackson, Selph, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Horner, Ledford, Midget, Pace "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of the Corridor Site Plan for Z-5110-SP-2 and **APPROVAL** of the Alternative Landscape Compliance for AC-033; subject to conditions as recommended by staff.

Legal Description for Z-5110-SP-2/AC-330:
Lots 18 through 22, Plainview Heights Addition, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

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

Z-6635 – Charles E. Norman **OL/RS-3 to CS**
North and south of East 14th Place and South Lewis (PD-6) (CD-4)

TMAPC Comments:
Mr. Boyle stated Z-6635 needs to be continued to May 13, 1998 in order to correct notice.

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

PUD-588 – Stephen Schuller **CH/CS/RM-2/RS-4 to PUD**
1659 East 11th Street (Northwest corner East 11th and South Utica) (PD-4) (CD-4)
(Proposed convenience store)

Applicant's Presentation:
Mr. Stephen Schuller stated he is requesting a two-week continuance in order to address some of the issues in the staff recommendation. He further stated he needed to discuss issues with his client and the interested party.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:
On **MOTION** of **HORNER** the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Boyle, Carnes, Gray, Harmon, Selph, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Pace "absent") to **CONTINUE** PUD-588 to May 13, 1998.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Date approved: 5/13/98

Chairman

ATTEST: Brenden Jackson
Secretary