

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting No. 2318

Wednesday, August 21, 2002, 1:30 p.m.

Francis Campbell City Council Room

Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Bayles	Dick	Dunlap	Romig, Legal
Carnes	Horner	Fernandez	
Coutant		Huntsinger	
Harmon		Matthews	
Hill		Stump	
Jackson		Bosonetto	
Ledford			
Midget			
Westervelt			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Monday, August 19, 2002 at 10:00 a.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair Harmon called the meeting to order at 1:59 p.m.

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of August 7, 2002, Meeting No. 2317

On **MOTION** of **HILL**, the TMAPC voted 5-0-1 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, "aye"; no "nays"; Westervelt "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of August 7, 2002, Meeting No. 2317.

* * * * *

REPORTS:

Director's Report:

Mr. Stump reported on the TMAPC receipts for the month of July 2002, which is almost a full month at the new level of fees. Totals are approximately three times greater than the average for fiscal year 2001. He stated that there is a definite increase in revenues due to the fee increases.

Mr. Stump stated that there are three items on the City Council agenda for Thursday, August 22, 2002 and Dane Matthews and Jim Dunlap would be attending.

Mr. Harmon announced that PUD-567-6 has been withdrawn by the applicant and is therefore stricken from the agenda.

SUBDIVISIONS:

LOT-SPLITS FOR WAIVER OF SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS:

L-19411 – Kenneth Smith (1392) (PD-6) (CD-9)

Location: 1230 East Hazel Boulevard

Commissioner Coutant announced that she would be abstaining from the following item.

Staff Recommendation:

Without obtaining a building permit, the owner of Tract 1 erected a building in his rear yard. He now wants to split 12' off Tract 2 to add to Tract 1 in order to meet the rear yard requirement. In splitting off the proposed 12', Tract 2 will no longer abut the sewer line, and Tract 1 will have more than three-side lot lines. An easement would be necessary on the subject 12' and a waiver of the Subdivision Regulations would be required for the number of side lot lines. Both resulting tracts meet the RS-2 bulk and area requirements.

The Technical Advisory Committee requested an easement on the 12' strip being split off with the stipulation that nothing be built on that easement. While staff is concerned with the number of items that have been constructed without the proper permits, staff does not believe that the requested lot-split and waiver of Subdivision Regulations for the number of side lot lines would have an adverse effect on the surrounding properties. Therefore, staff would recommend **APPROVAL** of the waiver of Subdivision Regulations and of the lot-split with the condition that a utility easement be recorded on the entire 12' parcel, that nothing be constructed on that 12' easement, and that the parcels be properly tied together by deed.

Mrs. Fernandez informed the Planning Commission that there are two existing dwellings on Tract 1 and a cabana was erected without a building permit and does cover much of Tract 1 on the southern portion. There is currently a Board of Adjustment case filed for the additional building requesting a variance of the rear yard requirements. With the lot-split, the BOA action may not be necessary.

Mrs. Fernandez reminded the Planning Commission that today's application is for a lot-split with a waiver of the Subdivision Regulations due to more than three side-lot lines.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Westervelt announced that this is in his neighborhood and he has had ex parte communication because he could not live there without hearing about it. He stated that he would be voting today.

Applicant's Comments:

Roy Johnsen, 201 West 5th Street, Suite 501, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103, stated that he is in agreement with the staff recommendation, but he feels that he has some relevant comments, since there is an interested party. He stated that he and Ken Smith are attorneys for Klienco, which was the contractor for the construction of the cabana on the northernmost lot, as well as for Mr. and Mrs. Williamson, owners of the northernmost lot and the southern lot.

Mr. Johnsen stated that with regret he has to advise the Planning Commission that the cabana was built without a permit. He indicated that a he has discussed this issue with Ken Klien (President of Klienco). Klienco celebrated their 40th anniversary last year and Ken Klienco has been with the company more than 30 years. In that time he can't recall ever failing to obtain a building permit. Klienco is known as the premiere remodeling company and build very expensive and quality products. His client usually has 70 to 80 construction projects going on throughout the year in the City of Tulsa. The reputation of this company is without blemish and this is not one of those situations where someone has purposely failed to obtain a permit, then built it and asked for forgiveness. An application has been made to the City for permits, which is pending this approval today.

Mr. Johnsen stated that the lot-split would not change the land use, the number of lots and it doesn't take any lot below the required square footage. Both lots, if approved, would exceed the RS-2, 9,000 SF minimum. This lot-split would not change the average lot width and would meet the normal zoning conditions applicable to single-family lots. The subject property would have sufficient livability space (open space) as required by the Zoning Code with or without the lot-split. If the Zoning Code requirements were applied to square footage of detached accessory buildings, the subject property would meet the requirement with or without the lot-split.

Mr. Johnsen stated that the issue is that there is a limitation in the single-family districts that detached accessory buildings can't exceed 25 percent of the required rear yard. With the cabana and the garage, this application exceeds the 25 percent limitation on occupancy of the required rear yard. If twelve feet from the south lot is added to the north lot, then the two combined buildings would be below the 25 percent limitation of detached buildings in the rear yard. The northern lot would be larger and would have more of a rear yard, and the present constructed improvements would then meet all of the Code requirements. The south lot would still be fully compliant with all of the applicable single-family regulations and would be suited for an additional single-family dwelling, though the applicant doesn't anticipate developing an additional single-family dwelling on the south lot.

Mr. Johnsen explained that under the Subdivision Regulations, a lot can only have three side lot lines, which would be the front-lot line, rear-lot line and anything else is considered a side lot line. The applicant is allowed to bring their request before the Planning Commission to see if more than three lot lines adversely impact the public interest in some way. He doesn't believe that this request would adversely impact the subject area or public interest. Boundaries to the adjoining properties do not change and the southern lot would still front south in the typical manner. He commented that staff has reviewed this application and recommended approval. Mr. Johnsen concluded and requested the Planning Commission to approve the subject lot-split subject to conditions as recommended by staff. He commented that his client was instructed to contact the nearest neighbors; the owners of the tract to the west of the northernmost and southernmost lots and the tract across the street to the north have signed letters of support (Exhibit A-2).

Interested Parties Comments:

Stephen Schuller, 100 West 5th Street, Suite 500, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103, representing Jim and Robin Hawkins, stated that his clients live immediately to the east of the subject property on Hazel Boulevard. His clients are opposed to this application as a disingenuous attempt to circumvent clear provisions of the Zoning Code that are designed to prevent what the Williamsons are attempting to do.

Mr. Schuller stated that the applicant has basically covered up their entire required rear yard with the garage and cabana, which is a massive building with columns, guttering and a metal roof, plus the paving. Mr. Schuller submitted photographs (Exhibit A-1). No permits were obtained for the subject cabana and none were applied for until the neighbors made inquiries to the Williamsons to see what the permits would allow. The neighbors are incensed that the Williamsons have thumbed their noses at the Zoning Code and other City ordinances and built what they wanted without getting the requisite approvals. He indicated that Ken Klien sits on the City's Building, Housing and Fire

Prevention Board, and the neighbors find it hard to believe that Mr. Klien simply made a mistake by not obtaining a building permit.

Mr. Schuller explained that his clients are convinced that the Williamsons are relying on the likelihood that they would not be compelled to tear down a building that is already built and knew that they couldn't have obtained the requisite approvals if they had applied and therefore built the cabana, and dare the City to take some kind of action.

Mr. Schuller indicated that the cabana has a substantial barbeque grill inside and they vent the smoke directly onto the Hawkins's property and landscaping. The structure is five feet from the common property line. He noted that there is very little grass and very livability space that is not paved. There is a brick stairway built in the area and staff has recommended that there be no construction (12-foot of easement).

Mr. Schuller stated that the Williamsons filed an application with the Board of Adjustment for a variance from the rear yard coverage issue. He commented that the neighbors do not know what the hardship would be. The Williamsons figured out that they would have a problem with the BOA and decided to do the lot-split in order to have more rear yard in order to meet the requirements. He explained that there would be a problem with the City's water and sewer lines that run along the rear lot lines that would be a twelve-foot easement. He indicated that the City ordinances require that each property actually touch the City's water and sewer main, and historically the City has denied lot-splits where a property is then separated (by a lot-split) from the City's water and sewer mains. The City requires that there be a service line from the water and sewer main going to the property over an easement over someone else's property. He commented that he has had several clients who have had to restructure their transactions and redo their design and developments in order to comply with the City ordinance. In this instance, the Technical Advisory Committee and staff have determined that it is all right to now separate property from the City's water and sewer mains and run services lines through easements over adjacent properties. Mr. Schuller submitted letters from neighbors opposing this application and Board of Adjustment relief (Exhibit A-4). He concluded that the lot-split would have an adverse impact on the neighborhood and it should be denied. Mr. Schuller commented that he has numerous clients who would be glad to see this sort of precedent set because it would permit all types of development that has been denied in the past.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Westervelt asked Mr. Schuller if he would have a problem requesting a lot-split for an applicant who owned two contiguous lots and wanted to reallocate the footage in order to meet the Zoning Code requirements. In response, Mr. Schuller stated that he would because the City would turn him down for separating the property from the water and sewer lines. Mr. Westervelt stated

that it wouldn't be very challenging for the applicant to grant himself a sewer easement since he owns both lots. Mr. Schuller stated that if the Planning Commission approves this request today he wouldn't have any problems filing for lot-splits like the subject application. Mr. Schuller explained that in the past he has been turned down by the City's Public Works Department because they do not permit service lines to cross other properties to get to a lot.

Mr. Westervelt asked Mr. Schuller if he is able to control the direction of the smoke as it is leaving the barbeque grill in ten-mile-per-hour winds. In response, Mr. Schuller stated that he can't control it when the wind is blowing, but he can control where it is vented.

Mr. Westervelt asked Mr. Schuller if the city looks to see where the outdoor barbeque vent is located when permits are applied for. In response, Mr. Schuller stated that he doesn't know if the city looks or not. Mr. Stump stated that he doesn't know if the city looks at barbeque grills vents or not.

Mr. Westervelt expressed his disappointment in the comments made by Mr. Schuller regarding his opinions of Mr. Klien and Klienco Company doing this intentionally to circumvent the Zoning Code.

Mr. Carnes requested that staff or the applicant show where the water and sewer lines are located between the two properties in question. In response, Mr. Schuller submitted atlas pages of the sewer and water mains (A-3). Mr. Westervelt stated that TAC has already reviewed this application and is comfortable with the request.

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Schuller what he would find acceptable regarding a lot-split. In response, Mr. Schuller stated that he hasn't given that a lot of thought because Mr. and Mrs. Hawkins are not at all pleased with the kind of development that has gone in next to their property. His clients have not been able to come to a resolution with the Williamsons, but what would be acceptable is to remove the cabana.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Johnsen stated that he disagrees with Mr. Schuller on how the sewer and water mains are handled with a lot-split. Along back lot lines of subdivisions there are usually utility easements and the lots back to each other. Part of the easement would be on one lot and part would be on the other lot. The actual sewer line that is constructed may be in one or the other lots. The lot that the sewer is not located on runs a perpendicular service line to it and the connection is acceptable by the City. Where there is a problem is where there is no parallel easement with utilities in it and then one would have to run across someone else's lot 200' to get to a main on another street, and that is what the City will not permit. If there is a paralleling existing line, then it would be a prior approval lot-split if there is sufficient easement. The TAC and Jack Page's office enforce the

easements, and he has a letter from Jack Page stating that the lot-split is acceptable. TAC has studied this request and has signed off on it.

Mr. Johnsen stated that he appreciates Mr. Westervelt's comments regarding the implication of Mr. Schuller's remarks. The Williamsons are not responsible for the permitting issue and Mr. Klien takes the responsibility for having dropped the ball obtaining a permit. Mr. Klien has been in business for over 30 years in this community and is well respected. On the facts, regulations and concepts of the requirements that are of issue, the staff has recommended approval and he requests the same.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Carnes stated that the contractor made the mistake and when they make a mistake they should be fined for it. Due to the fact that these people own this property that they are giving, then he would make a motion for approval per staff recommendation.

Mr. Westervelt stated that this application is in his neighborhood and he has a gazebo in his backyard with some concrete that encroaches the sewer easement in the back, which has been there a long time and the City has no problem with it. If this lot-split had been requested before the cabana was built, it would have been granted. He commented that he has a problem with the sudden condemnation of a decent citizen and good neighbor and of Mr. Klien. Staff and TAC made a very good recommendation.

Mr. Harmon stated that he would be supporting the motion; however, he does find it unusual for a well-respected developer to make this type of mistake. He commented that we are all human and make mistakes occasionally.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 5-0-1 (Carnes, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Coutant "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of the waiver of Subdivision Regulations and of the lot-split for L-19411 with the condition that a utility easement be recorded on the entire 12' parcel, that nothing be constructed on that 12' easement, and that the parcels be properly tied together by deed as recommended by staff.

* * * * *

L-19417 – Sack & Associates, Inc. (2683)

(PD-26) (CD-8)

Location: 10911 South 69th East Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant has applied to split 16,674 sq. ft. off Tract A and attach it to Tract B. A waiver of the Subdivision Regulations would be required to approve the lot split because Tract A would have more than three side lot lines. Both resulting tracts meet the RS-1 and PUD-646 requirements.

The utility companies had no concerns regarding this lot-split. Staff believes this lot-split would not have an adverse effect on the surrounding properties and would therefore recommend **APPROVAL** of the waiver of Subdivision Regulations and of the lot-split.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** the waiver of Subdivision Regulations and of the lot-split for L-19417 as recommended by staff.

FINAL PLAT:

HIS Subdivision – PUD-652 (3193)

(PD-18) (CD-9)

Location: 5521 South Peoria

Staff Recommendation:

This plat consists of 1 Lot in 1 Block on .81 acres. The property will be used for commercial uses.

All release letters have been received for this final plat. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the final plat.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** the final plat for HIS Subdivision.

PLAT WAIVER:

BOA-19425 (593)

(PD-4) (CD-4)

Location: Southwest corner of 4th Place and South Florence Avenue, University of Tulsa

Staff Recommendation:

The platting requirement was triggered by City Board of Adjustment Case # 19425 which was approved on August 13, 2002 to allow a Muslim Student Center and special parking requirements.

Staff provides the following information from TAC at their August 1, 2002 meeting:

ZONING:

TMAPC Staff: The property is to proceed to the City Board of Adjustment for a new Muslim Student Center on the University of Tulsa campus. The property has been previously platted.

STREETS:

No Comment.

Public Works, Traffic:

No comments.

SEWER:

Public Works, Waste Water: No comments.

WATER:

Public Works, Water: No comments.

STORM DRAIN:

Public Works, Storm Water: A PFPI will be required and possibly an overland drainage easement. Easements can be dedicated by separate easement.

FIRE:

Public Works, Fire: No comments.

UTILITIES:

Franchise Utilities: No comments.

Staff can recommend **APPROVAL** of the plat waiver requested with the requirements of the storm water department being met.

A YES answer to the following 3 questions would generally be FAVORABLE to a plat waiver:

	Yes	NO
1. Has Property previously been platted?	X	
2. Are there restrictive covenants contained in a previously filed plat?	X	
3. Is property adequately described by surrounding platted properties or street R/W?	X	

A YES answer to the remaining questions would generally NOT be favorable to a plat waiver:

4. Is right-of-way dedication required to comply with major street and highway Plan?		X
5. Would restrictive covenants be required to be filed by separate instrument if the plat were waived?		X
6. Infrastructure requirements:		
a) Water		
i. Is a main line water extension required?		X
ii. Is an internal system or fire line required?		X
iii. Are additional easements required?		X
b) Sanitary Sewer		
i. Is a main line extension required?		X
ii. Is an internal system required?		X
lii Are additional easements required?		X
c) Storm Sewer		
i. Is a P.F.P.I. required?	X*	
ii. Is an Overland Drainage Easement required?	X*	
iii. Is on site detention required?		X
iv. Are additional easements required?		X
7. Floodplain		
a) Does the property contain a City of Tulsa (Regulatory) Floodplain?		X

- b) Does the property contain a F.E.M.A. (Federal) Floodplain? X
- 8. Change of Access
 - a) Are revisions to existing access locations necessary? X
- 9. Is the property in a P.U.D.? X
 - a) If yes, was plat recorded for the original P.U.D. NA
- 10. Is this a Major Amendment to a P.U.D.? X
 - a) If yes, does the amendment make changes to the proposed physical development of the P.U.D.? NA

* At this time, no determination can be made regarding these items. Once construction plans have been submitted and reviewed, Public Works can determine if there will be a connection to the public storm sewer, resulting in the need for a PFPI and additional easements.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** the plat waiver requested with the requirements of the stormwater department being met for BOA-19425 as recommended by staff.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING

APPLICATION NO.: CZ-311

AG to RS

Applicant: Jim Coleman

(PD-23) (County)

Location: West of northwest corner of West 15th Street and South 263rd West Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

RELEVANT ZONING HISTORY:

CBOA-1162 June 1993: The County Board of Adjustment approved a request for a variance of the required 30' street frontage to 0' for the development of a new subdivision that acquired access by a gravel road not maintained by the County. The property is located east of Coyote Trail and south of West 11th Street.

CBOA-1146 April 1993: The County Board of Adjustment approved a special exception to permit a mobile home for residential purposes in an RS-zoned district, and denied a use variance to permit a convenience store and the storage of large trucks on the subject RS-zoned property. The property is located on the northwest corner of Coyote Trail and West 17th Street South.

CBOA-1046 December 1991: The County Board of Adjustment approved a request for a variance of the required 75' setback from an AG-zoned district to 10' on the south and 50' on the north for the expansion of a boat storage facility. The Board also rescinded the solid screening fence requirement where the property abutted the railroad right-of-way. The property is located west of the southwest corner of West 21st Street and South 265th West Avenue (see CZ-194).

CZ-194 November 1991: A request to rezone a 12.5-acre tract located west of the southwest corner West 21st Street and South 265th West Avenue from AG to IL or CG for the expansion of a nonconforming boat storage facility. TMAPC recommended denial of rezoning and approved a recommendation made by staff that the fees be applied towards a CBOA use variance request. Upon appeal for rezoning to the County Commission, however, the request was approved for IL zoning.

AREA DESCRIPTION:

SITE ANALYSIS: The subject property is approximately 36 acres in size and is located west of the northwest corner of West 15th Street and 263rd West Avenue, Tulsa County. The property is sloping, wooded, vacant and zoned AG.

STREETS:

Exist. Access	MSHP Design.	MSHP R/W	Exist. # Lanes
West 15 th Street	Residential street	50'	2 lanes

UTILITIES: Sand Springs serves this area for water and sewer is by septic systems or lagoons.

SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is abutted on the north by scattered single-family dwellings, zoned AG; to the west by vacant land in Creek County; to the south and east by mainly vacant and single-family dwellings, zoned AG.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

The subject property is not within any adopted district plans. The Development Guidelines, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, provide for evaluation of the existing conditions, land uses, existing zoning and site characteristics for the goals and objectives of areas that have not been specifically defined for redevelopment. According to the Development Guidelines, this area would qualify for a Low Intensity – No Specific Land Use

designation. The requested RS zoning would be **in accord** with those guidelines.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the surrounding uses, staff can support the requested RS zoning for the subject property and recommends **APPROVAL** of RS zoning for CZ-311.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HILL**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Dick, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Jackson, Ledford "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Midget, Westervelt "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of RS zoning for CZ-311 as recommended by staff.

Legal Description for CZ-311:

A tract of land in the NW/4 of Section 7, T-19-N, R-10-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma; more particularly described as follows, to-wit: Beginning at the Southwest corner of the NW/4 of Section 7, T-19-N, R-10-E, thence N 00°03'52" E along the West line of the NW/4 a distance of 165.54' to a Corp of Engineer's monument, thence S 89°54'05" E along Corp of Engineer's course #6 a distance of 169.30' to a Corp of Engineer's monument, thence N 00°03'02" E along course #7 a distance of 662.19' to a Corp of Engineer's monument, thence N 72°01'39" E along course #8 a distance of 533.48' to a Corp of Engineer's monument, thence N 00°00'32" E along course #9 a distance of 165.54' to a Corp of Engineer's monument and the Southwest corner of Lot 4, Eagle Ridge II, a subdivision in Tulsa County, thence S 89°53'34" E along the boundary line of Eagle Ridge II, a distance of 928.72' to the Northwest corner of Lot 17, thence S 00°09'26" E along the West line of Lot 17 a distance of 1,158.60' to the Southwest corner thereof, thence N 89°54'10" W along the South line of the NW/4 a distance of 1,609.46' to the Point of Beginning, containing 36.00 acres, more or less, and located west of the northwest corner of West 15th Street and 263rd West Avenue, Tulsa County, **From AG (Agriculture District) To RS (Residential Single-family District).**

APPLICATION NO.: PUD-625-1/Z-6735-SP-1a

**MINOR AMENDMENT
CORRIDOR SITE PLAN**

Applicant: Charles E. Norman

(PD-18) (CD-8)

Location: East of southeast corner of East 81st Street and South Mingo Road

Staff Recommendation:

The PUD and Corridor Site Plan were approved by the City Council in January 2000. The subject tract consists of 9.4 acres located east of the southeast corner of East 81st Street and South Mingo Road. The tract is approximately 660 feet wide and 610 feet deep and is located between the Tulsa Community College Southeast Campus on the east, the Meadow Brook Village commercial development on the west.

The PUD consists of two development areas. The north 6.89 acres (Development Area A) was approved for office, commercial and hotel uses with a maximum building height for hotel and office uses of 75 feet. The south 2.35 acres (Development Area B) was approved for office and mini-storage uses with a maximum building height of one story not to exceed 25 feet.

The property owner now proposes to construct a four story hotel along the west boundary of Development Area A and within a part of Development Area B facing and oriented to the Mingo Valley Expressway to the east of the property as indicated on the amended concept illustration, Exhibit A. The proposed hotel would require the use of the north 50 feet of the west 348 feet of the original Development Area B. The east 310 feet of Development Area B would be used for stormwater detention facilities only as shown by the amended concept illustration, Exhibit A.

A preliminary plat of the entire property named College Center at Meadowbrook has been filed which divides the property into four lots and a Reserve Area A.

The property owner requests approval of minor amendments to PUD-625 and Corridor Site Plan Z-6735-SP-1 as follows:

- 1) To combine Development Areas A and B;
- 2) To delete the office and mini-storage uses permitted in Development Area B;
- 3) To allocate permitted floor area to each lot within the proposed plat; and
- 4) Establish development standards for each proposed lot.

Staff finds that the request is minor in nature and substantial compliance is maintained with the approved development plan, purposes and standards of the

PUD Chapter. Therefore, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-625-1/Z-6735-SP-1 a subject to the following conditions:

Permitted Uses:

Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4;

Uses permitted in Use Unit 10, Off-Street Parking; 11, Offices and Studios; 12, Entertainment Establishments and Eating Establishments Other than Drive-Ins; 13, Convenience Goods and Services; 14, Shopping Goods and Services; 18, Drive-In Restaurants; 19, Hotel, Motel and Recreation Uses; and uses customarily accessory to permitted principal uses.

Reserve Area A:

Stormwater detention facilities and open space and uses customarily accessory to permitted uses.

Maximum Building Floor Area:

Lot 1	10,000 SF
Lot 2	10,000 SF
Lot 3	
Hotel	60,000 SF
Other Uses	30,000 SF
Lot 4	
Hotel	90,000 SF
Other Uses	25,000 SF
Reserve Area A	None.

Maximum Land Coverage by Buildings within a Lot: 30%

Maximum Building Height:

Hotels and Offices	75 Ft
Other permitted uses	30 FT

Architectural elements may exceed the maximum building height with detail site plan approval.

**Minimum Lot Frontage on East 81st Street South 150 FT
(Lots 1, 2, 3):**

Off-Street Parking:

As required by the applicable Use Unit of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

Minimum Building Setbacks:

Lot 1:

From the centerline of East 81 st Street South	100 FT
From the west boundary	20 FT
From the south boundary	20 FT
From the east boundary	5 FT

Lot 2:

From the centerline of East 81 st Street South	100 FT
From the west boundary	5 FT
From the south boundary	20 FT
From the east boundary	20 FT

Lot 3:

From the centerline of East 81 st Street South	100 FT
From the east boundary	20 FT
From the west boundary	20 FT
From the south boundary	0 FT

Lot 4:

From the north boundary	20 FT
From the west boundary	20 FT

From the south boundary	100 FT
From the east boundary	20 FT

Internal lot yards may be modified by detail site plan.

Landscaped Area:

A minimum of ten percent of the net lot area shall be improved as internal landscaped open space in accord with the provisions of the PUD Chapter and Landscape Chapter of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

The south 80 feet of Lot 4 shall be maintained as internal landscaped open space.

Signs:

- 1) One ground sign shall be permitted for each lot on the East 81st Street frontage with a maximum of 160 square feet of display surface area and 25 feet in height.
- 2) Wall signs shall be permitted not to exceed 1.5 square feet of display surface area per lineal foot of tenant space to which attached. The length of a tenant sign shall not exceed 75% of the frontage on the tenant space. No wall signs shall be permitted on the south-facing walls of buildings within Lot 3 or Lot 4.
- 3) One ground sign identifying hotel uses within Lots 3 and 4 shall be permitted at the principal entrance from East 81st Street South with a maximum of 180 square feet of display surface area and 35 feet in height.

Screening:

A solid masonry screening fence wall six feet in height and a double row of trees per conceptual plan shall be ~~constructed~~ placed along the south boundary of Lot 4 and Reserve Area A and the south 25 feet of the west boundary of Lot 4 and the south 25 feet of the east boundary of Reserve A provided the screening fence requirement adjacent to the stormwater detention facility in Reserve A may be modified by detail landscaped plan approval.

3. Buildings within Lot 4 shall have no windows or doors in any of the south-facing building walls, except in corridors, facing the residential area to the south above the first story if building wall is within 170 feet of the south boundary.
4. There shall be a maximum of three access points onto East 81st Street South. There shall be an internal mutual access system in which all lots are interconnected with each other and 81st Street. All access shall be approved by Traffic Engineering and the Tulsa Fire Department.
5. An owners associations or a common area maintenance agreement shall provide for the maintenance of the private street, detention area and common landscaped areas.
6. 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, parking and landscaping areas, has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD development standards.
7. A detail landscape plan for each lot shall be approved by the TMAPC with notice given to the interested parties (not staff approval) prior to issuance of a building permit. 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 the lot, 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.
8. No sign permits shall be issued for erection of a sign on a lot within the PUD until a detail sign plan for that lot has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD development standards.
9. All trash, mechanical and equipment areas, including building mounted, shall be screened from public view in such a manner that the areas cannot be seen by persons standing at ground level. Trash dumpsters within Lot 4 shall be located a minimum of 250 feet from the south boundary of the lot.

10. Lighting used to illuminate the subject tract shall be so arranged as to shield and direct the light away from adjacent residential areas. Shielding of such light shall be designed so as to prevent the light-producing element or reflector of the light fixture from being visible to a person standing in the adjacent residential areas or street right-of-way. Light standards within the south 25 feet of Lot 4 are prohibited. Light standards within the north 75 feet of the south 100 feet of Lot 4 shall not exceed eight feet in height. Light standards within the remainder of Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4 shall not exceed 35 feet in height.
11. The Department of Public Works or a professional engineer registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify to the appropriate City official that all required stormwater drainage structures and detention areas serving a lot have been installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to issuance of an occupancy permit on that lot.
12. No building permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 1107F 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 that relate to PUD conditions.
13. Subject to conditions recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee during the subdivision platting process which are approved by TMAPC.
14. Approval of the PUD is not an endorsement of the conceptual layout. This will be done during detail site plan review or the subdivision platting process.
15. There shall be no outside storage of retail display fixtures, merchandise, recyclable material, trash or similar material outside a screened receptacle, nor shall trucks or truck trailers be parked in the PUD except while they are actively being loaded or unloaded. Truck trailers shall not be used for storage.
16. All other development standards for PUD-625 and Corridor District Site Plan Z-6735-SP-1 not herein amended shall remain in full force and effect.

Applicant's Comments:

Charles Norman, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103, stated that the purpose of this application was to provide for a larger Lot 4 for a Hilton Inn Hotel and being a larger building than was originally contemplated for the two south lots within the commercial development (Area A). The minor amendment is needed in order to allow the hotel to project in to what was Development Area B by 70 feet. Consequently, the southern 150 feet was originally approved for

office or mini-storage use and he is now proposing to delete those uses and limit it to Lot 4 (the southern part would be platted as part of Lot 4 and maintained by the hotel).

Mr. Norman stated that he agrees with the staff recommendation with a minor clarification. He explained that he proposed to the neighbors that the subject building would not have any south-facing rooms and the staff has incorporated it by referencing "windows in the south wall could only be within stairwells"; however, the windows would be at the end of a corridor and not stairwells. Also, there is a reference that there would be no windows in the south 170 feet that face into the residential area and he believes the intent of the staff is to prohibit south-facing walls and not windows in the east-facing wall that might be slightly looking into that area. He indicated that he has met with the homeowners association, which involves a single-family area immediately to the south. There are presently two homes in the subject area and one under construction. He stated that he has agreed that the landscape architect would consult with the association and residents of the lots regarding the tree types that would be incorporated. He also agreed to modify the recommendation on the screening from a solid screening fence to a solid concrete-type fence. He concluded that with these minor changes, he would request approval of the recommendation of staff.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Harmon asked staff if there would be any problems with the modifications proposed by Mr. Norman. In response, Mr. Stump stated that there wouldn't be any problems except in number three standard. Mr. Norman stated that he believes the staff recommendation is correct, but could be worded more clearly.

Interested Parties Comments:

Stephen Goforth, 8217 South 100th East Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74133, stated that he lives in the subject area and owns the Christian Brothers Automotive in the same area. He requested that he not have water in his backyard. He explained that there was a belt of trees cleared out of the east boundary and now it allows enough drainage to settle in his backyard. He stated that if the requirement for detention is lifted, then there should be specific attention given to address the drainage problems. He further stated that he would like something on the record that before they do the landscape between his property and the subject property that there be discussion between the homeowners and the applicant in order to come to a good transition between the two buildings. He commented that as long as he is able to continue talking with the applicant regarding these items, he is very pleased with the development.

Mr. Stump stated that since Mr. Goforth is now on the record on the PUD, he would receive notice of any site plans that come up. Mr. Goforth requested that the notices be sent to his home address and the Christian Brothers Automotive, 9808 East 81st Street South, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74133.

Interested Parties Comments:

Norm Thoreson, 9848 East 84th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74133, stated that Mr. Norman visited with the homeowners association and the only two concerns are the trees along the back row and concrete fence. He commented that if Mr. Norman installs the trees and the solid concrete wall, then the association would not have any problems with the plan as it is presented today.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** of PUD-625-1/Z-6735-SP-1-a, subject to the conditions as recommended by staff, noting the language change from the south-facing windows, wood screening fence would be changed to masonry, stairwells should read corridors and noting that the Planning Commission would be reviewing a detail landscape plan and detail site plan and noticing should be given to the same group and interested parties present today. (Words deleted by the TMAPC are shown as ~~strikeout~~; words added or substituted by TMAPC are underlined.)

APPLICATION NO.: PUD-432-D-3

MINOR AMENDMENT

Applicant: Charles E. Norman

(PD-4) (CD-4)

Location: Northeast corner of East 13th Street and South Utica Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting a minor amendment to increase the signage in Development Area A of PUD-432-D. The proposed sign would be for the Oklahoma Heart Institute, which is one of many tenants located in the south building within Development Area A.

PUD-432-D was approved by the City Council in August 1995. The following maximum signage was permitted in Development Area A:

- 1) Two ground signs are permitted, not to exceed eight feet in height nor 48 square feet each in display surface area and shall be consistent in design with other medical center signage.
- 2) Two wall signs are permitted, not to exceed 40 square feet each of display surface area. No more than one wall sign is permitted on the southern building and it shall not be on the south- or east-facing walls.

In August 1996, the Planning Commission approved a minor amendment (PUD-432-D-1) which increased the signage in Development Area A. The approval permitted the following additional signage:

- 1) A 55 square foot wall sign and a 16 square foot logo on the west-facing wall of the north building.
- 2) A 50 square foot wall sign and logo and a 16 square foot logo on the west-facing wall of the south building.

The signage approved for the south building was to be unlighted and located on the lower fascia.

The applicant is requesting more than four times the currently allowed signage on the south building within Development Area A as follows:

- 1) A back-lighted wall sign on the upper building fascia of the west-facing wall (South Utica Avenue) identifying the Oklahoma Heart Institute at Hillcrest Medical Center containing a total of 102.5 square feet of display surface area as shown on Exhibit C; and
- 2) An identical back-lighted wall sign on the upper building fascia of the south-facing wall (East 13th Street) identifying the Oklahoma Heart Institute at Hillcrest Medical Center containing a total of 102.5 square feet of display surface area as shown on Exhibit C;

Subject to the removal of the existing signage approved in 1996, as described above.

The proposed minor amendment would permit signage for the first time on the south-facing wall and additional signs that are larger, higher and back-lighted on the west wall. The proposed signs on the south wall would be facing into a single-family residential area. From the original approval of PUD-432-D in 1995, staff has not supported signage on the south-facing wall of the south building which has single-family residences facing directly into it. The height and size of the sign proposed for the south wall, facing into the residential area, would be a major departure from the previously-approved sign standards and would result in an increase of incompatibility with the present use of proximate properties.

The proposed signage on the west-facing wall is oriented toward Utica Avenue, which is classified as an urban arterial, and there are nonresidential uses on the west side of Utica. Therefore, staff can support the signage on the west but not on the south. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of a back-lighted wall sign on the upper building fascia of the west-facing wall (South Utica Avenue) identifying the

Oklahoma Heart Institute at Hillcrest Medical Center containing a total of 102.5 square feet of display surface area as shown on Exhibit C, subject to the removal of the existing wall signage approved for the west wall of the south building in 1996 and **DENIAL** of the requested signage on the south-facing wall of the south building.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Harmon stated that the request appears to ask for four times what would ordinarily be allowed. He asked how much additional signage staff is recommending. In response, Mr. Dunlap stated that staff is recommending twice as much as what is ordinarily allowed.

Applicant's Comments:

Charles Norman, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103, representing Hillcrest Medical Center, stated that the residential area that is being referred to is between 13th Street and 13th Place and the east side of South Utica Avenue. Hillcrest acquired, as part of the Utica Medical Corridor, two lot widths and have cleared the lots and planted them with heavy trees. He indicated that Hillcrest also planted trees on both sides of the Bell Medical Office Park. Mr. Norman submitted photographs (Exhibit B-2).

Mr. Norman stated that approximately 80% of the patients arrive by the expressway system from the east or southeast on the Broken Arrow Expressway or from the west. When the patients get off the expressway at Utica and go north, the building is on the right-hand side. He explained that the main objective of the request is to allow visitors to identify the location of the building and where Oklahoma Heart Institute is located. The southwest corner of the subject property would have a sign and it would not be across from a residential area, but directly across from those double lots acquired from Hillcrest and maintained with the existing trees. He stated that there are 24 trees in the south part of the building and that is not counting the trees on the South Utica side. The first house to the east of Utica would have to look through the trees and upward in order to see the proposed sign, which would be 45 feet in the air. The staff is recommending a sign that would face the west, but wouldn't be visible for people getting off of the expressway and going north. The existing signage on the west-facing of the building was approved about six years ago, and he would like to relocate it to another building wall. Currently, coming from the south there is no location where people can be alerted as to the identification of the heart clinic within the subject building. There have been similar problems in other medical campuses, i.e., St. John Medical Center, Saint Francis Medical Center, etc. Mr. Norman submitted photographs of signage for the Warren Clinic that is within an office zoning district.

Mr. Norman stated that the staff report does not mention that he has presented these applications to the Board of Adjustment and requested an increase of variance of the allowed signage in the OL and OM districts. This is how the

original limitations for this PUD were established, based on signage permitted in the office districts. After hearing these comments and discussion about identification of location and the type of signage that is proposed, the Board of Adjustment approved a variance to permit both sides as presented in July. Signage requested would be directly across from the landscaped lots. Mr. Norman submitted a sample of the material the signs would be made of (Exhibit B-1). He explained that this is a new product and the sign would appear to be black in the daytime and white at night when it is lighted. Mr. Norman concluded that he has followed the same procedures in this application that he has done on previous applications within the Hillcrest Medical Center and St. John Medical Center, etc. All of these types of campus situations, where multiple buildings are involved and where the underlying signage does not reflect the need for building identification. The signs are not intended for commercial signage, but identification of location. The need is due to lack of visibility of the face of the building because of the trees that were planted in order to make an acceptable buffer.

Mr. Norman stated that during the Board of Adjustment hearing, none of the property owners attended the meeting in order to object and none are here today. He explained that his client now has more than one location in the metropolitan area and this proposal is simply to identify the location at Hillcrest.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Carnes stated that he has been on the Planning Commission for a long time and Mr. Norman has repeatedly applied for a PUD and accepted the signage, then come back for more signage. This is just another one of those times. In the 1980's, the Planning Commission worked on the signage and cleaned up the city. Mr. Carnes further stated that Mr. Westervelt voted for an application the other day that decreased signage in order to allow an existing sign to be raised in height. He was probably right for doing so, but now that the Planning Commission let that sign be raised it will probably cause problems in the future. Mr. Carnes concluded that he would be supporting staff on this recommendation.

Mr. Norman stated that he has not repeatedly appeared on signage, but brought applications that he mentioned with respect to twice on Hillcrest and twice on St. John and the University of Tulsa. The total signage outlined in the rectangle is 112 square feet (10' x 12' sign), which is not a huge square footage. The identification of the subject clinic has been a real problem for the clinic people operating it. This application has been brought to the Planning Commission for all of the identification issues and the tree growth that make it impossible to locate and identify that particular building. He commented that he is not known for coming before the Planning Commission with excessive sign applications for any commercial use. There has been a trend in the community to allow wall signs in order to identify major occupants that has taken place in the office zoning districts and different forms and ways, particularly medical centers.

Ms. Hill stated that she is surprised that the doctors haven't outgrown the subject building, because she managed their cardiology practice when they were located down the street. Ms. Hill asked Mr. Norman if there were ground signs in between the two buildings that face the west. In response, Mr. Norman stated that there is a ground sign that indicates William H. Bell Medical Park and there is a sign on the face of the other building for Utica Park Clinic with a sign on the canopy identifying Oklahoma Heart. Mr. Stump stated that there is another ground sign at the automobile entrance (east side between the two buildings) stating the various offices. Mr. Norman stated that there may be a small sign where Mr. Stump indicated, but the point is that when a vehicle comes off of the Broken Arrow Expressway to 13th Place and then turn right, they can't see the building.

Mr. Stump stated that the vehicles wouldn't be able to see the sign when they get off of the expressway because of the trees. In response, Mr. Norman stated that he believes the sign would be of help to vehicles at the mid-block area. Mr. Stump stated that it believes it would encourage the clinic to saw down the trees in order to see the proposed sign.

Mr. Harmon stated that he travels the Broken Arrow Expressway, and if the vehicle exits at the 15th Street overpass, then it would be too late to read a south-facing sign. Mr. Norman stated that it is only once the vehicle is on Utica that it would be able to see the sign going north. Mr. Harmon stated that with a south-facing sign on the subject building, by the time the passengers see it from the Broken Arrow Expressway, they would have passed their exit. Mr. Norman stated that the sign is not intended to identify where to exit the expressway in order to find the Hillcrest campus, but only when the vehicles turn north. Mr. Norman further stated that the sign is only intended for vehicles traveling 13th Place and then turning right. Mr. Harmon commented that once the vehicle turns right off of 13th Place, then they have found the building and a sign is not necessary. Mr. Norman stated that the vehicle wouldn't be able to see it because there is no identification sign on the building until they see the ground sign. Mr. Stump stated that there is a large sign in between the two buildings and the parking lot is for the two buildings. Mr. Stump further stated that there is another sign on Utica to identify the buildings.

Mr. Norman stated that he believes that the absence of protestants at both the Board of Adjustment and today indicates that the subject application is not considered to be a problem for that particular street.

Ms. Hill stated that she has no problem with the west-facing sign, but she does have a problem with the south-facing sign. She commented that it is not too hard to find Hillcrest and this is right across the street. The west-facing sign is appropriate because there is a tennis court and church across the street and it wouldn't be impacted the west side.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** of a back-lighted wall sign on the upper building fascia of the west-facing wall (South Utica Avenue) identifying the Oklahoma Heart Institute at Hillcrest Medical Center containing a total of 102.5 square feet of display surface area as shown on Exhibit C, subject to the removal of the existing wall signage approved for the west wall of the south building in 1996 and **DENIAL** of the requested signage on the south-facing wall of the south building for the minor amendment PUD-432-D-3 as recommended by staff.

* * * * *

APPLICATION NO.: PUD-538-5

MINOR AMENDMENT

Applicant: Mike Alexander

(PD-26) (CD-8)

Location: 10018 South Braden Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting a minor amendment to change the rear yard requirement from 15 feet to 11.6 feet for an existing dwelling on Lot 5, Block 1, Winbury Place.

The Planning Commission approved a minor amendment for this lot on May 15, 2002 (PUD-583-3) which permitted the northwest corner of the then-proposed dwelling to extend into the 15-foot required rear yard per the submitted site plan (see enclosed exhibit). The dwelling was built extending into the 15-foot required yard at three different points, i.e., not per the submitted site plan and therefore not per the TMAPC approval. Staff still thinks that the request is minor in nature and will not result in any increase of incompatibility with existing uses.

Since the rear yard of this lot abuts commercial uses and the proposed dwelling is outside the utility easement, staff finds the request to be minor in nature. Therefore, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the request per the submitted site plan.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** the minor amendment for PUD-538-5, per the submitted site plan as recommended by staff.

OTHER BUSINESS:

APPLICATION NO.: PUD-206

DETAIL SITE PLAN

Applicant: Joe Adwon

(PD-18) (CD-8)

Location: 92nd and Sheridan

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for a restaurant. The proposed use is in conformance with PUD-206 Development Standards.

The proposed building meets all setback requirements and height restrictions. A masonry dumpster enclosure is planned and the number of parking spaces provided meets minimum requirements. However, not all parking areas and aisles are dimensioned.

The Zoning Code requires that all parking lot lighting be hooded and directed downward and away from adjacent residential. Although locations of parking lot lighting fixtures are designated on the plan, no detail regarding hooding and/or shielding of the fixtures has been provided.

There is sufficient landscaped area to meet street yard requirements. However, the landscaped strip along Sheridan does not meet the minimum five-foot required by the zoning code.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-206 Detail Site Plan subject to the following conditions: 1) submittal and approval of lighting fixture detail, showing hooding and/or shielding elements; 2) compliance with minimum five-foot landscape strip requirement along Sheridan frontage; and 3) dimension all parking areas (stall width and length) and aisles (width).

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute sign or landscape plan approval.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HILL**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** the detail site plan for PUD-206 subject to the following conditions: 1) submittal and approval of lighting fixture detail, showing hooding and/or shielding elements; 2) compliance with minimum five-foot landscape strip requirement along Sheridan frontage; and 3) dimension all parking areas (stall width and length) and aisles (width) as recommended by staff.

Consider Calling for a Public Hearing to Amend the City of Tulsa Zoning Code

Add a spacing requirement between sexually-oriented businesses and uses predominantly frequented by children.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner, Ledford, Midget "absent") to **APPROVE** calling for a public hearing to amend the City of Tulsa Zoning Code to add a spacing requirement between sexually oriented businesses and uses predominantly frequented by children for September 18, 2002 at 1:30 p.m.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m.

Date Approved:



Chairman

ATTEST: 
Secretary