

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of Meeting No. 2382**

Wednesday, June 23, 2004, 1:30 p.m.

Francis Campbell City Council Room

Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

| <b>Members Present</b> | <b>Members Absent</b> | <b>Staff Present</b> | <b>Others Present</b> |
|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Carnes                 | Bayles                | Alberty              | Romig, Legal          |
| Coutant                | Miller                | Chronister           |                       |
| Harmon                 |                       | Huntsinger           |                       |
| Hill                   |                       | Matthews             |                       |
| Horner                 |                       |                      |                       |
| Jackson                |                       |                      |                       |
| Ledford                |                       |                      |                       |
| Midget                 |                       |                      |                       |
| Westervelt             |                       |                      |                       |

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Friday, June 18, 2004 at 3:00 p.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

After declaring a quorum present, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice Chair Jackson called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

**SUBDIVISIONS:**

**MINOR SUBDIVISION PLAT:**

**Ameristar E-Coat Plant** – (0430)

(PD-16) (CD-6)

9903 East Pine Street

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This plat consists of one lot, one block, on 6.67 acres.

The following issues were discussed June 3, 2004 at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting:

1. **Zoning:** The property is zoned OL with IL zoning pending.

2. **Streets:** Document existing right-of-way. Provide a 30-foot intersection radius. Show missing lot dimensions.
3. **Sewer:** No comment.
4. **Water:** No comment.
5. **Storm Drainage:** No comment.
6. **Utilities:** Okay.
7. **Other: Fire:** No comment.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the minor subdivision plat subject to the special and standard conditions below.

**Waivers of Subdivision Regulations:**

1. None requested.

**Special Conditions:**

1. The concerns of the Public Works Department staff must be taken care of to their satisfaction.

**Standard Conditions:**

1. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements shall be tied to or related to property line and/or lot lines.
2. Water and sanitary sewer plans shall be approved by the Public Works Department prior to release of final plat. (Include language for W/S facilities in covenants.)
3. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s).
4. Any request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Public Works Department Engineer prior to release of final plat.
5. Paving and/or drainage plans (as required) shall be approved by the Public Works Department.

6. Any request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Public Works Department.
7. A topography map shall be submitted for review by TAC (Subdivision Regulations). (Submit with drainage plans as directed.)
8. Street names shall be approved by the Public Works Department and shown on plat.
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. Bearings, or true N/S, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by the County Engineer.
11. All adjacent streets, intersections and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
12. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Public Works Department during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for plat release.)
13. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City/County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
14. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department. [Percolation tests (if applicable) are required prior to preliminary approval of plat.]
15. The owner(s) shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot: type, size and general location. (This information to be included in restrictive covenants on plat.)
16. The method of water supply and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department.
17. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
18. The key or location map shall be complete.

19. A Corporation Commission letter, Certificate of Non-Development, or other records as may be on file, shall be provided concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged. If plugged, provide plugging records.)
20. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be provided prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under 3.6.5 Subdivision Regulations.)
21. Applicant is advised of his responsibility to contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding Section 404 of the Clean Waters Act.
22. All other Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.
23. All PUD standards and conditions shall be included in the covenants of the plat and adequate mechanisms established to assure initial and continued compliance with the standards and conditions.
24. Private streets shall be built to City or County standards (depending upon the jurisdiction in which the plat is located) and inspected and accepted by same prior to issuance of any building permits in the subdivision.

**The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.**

**INTERESTED PARTIES:**

**James Mautino**, 14628 East 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74108, stated that he wanted to inform the Planning Commission of what has been taking place on the subject property. He commented that he understood that the applicant is going to proceed with a landfill permit. He explained that the property owner has filled dirt onto the subject property and it was done illegally. The dirt that was trucked in from Hillcrest was not the correct type of dirt for landfill and there is a dispute on how much was brought in and taken out. He indicated that he has been watching the subject site for several weeks and several trucks were in and out during that time. He stated that the property owner states that only five loads of dirt were brought in and on June 22, 2004 he observed that there were five truckloads of dirt taken out.

Mr. Mautino indicated that he does not believe that all of the dirt has been removed and he will be checking with Jack Page regarding this issue. The fair thing would be to remove all of the dirt and use compensatory storage in order to prevent raising the floodplain. He stated that this would be brought to the City Council Committee on Tuesday.

**Brenda Gregg**, 1339 North Mingo, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74116, stated that she would like to go on record regarding this property. Half of the property has fill dirt on it and half does not. There is a dispute regarding the subject property and the dirt that would be hauled in, which she believes would block the watercourse during floods.

Ms. Gregg stated that she has had to ask Senator Inhofe to send a FEMA tech from Washington to either approve of or stop the fill. The Council is investigating a lot of wrong doing that was going on without any permits. She indicated that she is going to ask for an investigation because the fill dirt from 1991 was taken from Mingo Creek and it was contaminated and can't be built on. She further indicated that she is preparing to ask the proper authorities to look into this issue. She concluded that she is just going on record to request that this plat be delayed until the investigations are done.

**TMAPC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Alberty stated that he would like to interject at this point. Ms. Gregg has mentioned a continuance; however, the Technical Advisory Committee heard this application on June 3, 2004 and Subdivision Regulations state that "the Planning Commission has 30 days to either approve, deny or modify". If this item were continued to the next regularly-scheduled meeting, it would be July 7<sup>th</sup>, which would be in violation of the Subdivision Regulations. He further stated that the issues Ms. Gregg and Councilor Mautino have raised are certainly issues that are being considered by the City of Tulsa, but they are permitting issues and they are issues of which Jack Page's office is well aware and they are trying to address those. It does not concern this body and this is the subdivision plat and it meets all the conditions for approval. The subdivision plat is conditioned upon all of the letters from the various agencies (TAC) and it should not impede the Planning Commissions' action.

**Applicant's Comments:**

**John W. Moody**, 1800 South Baltimore, Suite 900, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119, stated that he represents Ameristar Fence Products. He commented that he does not believe that a continuance would accomplish the things that the interested parties would like to see accomplished.

Mr. Moody explained that there was a dirt contractor who did bring in 40 loads of dirt from the Hillcrest site, which was not part of the permit that had been approved by the City for the earth change. He further explained that he does not know why the contractor did this, but 45 loads of dirt have been removed and Crafton Tull and Associates have given a letter, required by Jack Page, certifying that all of the fill was removed. His client is not asking for any permission to put dirt on the property that does not belong there. There is dirt that has been moved for the compensatory storage work that was originally done under the earth change permit.

Mr. Moody stated that his clients have been instructed and they are complying with all of the directives of the Public Works Department and all of the requirements for earth change permits. He is not asking for any waivers of the plat for any of these issues and stormwater management or issues are addressed by Public Works. He indicated that his client will comply with all requirements of the City and FEMA.

Mr. Moody reminded the Planning Commission that the issue before them today is the minor subdivision plat. It meets all of the requirements and his client is in agreement with all of the TAC and staff's conditions. He request that this plat go forward and not be delayed.

Mr. Moody stated that Councilor Mautino and the interested parties' interests are protected because the plat would have to go before the City Council for final approval and will have to be signed by the Chairman of the City Council, which will be some time before what happens and there will be plenty of time to address the issues. He explained that Mr. Mautino as a Councilor on the City Council could put a hold on the plat until the final issues are resolved. He believes that it would be appropriate to recommend approval of the plat. The property is already platted and zoned OL. If the property owner wanted to build offices on the subject property, they could get the permits and would be doing the very same thing that is going on today. This application does not adversely effect any interest of the public. Delay or denial is very important to his client because they do have a facility that they would like to build to fulfill a major contract for construction of products, which will create new employment in Tulsa and will add to the tax base in Tulsa. His client is not requesting the ability to violate any rule or do anything except what is permitted by the City. There are plenty of safeguards through Public Works Department and the City Council to ensure that these matters are resolved prior to the plat being released and filed. Mr. Moody submitted a letter from Crafton Tull and Associates certifying that all of the landfill was removed (Exhibit B-1).

**TMAPC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Ledford stated that he would like to move this plat forward primarily because the discussion today is about two different issues. In accordance with the Subdivision Regulations, the applicant does not have to have approved plans prior to the preliminary plat. If the Planning Commission starts dealing with preliminary plats by stating that they have to have approved plans by Public Works Department prior to TMAPC approval, then the Subdivision Regulations would have to be changed.

Mr. Ledford stated that he finds this plat in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations and moved to approve it as it is submitted today.

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **LEDFORD**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the minor subdivision plat for Ameristar E-Coat Plant, subject to special conditions and standard conditions as recommended by staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

**CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Application No.:** Z-6944

**RS-3 to OL**

**Applicant:** David Leifeste

(PD-6) (CD-9)

**Location:** 1320/1316 East 35<sup>th</sup> Place (East of southeast corner of 35<sup>th</sup> Place and South Peoria Avenue)

**Ms. Hill announced that she would be abstaining on this item.**

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**April 1994 Z-6436:** The TMAPC and City Council approved rezoning from RS-3 to PK on a site north of the subject property.

**January 1994 Z-6430:** The TMAPC and City Council approved rezoning from RS-3 to PK on a property north of the subject parcel.

**June 1992 PUD 488:** The TMAPC and City Council unanimously approved rezoning from CH, OL and RS-3 to CH/OL/RS-3/PUD to add a seven-lane drive-in to an existing bank north of the subject property. The TMAPC recommended increasing the proposed screening fence height to 8' and making the width of the landscaped area on the east boundary a minimum of 12'. The City Council concurred.

**December 1991 Z-6334:** All concurred in granting a rezoning from RS-3 to CH and PK on a site south and west of the subject property.

**November 1991 PUD 474:** All concurred in granting a rezoning from RS-3 to OL/PUD 474 on a property north of the subject property.

**AREA DESCRIPTION:**

The property lies within the Northern Brookside Area within the business area boundaries and is adjacent to (east of) a service station.

**SITE ANALYSIS:** The subject property is flat, partially wooded and developed with two single-family residences.

**STREETS:**

| <b>Exist. Access</b>              | <b>MSHP Design.</b> | <b>MSHP R/W</b> | <b>Exist. # Lanes</b> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| East 35 <sup>th</sup> Place South | Residential street  | N/A             | 2                     |

**UTILITIES:** The subject tract has municipal water and sewer.

**SURROUNDING AREA:** The Brookside area is one of mixed commercial/office/parking and related uses, adjacent to largely single-family residential uses (in this case, to the east). Nonresidential uses are typically pedestrian-oriented and set on or near the right-of-way. Parking is sometimes an issue and several of the existing businesses have shared parking arrangements in the area.

Uses in the immediate vicinity of the subject site include single-family residential to the east, zoned RS-3; a service station to the west, zoned CH; a shopping center/office development and associated parking to the north, zoned CH and PUD-474; and parking and single-family residential uses to the south, zoned PK and RS-3.

**RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

As noted above, this property lies within the Brookside study area. Provisions in the Brookside Infill Development Design Recommendations (page 36) call for continued emphasis on pedestrian-orientation, with particular attention to sidewalk provision, design and replacement; crosswalks, storefront displays and other pedestrian amenities. Concerns within the Brookside area as a whole include provision of adequate parking (encouraged to be at the rear of properties and where feasible, shared) and compatibility of new development with existing development.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the Comprehensive Plan (both that of Planning District 6 and the Brookside Infill Development Design Recommendations) and trends in the area, staff can support the requested rezoning and therefore recommends **APPROVAL** of OL zoning for Z-6944.

**Applicant's Comments:**

**John W. Moody**, 1800 South Baltimore, Suite 900, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119, stated that he represents the applicant. Mr. Moody submitted a conceptual site plan (Exhibit A-1). He explained that this case was continued in order for his client to demonstrate what could be a normal development under the OL zoning district. The subject site limits what can be done under the OL zoning, which is the least intense non-residential zoning. After meeting all the requirements the

envelope is fixed and results in a one-story 3,000 SF office building, ten parking spaces, five-foot setbacks backing up to the CH property (gas station) on the west.

Mr. Moody stated that a PUD is not necessary to develop the subject site because the zoning restrictions contained under the OL district define what anyone could do with the subject property.

**TMAPC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Harmon asked why the conceptual plan does not indicate a screening fence on the south border. In response, Mr. Moody stated that if the screening fence was omitted it was a mistake and he did not have the intention of asking for a waiver on the screening fence. Mr. Moody commented that Mr. Harmon is correct that there would have to be a screening fence on the south boundary and he didn't intend to imply that it wasn't needed.

**INTERESTED PARTIES:**

**Guy deVerges**, 1343 East 35<sup>th</sup> Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74105, stated that he lives down the street from the proposed zoning change. He disagrees that the only use for the subject property is for office uses. He believes that the homes could be rehabilitated for residential use.

Mr. deVerges stated that it is important to preserve the look of his neighborhood. He expressed concerns that the existing houses may be destroyed. There are traffic and congestion issues that changing to OL zoning could make worse. The Brookside Association is, in theory, behind changing the zoning to light office for this area; however, they do not know anything about this specific development. Residential redevelopment of the two existing houses would be best for the neighborhood.

Mr. deVerges stated that if the existing homes are to be destroyed, he feels that the neighborhood should be able to have some say regarding how they are constructed and how they would look. He would like the existing homes to remain residential and have families move into the houses. He commented that the neighborhood is a multi-use neighborhood and the residents prefer that. The plans that are shown today are basically a footprint and there is no idea what the structure would look like.

**TMAPC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Ledford thanked Mr. Moody for the conceptual site plan that the Planning Commission requested. It was the Planning Commission's desire to see what a generic site plan would like if the two existing homes couldn't be rehabilitated. Mr. Ledford stated that he would recommend approval of the OL zoning.

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **LEDFORD**, TMAPC voted 7-1-1 (Carnes, Harmon, Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; Coutant "nays"; Hill "abstaining"; Bayles, Miller "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** the OL zoning for Z-6944 per staff recommendation.

**TMAPC COMMENTS:**

Mr. Westervelt stated that there is a letter from David Paddock, member of the Brookside Infill Development Task Force, stating that this application is consistent with the Brookside Plan.

**Legal Description for Z-6944:**

West 50 of Lot Five in Block Four, and East 50 of Lot 5 Block Four, Olivers Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, and located east of the southeast corner of 35th Place and South Peoria Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, **From RM-3 (Residential Single-family High Density District) To OL (Office Low Intensity District).**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Application No.:** Z-6946

**OL to IL**

**Applicant:** Bruce Rothell

(PD-16) (CD-6)

**Location:** East of northeast corner of East Pine and North Mingo Road

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

**December 2000 Z-6789:** All concurred in approval of rezoning property south and east of the subject property and east of the Mingo Creek channel from IL to RM-2.

**AREA DESCRIPTION:**

**SITE ANALYSIS:** The subject property contains approximately five acres. It is located east of the northeast corner of East Pine Street and North Mingo Road. The property is flat, non-wooded, vacant and zoned OL.

**STREETS:**

| <b>Exist. Access</b> | <b>MSHP Design.</b> | <b>MSHP R/W</b> | <b>Exist. # Lanes</b> |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| East Pine Street     | Secondary arterial  | 100'            | 2 lanes               |

**UTILITIES:** Municipal water and sewer appear to be available.

**SURROUNDING AREA:**

The subject property is abutted on the north by industrial and related uses, zoned IL; on the south by a large vacant area, zoned AG; on the west by vacant land and a single-family residence, zoned CS; and on the east by industrial uses and the Mingo Creek channel, zoned IL.

**RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:**

The District 16 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tulsa, designates the subject property as Medium Intensity – No Specific land use and Special District Two, Industrial Area. Plan policies (Section 3.2) call for industrial uses in this area due to proximity to transportation and the physical characteristics of soil, slope, etc.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested IL **may be found** in accord with the area designated as Medium Intensity – No Specific land use and also with the area in the Special District, by virtue of its location within a special district.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on existing physical facts and the Comprehensive Plan, staff can support the requested IL designation and therefore recommends **APPROVAL** of IL for Z-6946. Staff notes that this appears to be an early multiple-lot subdivision and this rezoning, if approved, will require replatting of the property.

**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 **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted 8-1-0 (Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; Carnes "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Miller, "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** the IL zoning for Z-6946 per staff recommendation.

**Legal Description for Z-6946:**

All of Pinevale First Addition, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, and located east of the northeast corner of East Pine Street and North Mingo Road, Tulsa, Oklahoma, **From OL (Office Low Intensity District) To IL (Industrial Light District).**

\*\*\*\*\*

## ZONING PUBLIC HEARING

Application No.: PUD-355-C-2

MINOR AMENDMENT

Applicant: Ricky Jones

(PD-18) (CD-8)

Location: West of northwest corner of East 91<sup>st</sup> Street and South Yale Avenue

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant is requesting a minor amendment of the required building setback line common to Lots 5 and 6 to 30 feet to permit the construction of one building on each lot.

PUD-355-C was approved by the City Council June 7, 2001. Development Area 2 contains 1.295 gross acres and has been approved for the following uses:

Those uses permitted by right in the CS zoning district, excluding those uses located in Use Unit 21A of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

The following minimum building setbacks were approved for Lots 5 and 6:

#### Lot 5:

##### Minimum Building Setbacks:

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| From north boundary of development area | 75 FT |
| From south boundary of development area | 5 FT  |
| From east boundary of development area  | 50 FT |
| From west boundary of development area  | 75 FT |

#### Lot 6:

##### Minimum Building Setbacks:

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| From the centerline of East 89 <sup>th</sup> Street South | 100 FT |
| From south boundary of development area                   | 40 FT  |
| From east boundary of development area                    | 5 FT   |
| From west boundary of development area                    | 40 FT  |

The applicant is requesting that the minimum building setback line common to Lots 5 and 6 be 30 feet. Staff finds that the request does not substantially alter approved development plan or the character of the development. Therefore, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the request.

**Applicant was not present.**

**There were no interested parties wishing to speak.**

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **HARMON**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the minor amendment for PUD-355-C-2 per staff recommendation.

\* \* \* \* \*

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**Application No.:** PUD-603-A

**DETAIL SITE PLAN  
LANDSCAPE PLAN**

**Applicant:** Mark Capron

(PD-26) (CD-8)

**Location:** Southwest corner of South Memorial Drive and East 98<sup>th</sup> Street  
South

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for an automotive dealership. The proposed use, automotive dealership, is in conformance with development standards.

The site plan complies with maximum floor area and height permitted and complies with building setbacks, parking and landscaped area requirements. Parking lot lighting is in compliance with the Zoning Code and development standards. Per the standards as amended by PUD 603-A-1, "No vehicular access doors are permitted on west-facing walls, which are within 250 feet of the west boundary of the PUD". All west-facing walls of the proposed buildings are within 250 feet of the west boundary and all appear to be in compliance with this standard, with possible exception of the car wash. Per the site plan, vehicle display storage spaces are located adjacent to the west wall; however, it is unclear per the elevations whether the area labeled "car wash" is for vehicle access or is a solid wall.

Per development standards, TMAPC review of the landscape plan is required to assure substantial compliance with the conceptual landscape plan of the original PUD document. The standards and this document require a two-foot high berm of not less than 15 feet in width, heavily planted with trees that shall be located along the westerly boundary of the PUD and along the west 240' of the 98<sup>th</sup>

Street South frontage. A masonry screening wall is required per PUD 603-A-1. The landscape plan as submitted complies with the zoning code meets these PUD standards.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-603-A detail site plan as proposed contingent upon there being no vehicle access doors on the west elevation of the car wash.

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

**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 **HORNER**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the detail site plan and landscape plan for PUD-603-A, subject to there being no vehicle access doors on the west elevation of the car wash, per staff recommendation.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Application No.: PUD-230**

**DETAIL SITE PLAN**

**Applicant:** Don Rowland

(PD-17) (CD-5)

**Location:** North of 41<sup>st</sup> Street, west side of 103<sup>rd</sup> East Avenue

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for an office building. The proposed use, General Office, Use Unit 11, is in conformance with development standards.

The site plan complies with maximum floor area and height permitted and complies with building setbacks, parking and landscaped area requirements. Proposed lighting is in compliance with the zoning codes and development standards.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-230 detail site plan as proposed.

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

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 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the detail site plan for PUD-230 as proposed, per staff recommendation.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Commissioners' Comments:**

Mr. Jackson stated that there would be a worksession immediately following today's meeting in Room 1102, City Hall.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Date Approved:

July 7, 2004



Chairman

ATTEST:



Secretary

