TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES of Meeting No. 1379 Wednesday, October 14, 1981, 1:30 p.m. Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Eller Gardner

Holliday, Secretary Hiagins

Freeman Parmele Petty Inhofe

Gardner Chisum -Compton

Linker, Legal Department

Kempe, 2nd Vice-Chairman

C. Young, Chairman

T. Young

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, October 13th, 1981, at 11:20 a.m. as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG Offices.

Chairman Carl Young called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

REPORT OF RECEIPTS AND DEPOSITS:

On MOTION of ELLER, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Higgins, Petty, Parmele, Inhofe "absent") to approve the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the month ended September 30, 1981.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT: Z-5517 Charles Norman (Helmerich & Payne, Inc.) Chairman Young advised that this item was placed on the agenda to consider whether the Planning Commission action on September 2, 1981, waiving platting requirements should be rescinded and further hearing held. He advised that the matter had been resolved, the right-of-way given and the matter stricken from the agenda.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. Z-5624

Applicant: Richard Stimson

NW of Haskell Street and Peoria Avenue

Present Zoning: RM-1 Proposed Zoning: IL

Date of Application: August 28, 1981 Date of Hearing:

October 14, 1981

Size of Tract:

Location:

50' x 150'

Presentation to TMAPC by Bill Harrington

Address: Thompson Building

Phone: 582-1065

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 2 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity, Industrial, potential Corridor and Special District 2.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the IL District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The Staff recommends DENIAL of the requested IL zoning for the following reasons:

The subject property is located on the north side of Haskell Street, West of Peoria Avenue. The property presently contains a single family residence and the applicant is requesting IL zoning to permit a furniture storage use.

The area of the subject tract represents a mixture of residential, industrial and commercial uses. The area is in transition from residential to industrial. The subject property abuts single family residential tracts to the east, west and north. The abutting tracts to the south contain a large manufacturing warehouse and parking lot. The Staff feels that the subject application does not meet the test for industrial conversion of residentially zoned property, since the tract is abutted on three sides by single family residences and would isolate residential properties to the east. However, the Staff feels that if the application contained the abutting properties to the east, it would meet the test for industrial conversion of residentially zoned property.

The Staff feels that IL zoning on the subject property is not appropriate and not consistent with the policies of the District 2 Plan, and accordingly recommends DENIAL of the requested IL zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was represented by Mr. Bill Harrington, attorney. A petition in favor of the rezoning (Exhibit "A-1") was presented, showing approximately 18 signatures of residents in the neighborhood. The property owner to the west did not sign the petition. Four pictures (Exhibit "A-2") were presented of properties in the surrounding area showing that it is already a mixed area and pictures particularly of the property to the west. IL zoning would be an improvement for that property in preference to the type of residence on the property at this time. The applicant has been using the property for an upholstery shop and storage of the furniture while he was working on it, for some time. He was informed that a change of zoning

10 \07 - 1070/0\

Z-5624 (continued)

was needed and that IL would be the proper classification. Mr. Stimson feels this is a proper use for the property, since it is adjacent to IL in the immediate vicinity. Across the street is the Zebco warehouse. Mr. Stimson owns two 25-foot lots and the application was made for both lots. The most important point is that this will be an IL area under a long-range plan. When Mr. Stimson took his petition to the surrounding property owners, they wondered why the entire area could not be IL and wanted to rezone their properties. Mr. Harrington felt an approval of IL on Mr. Stimson's property would have a domino effect and the area needs to be converted.

- C. Young stated that instead of isolating this tract, IL with residential on three sides, the applicant should have brought in an application with the four lots to the east, which would have justified the IL. All the neighbors could have been represented as suggested in the Staff Recommendation.
- Mr. Harrington commented that the application was filed before he represented the applicant. He requested the case be continued in order to amend the application to include the lots to the east so the Commission would have a larger area to consider.
- T. Young did not think the application should be passed in the event that the people should not want to pay the filing fee and have Mr. Harrington represent them. The reason they have not rezoned before might be the zoning fee.
- C. Young thought the residents should have the opportunity and wanted to keep from strip-zoning IL along a street that presently has no IL.
- T. Young responded that others have not had the opportunity to continue their zonings in order to involve surrounding property owners. He does not think it is the Commission's responsibility to cause parcels in an IL designated district to come in for zoning at one time. If it is going to go industrial and this is the first application to be presented, the applications should be approved as they come in.

Protestants: None.

MOTION was made by GARDNER to approve the Staff Recommendation for denial of IL zoning. Motion died for lack of second.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, C. Young, "aye"; T. Young, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Petty, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of Z-5624 until November 18, 1981, at 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

T. Young clarified that his "no" vote did not reflect denial of the IL zoning, only the continuance.

Application No. Z-5625

Applicant: Frank Turner (Sellmeyer)

Present Zoning: AG Proposed Zoning:

Location: North Garnett Road and Independence Street

Date of Application: August 28, 1981 Date of Hearing:

October 14, 1981

Size of Tract:

70.1 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Frank Turner

Address: 525 South Main Street, Suite #210; 74103

Phone: 587-0141

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 16 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District 2.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the IL District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested IL zoning for the following reasons:

The subject property is located approximately one-forth (4) mile north of the northeast corner of the interchange of the Crosstown and Mingo Valley Expressways. The property fronts on Garnett Road and is mostly vacant except for a single family residence and accessory building on the eastern portion and the applicant is requesting IL zoning to permit industrial use.

The tract under application is located within a recognized light-industrial redevelopment district. The tract is abutted to the north and southwest by industrial zoning and development. Several single family residences abut the subject property on the northeast and southeast boundaries. The Staff considers the remaining land in the northeast quadrant of the interchange of the Mingo Valley and Crosstown Expressways to be appropriate for light industrial development.

The Staff feels that industrial zoning on the subject tract is consistent with the policies of the District 16 Plan, and accordingly recommend APPROVAL of the requested IL zoning.

T. Young asked if the tract goes through to Garnett on the west to which Mr. Gardner replied in the affirmative. When the property to the north is platted, it will require some kind of a stub street into the subject property from the north to connect with the industrial subdivision for circulation purposes. The property to the northeast is in residential use.

Applicant's Comments:

Frank Turner was present to represent the applicant. The property is under contract for sale to Ramsey Industries who have planned an office park. Development will be done in accordance with the National Association of Business Parks Guidelines. The main thoroughfare for traffic will be a paved and curbed street that will go through the middle of the property. He did not want to state specifically what will be done until the best use is ascertained. There will be a street along the north side of the property. An office building will be on the front of Garnett which will

Z-5625 (continued)

be used for light maintenance or small storage with all the parking in front of this building. This will be a grade-A type of office and business park use. The only question in relation to this park would be the increase in traffic. The traffic routes will have to be satisfactory prior to the acceptance of the plat. The buildings will be controlled by an architectural committee and will have no metal buildings. They will be permanent concrete buildings.

Protestants: None.

Interested Parties: Rev. Steve Lee Addresses: 1055 North Garnett Road George Palmer 1209 North Garnett Road

Interested Parties Comments:

Steve Lee, pastor for Town and Country Christian Church, was not opposed to the rezoning and the plans presented; however, he did wonder what assurance could be made as to the use of the remainder of the land that is not presently planned for use. If it is zoned as applied for, is that assurance that it will be used for this purpose. C. Young answered that the applicant could do whatever is permitted in an IL District.

George Palmer, a resident in the area, wished to correct information that was given to the Commission. There is rental property and residences in the area. The area is not vacant. He is not opposed to the rezoning, but wanted to clarify this fact. He thinks this type of industrial tract will be good for the City.

Mr. Gardner informed the interested parties what is permitted in an IL District and that no commercial, such as a bar, liquor store, etc., is permitted by right. Those uses would require Board of Adjustment approval and another hearing.

On MOTION of ELLER, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Higgins, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Parmele, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned IL:

The South-Half of the NE/4 of Section 31, Township 20 North, Range 14 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, LESS and EXCEPT approximately 9.9 acres condemned by the State of Oklahoma along the west side thereof, for the Mingo Valley Expressway, containing approximately 70.1 acres, more or less.

PUD #267 Charles E. Norman (Reinkemeyer) SE corner of East 101st Street and South Sheridan Road (CS & RM-1)

A letter was presented from Charles Norman (Exhibit "B-1") requesting that consideration of this case be continued until November 11, 1981.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Higgins, Parmele, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue PUD #267 to November 18, 1981 (November 11 is a holiday for the City and the building will be closed), at 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

TMAPC RECEIPTS MONTH OF SEPTEMBER, 1981

ZONING					
	oning Fees ee Waived	(20) (0)	\$2,631.80		\$2,631.80
LAND DI	VISION				
S: Le	ubdivision Preliminary Plats ubdivision Final Plats ot-Splits ee Waived	(3) (4) (17) (8)	\$ 150.00 200.00 150.00		\$ 500.00
BOARD O	F ADJUSTMENT		\$2,295.00		
$F\epsilon$	ee Waived	(0)			\$2,295.00
<u>Di</u>	EPOSITORY TICKET CIT	TY RECEI	PT		
	767 768 769 770 771	004147 004643 005257 005256 005623		\$ 635.00 780.00 525.00 2,860.80 686.00 \$5,486.80	
			*Less:	(60.00)	\$5,426.80
CITY BO	\$1,895.00				
COUNTY I	\$ 400.00				
CITY SH	\$1,565.90				
COUNTY SHARE					\$1,565.90

*Less: City B.O.A. Application Fee - Sarah C. Jones - \$25.00 - Receipt #28742 - Deposit #003861 City B.O.A. Application Fee - New Prospect Realty - \$35.00 - Receipt #28696 - Deposit #003067

ŧ.

SUBDIVISIONS:

For Final Approval and Release:

<u>Lawton Industrial Park (3592)</u> 5400 Block of South Lawton Avenue (IL)

South Lewis Office Park (3293) NE corner of East 56th Place and South Lewis Avenue (OL)

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Higgins, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Parmele, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to approve release of Lawton Industrial Park and South Lewis Office Park Subdivision plats.

Blackwell-Crockett (3293) NE corner of 57th Street and South Lewis Ave.
(OL)

Cedarcrost Park (1783) NE corner of 90th Street and South Dolaware Ave.

Cedarcrest Park (1783) NE corner of 90th Street and South Delaware Ave.
(RM-T)

Fountain Square (838) 17th Street and South Lewis Avenue (RM-T)

<u>Lexington Green (683)</u> West side of South Lewis, between 61st & 66th Streets (CS)

Warrenton West (383) 66th Street and South Darlington Avenue (RS-3)

The Chair tabled, without objection, the preceding items.

LOT-SPLITS:

<u>L-15298 Carolyn Haney (1893)</u> 2500 Block of South St. Louis Avenue (RS-2)

Memo was presented from Murrel Wilmoth of the Staff. This split was presented to the Board on October 7, 1981, and the Commission questioned the sizes of the remaining parcels on each side of the lots created by the splits. Mr. Wilmoth stated in his memo that research indicated the lot to the north has 75' of frontage and one dwelling and the lot to the south has 80' frontage with one dwelling. This was for the Commissioners information only.

PUD #207 Lot 5, Block 3, Mill Creek Pond

The applicant is requesting that a minor amendment be approved to permit one corner of an existing structure to be located within 8' 6" of the side property line, PUD requires 10 feet. The lot is irregular in shape as is the shape of the residence. The Staff considers the request to be minor, and accordingly recommends APPROVAL, per plot plan submitted.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Higgins, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minor amendment.

Detailed Site Plan and Landscape Plan Review

PUD #202-B Lots 1 and 2, Block 2, Shadow Mountain II Addition
The applicant has submitted a detailed site plan and landscape plan for
PUD 202-B, Lots 1 and 2, Block 2, Shadow Mountain II Addition. The Staff
reviewed the submittals and found them in keeping with the approved PUD
Standards.

PUD 202-B (continued)

	Approved Standards	Requested
Floor Area Building Height Parking Loading Spaces	140,000 sq. ft. OM Zoning 350 (OM Zoning)	139,790 sq. ft. 8 Stories (103' 6") 350

Accordingly, the Staff recommends APPROVAL as submitted.

On MOTION of HOLLIDAY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Eller, Gardner, Holliday, Higgins, Kempe, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Parmele, Petty, T. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve this detailed site plan and landscape plan.

PUD #213 Charles Norman South of 31st Street and 90th East Avenue

The Chair, without objection, tabled this item, per Staff request. The Staff believed the request had already been approved and therefore, would not require any further action.

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

Date Approved 100 4 1981

Chairman

ATTEST:

10.14.81:1379(8)