TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1385
Wednesday, December 2, 1981, 1:30 p.m.
Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Gardner	Eller	Chisum	Linker, Legal Dept.
Higgins	Freeman	Compton	
Holliday, Secretary	Parmele	Gardner	
Kempe, 2nd Vice-Chairman	C. Young	Lasker	
Petty	Inhofe		
T. Young			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, December 1, 1981, at 10:30 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG Offices.

Second Vice-Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

REPORTS:

Comprehensive Plan Committee:

Commissioner Petty advised that the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee will meet after this meeting in Room 213.

Director's Report:

Mr. Linker submitted a written opinion which was requested by the Board in the previous meeting regarding approval of a home occupation in a single-family residential area zoned CO and PUD (Exhibit "A-1"). This will be brought up later in the meeting concerning PUD #206-A.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. Z-5639 Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: Richard Riddle (Gawey) Proposed Zoning: RM-0, RS-3, RM-1
Location: SW corner of 81st Street and Sheridan Road

Date of Application: September 25, 1981
Date of Hearing: December 2, 1981
Size of Tract: 20.02 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Richard Riddle
Address: 5413 South Yale Avenue, Suite 200 74135 Phone: 494-3770

AND

Application No. PUD 271 Present Zoning: (AG)
Applicant: Richard Riddle (Gawey)
Location: SW corner of 81st Street and Sheridan Road

Date of Application: September 25, 1981
Date of Hearing: December 2, 1981
Size of Tract: 20.02 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Richard Riddle
Address: 5413 South Yale Avenue, Suite 200 74135 Phone: 494-3770

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-5639

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low-Intensity -- No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the RM-0 and RM-1 may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The Staff recommends DENIAL of RM-1 zoning and APPROVAL of 10.58 acres of RS-3 and RM-0 on the balance (9.44) for the following reasons:

The subject tract is located south and west of the southwest corner of 81st Street and South Sheridan Road and is zoned AG, Agriculture. The applicant is requesting a combination of RS-3, RM-0 and RM-1 zoning to accommodate approximately 300 residential condominiums under the control of PUD #271.

The tract is vacant, as is the abutting land to the west, south and east. The properties to the north are developed, single-family residential, apartments and the lot on the corner of 81st and Sheridan is vacant, but zoned for commercial. The southwest corner of the intersection contains a service station and a single-family residence. The urban zoning patterns established at the intersection are CS and RM-2 inside the node and RM-0 and RS-3 outside the node. The RM-1 zoning requested by the applicant is not established in the area, nor is it consistent with the Development Guidelines or the Comprehensive Plan, given the existing physical facts of the area. Ten and one-half acres of RM-0 zoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Development Guidelines. This amount of RM-0 and RS-3 zoning would permit 202 dwelling units. The applicant is requesting 296 dwelling units or a 50% increase over and above the Guidelines. The Staff is concerned about the precedent that would be established if the applicant's zoning request is approved.

The Development Guidelines must be used to regulate the type, location and quantities of land use to be effective, else we have no land use regulation. Without some unique physical fact that makes the subject property different from other intersections, the quantity of RM-0 recommended by the Staff should not be exceeded.

Based on these reasons, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of 10.58 acres of RS-3 and the balance RM-0, dimensions as per overlay.

Z-5639 & PUD #271 (continued)

Staff Recommendation: (PUD #271)

Planned Unit Development #271 is located south and west of the southwest corner of 81st Street South and Sheridan Road. The applicant has filed a companion zoning application (Z-5639) requesting a combination of RM-1, RM-0 and RS-3 to accommodate 296 residential condominium units. The Staff recommended a combination of RM-0 and RS-3 zoning which permits 202 dwelling units.

The Staff reviewed PUD #271 based on the recommended RM-0 and RS-3 zoning per the Staff Recommendation.

The Staff finds PUD #271 inappropriately designed as shown by the site plan submitted, for the following reasons:

a) Total vehicluar circulation within the development is accomplished by moving through a series of parking lots;

b) the 191 parking spaces serving the units located on the cul-de-sac at the southern portion of the site have only one point of ingress and egress that is through another parking lot; and

c) there is no provision for a landscape buffer or transition area along Sheridan Road or 81st Street across from the existing or future single-family developments.

The Staff however, finds the land use concept (not the number of units), or circulation system proposed under PUD #271 to be:

a) Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; and

b) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the surrounding area.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #271, subject to the following modifications and conditions:

1) Development Standards

Land Area (Gross) (Net)	20.02 acres 18.45 acres
Maximum Dwelling Units	202
Maximum Building Height	2 stories
Permitted Uses	Residential dwelling units and accessory recreational uses such as clubhouse, pools, tennis court, cabanas, etc.
Minimum Off-Street Parking	1.5 per one bedroom units 2 per 2 or more bedroom units
Minimum Building Setback From arterial streets From perimeter boundary Between buildings	 35 feet 50 feet 20 feet
Minimum Open Space	1,955 square feet Dwelling Unit

2) That a modified detail site plan, resolving the access and circulation problems, be submitted for approval prior to the request for any building permit.

3) That a detail landscape plan, including buffering along Sheridan Road and 81st Street, be submitted for approval prior to the request for any building permit.

4) That a homeowner's association be created to maintain all common areas including private drives if units are sold now or in the future.

5) That a subdivision plat, incorporating the PUD conditions of approval within the restrictive covenants, be approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants, prior to the request for a building permit.

6) That all landscaping and fencing, per approved plan, be installed prior to occupancy.

Applicant's Comments:

Richard Riddle is an attorney representing Thomas J. Eckeridge, applicant, who is the owner of Mid-America Corp., out of Indiana. This Corporation is primarily building multifamily dwellings. They wish to come to Tulsa because of its economical strength and to supply needed multifamily units. He presented pictures of finished projects in Fort Wayne, Indiana, (Exhibit "B-1") and a text for the PUD (Exhibit "B-2").

Mr. Riddle sees no problem in complying with the Staff's recommendation on ingress and egress. The only difference of opinion he has with the Staff relates to the additional 92 units he feels the site justifies. There are significant physical facts as well as economical factors which justify approval of the zoning and PUD. The complex would contain 296 units, clubhouse, pool, tennis courts and extensive open spaces with a pond under their proposal. The proposed 296 units over 20 acres would mean a density of 14.8 units per acre. Recent developments in Tulsa average 19 to 22 units, therefore, this project would be significantly less dense. The dwelling units are being designed for condominium sales, but because of certain economical and financing factors Mr. Eckeridge will be required to hold these units as rentals for 3-5 years.

There will be an average of 1.7 parking spaces per dwelling unit. They hope to maintain as much of the present vegetation and terrain as possible as well as open space, which would not be changed if the illustrative site plan were modified in accordance with the other Staff recommendation. Approximately 67% of the site is open space which is about 1,800 square feet per dwelling unit and far exceeds the 1,200 square feet required for RM-0.

Mr. Riddle agrees with the Staff concept of significant setback from the arterial streets and also agrees with the setback requirements from the perimeter boundaries. In this particular case, the buildings are small enough that there will be significant distances between buildings far in excess of the minimum requirement for setback or spacing of the buildings. This site has physical chacteristics and location which cannot be ignored and should be used to satisfy his request for the additional 92 units. This

is in the major southside area, is close to employment center, shopping centers and is also close to St. Francis Hospital and ORU. The site has frontage on 81st Street and on Sheridan Road. The emphasis of the development would be consistent with the zoning configuration. The site has suitable soil and drainage. Other development aspects are set out in the text. This is one of the sites in Tulsa that has available utilities.

Protestant's Comments: Jack Bryant Address: 10 East 3rd Street, Suite 700
Jack Bryant, attorney for Hope Unitarian Church located at 8432 South Sheridan Road, shares all the problems with the proposal that have been voiced by the Staff and was particularly concerned with the growing traffic problems at that intersection. The streets are only 2 lanes with no stop lights; 81st Street is also developing into a major arterial because of Holland Hall and Oru on Lewis Avenue. Mr. Bryant did not feel the traffic problems have been discussed enough, such as access onto Sheridan. The increased density would only aggravate this problem. He has observed an increase in traffic already in this area without any development. He is sympathetic with the development problems of the City and would just as soon see Mr. Eckeridge develop because he seems to offer better quality units than existing developments in Tulsa, but this proposal would increase the density by 50% over and above the Guidelines established for this area. The whole purpose of the Guidelines is to allow the City to grow in a planned fashion. He feels any deviation would defeat the purpose of the plan. There is nothing unique about this location as far as Mr. Bryant can see. If this application is approved with the increased density, he thinks some warranties should be made by the applicant to minimize the problems resulting from increased density, such as widening the intersection and lights installed.

Interested Party: Dr. Edward Moore Address: 325 Utica Square Medical Center

Interested Party's Comments:
Dr. Moore owns 35 acres between the proposed development and the church. He has dicsussed this application with Mr. Riddle and does not see anything wrong. He does not understand the problem with the number of units, but feels knowledgeable people should be relied on to make these decisions.

Applicant's Comments:
Mr. Riddle explained the process the developers went through to select this tract. There have been numerous newspaper articles about the need for housing in Tulsa. The City has reached the saturation point in multifamily units. He feels this tract is an opportunity that will come at very little cost to the citizens.

Mr. Riddle has discussed the traffic problem with the City and they are cognizant of the need. Stop lights for this intersection have been budgeted for next year. The project will take about a year to complete. He realizes that the Staff's statements are valid as far as circulation and access on the site. He does not feel the streets are that significant a factor because the area is going to develop eventually.

Further Discussion:
Commissioner T. Young asked the Staff what RM-2 in the application would do toward meeting the 292 units. Mr. Gardner replied that there is a narrow strip of land about 67 feet in width that is within the node and the Staff has already calculated this at RM-2 density and increased the amount of RM-0 land accordingly (10½ acres). They would get about 8½ acres of RM-0

under a typical node. If the RM-1 zoning was approved, the Plan Map would not have to be changed. However, abutting property owners in the section would have the same privilege if the Guidelines were exceeded. Some RM-1 zoning was approved prior to the Guidelines. The Guidelines also say that instead of having 5 acres of CS on the intersection, there could be 10 acres of RM-1. The problem here is that this application is not at the intersection.

Commissioner Petty commented that economic conditions should not be a consideration in zonings, since these conditions change rapidly. Zoning is a more permanent situation.

Commissioner T. Young was not troubled with the differences in units, but was concerned about what may follow in the section. He did not feel this would end up as curb-to-curb apartments, but again the demand will dictate this. He was inclined to go with the application as submitted.

MOTION was made by T. Young to approve the application as submitted. MOTION died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Higgins felt economics have a strong feel on what the Commission can do because if the economics are not strong enough, there will be a lot of failed projects. However, she does not feel these extra units will help the economy.

Instruments Submitted: Pictures of complexes built by applicant (Exhibit "B-1")
PUD Text (Exhibit "B-2")

TMAPC Action: (Z-5639) 6 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, "aye"; T. Young "nay"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Freeman, Parmele, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RS-3 on 10.58 acres and the balance RM-0, per Staff Recommendations:

The NE/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 (LESS the North 417.42' of the East 521.77') and the E/2 of the NW/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4; and the SE/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 15, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

PUD #271: Special Discussion for the Record:

Commissioner T. Young felt that the requested number of units would not be inordinate in this area. He thought the PUD should be changed to reflect the number of units requested. Commissioner Higgins asked if this could be done with the underlying zoning. Mr. Gardner explained that in order to accommodate the units requested the zoning would have to exceed what the Staff recommended and the Commission just approved. The PUD is giving the maximum permitted.

TMAPC Action: (PUD #271) 6 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, "aye"; T. Young "nay"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Freeman, Parmele, C. Young, Inhofe "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be APPROVED for a Planned Unit Development, subject to the Staff modifications and conditions:

PUD #271 (continued)

The NE/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 (LESS the North 417.42" of the East 521.77') and the E/2 of the NW/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4; and the SE/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 15, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Application No. PUD 206-A Present Zoning: (CO)
Applicant: John Moody (Isbell, Inc.)
Location: 6121 East 93rd Place South

Date of Application: September 25, 1981
Date of Hearing: December 2, 1981
Size of Tract: .18 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: John Moody
Address: 4100 Bank of Oklahoma Tower Phone: 588-2651

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Gardner advised that the Staff previously recommended denial of this application on the basis that this particular type of use (holding classes) would create additional traffic in the area and would create a parking problem during the classes, since the tract is on a curve and parking would have to be in the street. The City Attorney presented his opinion (Exhibit "A-1") under the Director's Report, which stated that TMAPC and the City has jurisdiction in this matter because the tract is under a PUD.

Commissioner T. Young could not agree with the Staff recommendation because the Staff approved the configuration of the streets in this subdivision when the plat was approved. This may be a switch-back curve, but where there are houses there will be people parking in the streets. A knitting class does not seem to be a use that would disrupt the neighborhood.

Applicant's Comments:

John Moody represented Beverly Clark who is the applicant. She had previously applied for a home occupation exception through the Board of Adjustment. There would be no employees, no signs or advertising and this will be her home whether or not the amendment is granted. This is her only occupation and she will be teaching people to make her knitting designs. As Mr. Linker pointed out, this Board has the same right as the Board of Adjustment to approve this, subject to certain conditions limiting the use of the property. Mrs. Clark is willing to restrict activities to no more than two cars and no more than four classes a day. He feels this use is compatible with residential uses, which is one of the Board of Adjustment's considerations in a home occupation exception. All of the property along the switch-back on the south side of the street is owned by the City for a water detention facility and does not generate any traffic. Mrs. Clark did not wish to create a controversy with her neighbors and is willing to conduct this in a manner that is compatible with the neighborhood. Mrs. Clark is willing to limit the days of the week and the hours to whatever is acceptable to the Commission. Mr. Moody suggested no more than 5 days a week, Mondays through Fridays and limit the hours from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Protestant: Scott McEachin Address: 9207 South Maplewood Avenue

Protestant's Comments:

Mr. Scott McEachin was present as the Vice-President of the Homeowner's Association. The neighborhood was reluctant to have a business in the area and all the residents now realize this will be a home occupation-type activity, that there will be no signs and no employees. The reactions ranged from complete rejection to reluctant acceptance. The traffic generated by a home use occupation was a concern. The PUD under which the present owners have acquired their homes states that all the homes are to be used solely for residential purposes. This is the basic opposition. However, they do understand the limited nature of the activity to be conducted. They asked that the Planning Commission reject the application. However, they do recognize Mrs. Clark's willingness to compromise; and, if the Commission feels

PUD #206-A (continued)

this application should be approved, that it be approved with the limitations of two cars at one time, four classes a day and limitation of hours from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. He thought a reasonable request would be to limit these classes to week days.

Commissioner Petty did not feel this use would be different than an Amway or Tupperware Party and did not see any problem with approval.

MOTION was made by PETTY, SECOND by HOLLIDAY, that this application be approved. A clarification of the MOTION was requested and Petty stated this would be with no restrictions. However, Holliday felt restrictions were necessary, since the applicant is agreeable. Higgins was against the restrictions because there could be more than two cars and if the applicant were to have guests this would be undue strain on Mrs. Clark. Gardner pointed out that the Board of Adjustment is ruled by the Zoning Code and the Legal Department has suggested these conditions be followed. They would include no signs, no structural alteration, etc. Since this is not the Board of Adjustment, the Planning Commission needs to list these conditions. Higgins asked if the number of cars could be expanded to five in case the business does grow. Petty commented that he would be willing to make the conditions part of the approval if the applicant is in agreement with them.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of PETTY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Freeman, Parmele, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for minor amendment to this PUD to include a home occupation use, subject to the following conditions:

1. Four classes per day, Monday through Friday, 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.;

2. No more than two cars at one time;

3. No employees;

4. No signs and no advertising;

5. No building alterations; and

6. Limited to this owner only.

Lot 40, Block 1, Sheridan South Addition, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

Application No. Z-5642 Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: Don Pool (Shannon Construction Company) Proposed Zoning: RS-3
Location: South of 101st Street, between Sheridan Road and Yale Avenue

Date of Application: October 23, 1981
Date of Hearing: December 2, 1981
Size of Tract: 6.031 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Don Pool
Address: 1717 South Cheyenne Avenue Phone: 583-7040

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Amended Staff Recommendation

The District 26 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District II.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the RS-3 District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

The subject tract is 6 acres in size, is zoned AG Agriculture and is located west of the intersection of 101st Street South and Sheridan Road. The tract is vacant as are the abutting properties to the south and west. To the north is a single-family subdivision and to the east is scattered single-family residences. The land to the north is zoned RS-1, to the east RS-3 and to the south and west AG. The applicant is requesting RS-3 single-family zoning.

The original Comprehensive Plan calls for the area of the subject tract to be in Special District I, Plateau Area. This District was set aside because of the slope and soils problems that exist in the area. However, since the last TMAPC meeting, additional information has come to light which needs to be addressed. An amendment to the Comprehensive Plan designated the subject tract area Special District II, Sump Area. This is a sub-area of the original Special District I, Plateau Area that was identified as having special internal drainage problems. Within this Special District II, the previously permitted RS-1, RS-2 and RS-3 have been restricted to an RS-1 use only. It has also been identified that development intensities shall be consistent with the ability to provide adequate on-site drainage and retention of storm water runoff such that the historic runoff rates are not exceeded. Unless the property can be sewered, septic tank development requires a minimum of 1/2 acre lots and therefore, another valid reason for RS-1 zoning.

Given these facts, the Staff feels it could support the requested and previously recommended RS-3 only if the applicant can document a solution to the inherent drainage problems and provide sanitary sewer.

Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of RS-3 and APPROVAL of RS-1.

Applicant's Comments:

Don Pool reminded the Commission that this case was before the Board last meeting. When he investigated this case for his client, he found that the request is not within the Comprehensive Plan and did not wish to waste time trying to convince the Commission that the zoning should be approved when his personal opinion is in accordance with the Staff. For contractural reasons, he cannot withdraw the application. He has no argument with the Staff Recommendation.

Z-5642 (continued)

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of HOLLIDAY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Freeman, Parmele, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be DENIED RS-3 and APPROVED RS-1, per Amended Staff Recommendation:

All that part of the E/2, E/2, NW/4, NE/4 of Section 27, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows, to wit:

Beginning at a point on the North Boundary line of said E/2, E/2, NW/4, NE/4, a distance of 281.13' West of the NE corner thereof, said point being 1,656.64' West of the NE corner of Said Section 27; thence South 89°-51'-36" West along the North line of Said E/2, E/2, NW/4, NE/4, a distance of 50.20' to the NW corner of Said E/2, E/2, NW/4, NE/4; thence South 0°-01'-47" East along the West line of Said E/2, E/2, NW/4, NE/4, a distance of 1,320.86' to the SW corner thereof; thence North 89°-51'-00" East along the South Boundary of Said E/2, E/2, NW/4, NE/4, a distance of 331.39' to the SE corner thereof; thence North 0°-01'-58" West along the East Boundary of Said E/2, E/2, NW/4, NE/4, a distance of 698.42'; thence South 89°-51'-19" West a distance of 281.16'; thence North 0°-01'-48" West a distance of 622.41' to the Point of Beginning, containing 6.031 acres, more or less.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Blackwell-Crockett (3293) NE corner of 57th Street and South Lewis Avenue (OL)
AND
Cedarcrest Park (1783) NE corner of 90th Street and South Delaware Ave. (RM-T)

The Chair, without objection, tabled the above items.

Executive Center (983) SW corner of 71st Street and South Yale Avenue (OM)

The Staff advised the Commission that all letters of approval had been received and recommended final approval and release.

On MOTION of GARDNER, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Freeman, Parmele, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plat of Executive Center and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

LOT-SPLITS:

For Ratification of Prior Approval:

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Freeman, Parmele, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the following lot-splits:

L-15328 (1793) Edwin.G. Hill
L-15348 (1614) Charles E. Richards
L-15353 (892) Daryl P. Foy
L-15354 (383) Joe T. Reece

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #246 Charles Norman (Corporate Oaks)

Staff Recommendation:

The subject PUD is located on the north side of 71st Street, east of Yale Ave. The Planning Commission had previously approved PUD #246, subject to the height of the building in Development Area "A" not exceeding by more than 10 feet the flanking 2-story apartment structure to the west.

The applicant is now requesting that this 10-foot maximum be increased by 16 feet to a total of 26 feet above the height of the adjacent apartment structure for the purpose of adding 2 floors of structure parking.

Given the adjacent land uses, the heights of structures in the surrounding area, the existing site conditions and minimal impact that an additional 16 feet in height would have, the Staff considers this to be a minor amendment and recommends APPROVAL.

Applicant's Comments:

Charles Norman explained that this building is located in a drainage swell that runs crossway to the elevation. The building originally would have had one level of structural parking beneath the four-story building and since that time the owner has determined it desirable to add a second level of subsurface parking which increases the height 12 of the 16 feet requested. This PUD has an unusually high commitment of open space and the addition of the structure parking is what makes it possible to maintain this open space.

PUD #246 (continued)

The additional 4 feet requested is necessary to solve the problem of keeping the surface drainage from entering the parking garage. This building is separated from the garden apartments to the west by a double row of parking spaces on both lots and the request to increase the height will not adversely affect the relationship to the church on the east, or to the apartment buildings. He noted that he will have to come back before the Board for detailed site plan approval, but the engineering indicated the need for this height change and he wanted to bring this to the Board before the plans and specifications were completed.

On MOTION of HOLLIDAY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Holliday, Kempe, Petty, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Eller, Freeman, Parmele, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve this Minor Amendment to PUD #246.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

Date Approved December 23, 1981

1st Vice-Chairman

ATTEST:

Secretary

12.2.81:1385(13)