TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES of Meeting No. 1437 Wednesday, January 5, 1983, 1:30 p.m. Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT

MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

OTHERS PRESENT

Hennage, 1st Vice-Chairman Higgins Hinkle Gardner Inhofe Chisum Compton Gardner Lasker Wilmoth

Pauling, Legal Department

Kempe
Miller
Parmele, Chairman
Petty, Secretary
C. Young

C. Young T. Young

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, January 4, 1983, at 9:27 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG Offices.

Vice-Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

#### MINUTES:

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Higgins, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minutes of December 15, 1982 (No. 1435) and December 22, 1982 (No. 1436).

#### REPORTS:

Director's Report:

Mr. Lasker advised the Commission that the Staff is still working on the prior ratification of approval of minor amendments for PUDs, etc., and will probably present some criteria to the Commission in the next two weeks. This will initially be similar to the criteria used for the City and County Boards of Adjustment. The Staff would make a recommendation and the amendments would come to the Commission in bulk which will save time. On amendments where there is a question of whether the amendment is major or minor, the Staff would present this to the Commission for discussion.

Mr. Lasker also advised that election of officers for the TMAPC would be held on January 19, 1983, after the appointments have been made.

#### SUBDIVISIONS:

### For Final Approval and Release:

Utica Place Addition (PUD #287) (683) West side of South Utica Avenue, North of 71st Street (OM)

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

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plat of Utica Place Addition and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

# Century 21 East Extended II Addition (PUD #131) (794) 14th Street and South 111th East Avenue (RS-3)

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

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plat of Century 21 East Extended II Addition and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

### For Extension of Approval:

<u>Hilton Addition (3503)</u> NW corner of Memorial Drive and Easton (CS)

Mr. Wilmoth advised a letter has been received from the developer of this project requesting a one-year extension and the Staff has no objection to the request.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve a one-year extension for the plat of Hilton Addition.

### Request to Change Access:

Delaware Crossing Condominiums (1783)

NE corner of 91st Street and
Delaware Avenue (CS)

This is a request to move one access point 65 feet west. The total number of access points remains the same. The Traffic Engineering Department has approved the request and it is recommended the Planning Commission concur. (For the record, this lot is zoned commercial and is NOT part of the adjacent PUD.)

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the request to change access for Delaware Crossing Condominiums, as submitted.

### Subdivisions: (continued)

#### Amendment to Covenants:

An amendment to the covenants of South Utica Place was presented and Mr. Wilmoth advised this is a follow-up on a plat that was already filed of record, the plat waived in a PUD application, and this set of covenants contains the PUD covenants that accompany the plat.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve and execute the amended covenants of South Utica Place Addition.

Z-5786 Roy Johnsen (Unplatted) (194) North side of East Admiral Place, West of 193rd East Avenue (CS pend.)

This is a request for approximately four (4) acres on the north side of Admiral, west of 193rd East Avenue. The use is for a night-club consisting of one building located in the northerly 1/3rd of the tract with parking in front and utilities extended from Admiral. The Staff notes that in the strip between the expressway and Admiral, some plat waivers have been granted and some properties have been platted. The two tracts to the east of this one have been platted. Whether or not a plat is required, the following conditions will apply:

- (a) Dedication of additional 10' on Admiral to meet Street Plan;
- (b) access control requirements (by plat or by separate instrument);
- (c) utility easements and main extensions as needed.  $(17\frac{1}{2}')$  on the west and north.) and
- (d) drainage and grading plans through the permit process (subject to the City Engineer's approval).

Mr. Roy Johnsen was present at the T.A.C. meeting on behalf of the developer, and was advised that this was in the area served by the Northeast Utility Authority for sewer. An extension will be necessary, subject to construction and inspection by the City of Tulsa (or Health Department) and approval would be needed if not on sewer. Recommendation from the T.A.C. was delayed until the Planning Commission approved the zoning. It is now pending City Commission approval. If the City Commission should deny the zoning application, approval of this waiver would be void.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the waiver of plat on Z-5786, subject to the conditions outlined above.

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the request to waive the platting requirements on Z-5786, subject to the conditions listed in the Staff's presentation.

#### LOT-SPLITS:

### For Ratification of Prior Approval:

L-15656	(3094) Opal Dunham, et al	L-15668 (3293)	Tulsa Food®Company
15658	(1783) Arthur W. Jenkins		(Charles Gotwalls)
15660	(1183) Design & Decorative	15669 (3194)	Bordens, Inc.
	Center (Roy Johnsen)		(M. W. Mizner)
15661	(2293) Richard Karnback	15670 (1283)	Woodland Pointe
15663	(3693) Alltex Construction		(Chris Bernard)
	Company (Stephen Schuller)	15671 (1292)	Orpha Harnish
	( 493) Billy D. Taylor		A. Rex Watkinson, Jr.
15665	(2422) Thomas Stumpf	15673 (3203)	Mike Dameron
15666	(1692) Steven Horn	15675 (1593)	Alameda Inv., Ltd.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to ratify the approved Lot-Splits listed above.

#### For Waiver:

### L-15676 Commonwealth Proterties (1794) (Mike Taylor) (RM-1)

This is a request to split Lot 1, Block 1, Village Walk into three (3) lots of almost equal size. The smallest of the lots will be 202' wide and 165' deep with a lot area of 30,330 square feet. All three (3) lots are well in excess of the lot width, land area, and lot area required under RM-1 zoning. However, the existing buildings (2) will not meet the required yard setbacks. The Staff recommends approval of this lot-split as the density of the lot(s) will not be increased and the physical appearance of the development from the street will not change. For the record, this is the way these lots were originally shown on the plat processed by the T.A.C.

Mr. Gardner explained that generally the Staff is not involved with anything but the frontage and the area in a lot-split. However, in this particular configuration, approval of the lot-split makes the side yards nonconforming because the buildings are constructed and there would be a side lot variation. This will also require a Board of Adjustment variance as to setbacks of buildings, for which an application has been made.

Mr. Mike Taylor was present for Sisemore-Sack-Sisemore and agreed with the Staff's comments.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Parmele, Inhofe, "absent") to approve lot-split #15676, subject to Board of Adjustment approval of setbacks.

#### CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. Z-5771 Present Zoning: AG

Applicant: Latch (Schaffer, Keeter) Proposed Zoning: CS and RMH

Location: NE corner of 15th Street and Lynn Lane Road

Date of Application: October 13, 1982 Date of Hearing: January 5, 1983 Size of Tract: 57.57 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Bob Latch

Address: 2518-A East 71st Street - 74136 Phone: 496-2015

### Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 17 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 RMH District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map and the proposed CS District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

The subject tract is located at the northeast corner of 15th Street and 177th East Avenue. It is 57.57 acres in size, vacant, zoned AG, and the applicant is requesting CS and RMH zoning. It is surrounded on all sides by large lot single-family residential development.

The tract is not located at a node making the requested CS inappropriate and "spot zoning". In addition, the RMH zoning would allow densities much higher than the surrounding existing residential uses making the RMH incompatible. Lack of utilities (water & sewer) in the area is the reason for low density development at present.

Based on the above facts, the Comprehensive Plan, and the Development Guidelines, the Staff recommends DENIAL of both the CS and the RMH.

#### Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bob Latch was present and felt that mobile home parks have a bad image because of parks that were built in the past. It has been determined that there is a tremendous need for a quality-type park. The density now allowed by the Ordinance is not as great as duplex zoning under RS-3. The six or seven units per acre is not a high density. Mobile home communities cannot afford and should not have to pay commercial land prices for residential use. This is a commercial venture as far as the developer is concerned, but the intended use of the property by the renters is residential in nature. This is not a low-income housing situation, due to the cost of mobile homes at this time.

Mr. Latch presently has a mobile home park in another section of the City and has researched the property values surrounding this park, which have increased substantially during the last several years. This would be a nice, quality park with large lots, paved streets and screening fence all the way around. There is no sewer in the area and the park will be on a lagoon system. This has been a slow-growth area primarily because of the sewer situation, but other utilities are in place. The CS zoning was requested primarily as a service to the park. There are

## Application No. Z-5771 (continued)

no convenience stores of any nature within 2 miles of this corner. Mr. Latch felt this would be beneficial to the entire neighborhood and might stimulate more activity in the area.

After sending out the notice of this proposal, Mr. Latch received 4 calls and 3 of these were in favor.

Commissioner T. Young asked about the Lynn Lane School and Mr. Latch advised this School has been closed. Commissioner T. Young also asked about the lagoon system and Mr. Latch advised it will be an aereated lagoon. There is a lagoon system north and west of this property between Admiral and 11th Street in Rosedew Addition.

Protestants:

Ross Hunt Maxine Vickers Clint Watts Addresses: 17910 East 15th Street

7774 East 24th Street 17507 East 14th Court

#### Protestants Comments:

Mr. Ross Hunt presented a petition containing 28 signatures of protest (Exhibit "A-1"). Currently, zoning in the area is typically low density residential and agricultural. The residents were also opposed to the installation of a lagoon system. Also, restrictive covenants existing on the 40 acres directly to the south of this tract specifically oppose mobile homes. A similar proposal was denied about a year ago on property to the south of this tract. The lagoon in the Rosedew Addition does not function properly. He believes the subject property borders the Lynn Lane Waterworks, which would place the lagoon too close to the clean water.

Mrs. Maxine Vickers lives adjacent to this property and the lagoon would be in front of her house.

Mr. Clint Watts is opposed to the project because of the lagoon system. Other systems in the area have not proven successful. He is also opposed to a convenience store because it would be used as a hang-out.

Applicant's Comments:

In answer to the protestants' comments, Mr. Latch does not consider the lagoon mentioned by Mr. Watts in Eastborough Addition as a "lagoon", merely two small ponds of water that would not pass in the Tulsa County system (Eastborough is in Wagoner County). The Rosedew system is not an aereation system. The water reservoir is south of 21st Street, which is 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile farther south from the subject tract. He feels something will have to happen in this area to make it expand and grow.

Commissioner Petty asked Mr. Latch if he thought the trend to mobile home parks would be long-lasting. Mr. Latch believes this is the case. People like the mobile homes because of the cost and the upkeep on a smaller lot. The trend will continue, but maybe not to the degree of the demand today because the single-family market is making a comback. Mobile home zoning is going to be difficult to obtain in the future and he feels the City needs to accommodate the demand. Commercial land is too expensive to develop as mobile home parks.

Mr. Gardner explained that RS-3 zoning could not be used until the sewer has been extended, although the Comprehensive Plan calls for RS-3. At present, septics require a minimum of one-half acre and this is difficult

### Application No. Z-5771 (continued)

land to percolate.

Commissioner T. Young wondered if the people on the lots will rent or own each lot and Mr. Latch answered these will be rental units. Commissioner T. Young noted that the aereated lagoons become, in essence, a treatment plant as such. He discussed the possibility of dedicating this facility and lagoon to the City and Mr. Latch stated that he would be in favor of that possibility if the City would maintain and operate it. At one time it was proposed to build a sewer treatment plant there, but the Spunky Creek drainage area, which this is a part of, is classified as a "dry creek". Therefore, no treated, effluent water could be dumped there. Mr. Latch could only guess that the closest sewer tie-in is approximately three or four miles to the east with no plans to extend the sewer, as far as he knows.

#### Special Discussion for the Record:

Commissionr T. Young asked if RS-3 zoning could be approved under an RMH advertisement and Mr. Gardner stated it could be approved. This tract was advertised in specific areas. If the Commission granted RS-3, the area advertised for CS would remain agricultural. Mr. Latch is not wanting RS-3 zoning and the Staff would rather the tract be left agricultural. There is commercial zoning one-half a mile away, which will eventually be developed if the demand is there.

Commissioner C. Young agreed with the Staff that CS zoning would be spot zoning. He could support RS-3, since there are percolation problems and development is in larger lots.

Commissioner T. Young suggested approving a small amount of RMH with the remainder RS-3, which would require a PUD in order to permit the density requested. In that manner, conditions could be placed on a PUD and the sewer problem could be regulated to the extent of examining alternatives, since the main concern is the lagoon. However, Commissioner C. Young was also concerned with the proposed density.

Commissioner Petty realized there is a demand for mobile home zoning and there is a problem with getting this type of zoning within Tulsa.

Commissioner T. Young asked if there would be some homes on permanent foundations that would be rented. Mr. Latch advised that the homes would be individually owned and would be moved in and out. Turnover at his existing park is approximately 6 units per year out of 100 units. The lagoon will take about 10 to 15 acres and will not need to be zoned RMH. Mr. Gardner agreed that the lagoon will need at least 12 acres and RMH on the entire tract will set the density higher per acre. Mr. Latch suggested leaving the 15 acres out of the application, since he has no intention of developing at a higher density than 6 units per acre.

Commissioner C. Young thought the City should study where mobile home parks should be located in the City and County. Commissioner T. Young explained that there are two issues at hand -- modular home subdivisions and mobile home parks, which are high density residential, temporary and are objectionable wherever placed. However, mobile home parks do have a place and an effort should be made to decide where these could be placed. He did not want more than 5 units per acre on this tract.

### Application No. Z-5771 (continued)

Commissioner Higgins brought up the need for more classifications of mobile home parks. Mr. Gardner explained this is being studied and will be presented to the Planning Commission in the near future.

MOTION was made by C. YOUNG for denial of this application. MOTION died for lack of a second.

MOTION was made by PETTY, second by C. Young, to approve RS-3 zoning on that portion advertised RMH and denial of CS zoning. Commissioner T. Young noted that some RMH zoning would be required in order to apply for a PUD on the proposal. Mr. Gardner explained that enough RMH is needed to accommodate the proposed number of mobile homes because mobile homes are not permitted without the proper zoning. Since there are 57 acres on the tract and the maximum used for the lagoon would be 17 acres, then 40 acres could be used at 5 units per acre or 240 units. In order to get 240 units, 30 acres will have to be zoned RMH and the CS denied. Commissioner Petty thought this would be a reasonable compromise.

Commissioner Kempe commented that if this application is denied, she would make a motion to waive the 6-month waiting requirement so that Mr. Latch could bring a more specific plan before the Commission. Commissioner C. Young noted that the portion advertised for CS will have to be readvertised, so there will be a 3 to 4 week delay anyway. Commissioner Petty suggested continuing the case in order to allow the Staff to study the plan more thoroughly.

MOTION made by PETTY, second by YOUNG to approve RS-3 zoning on the portion advertised for RMH and denial of CS zoning was WITHDRAWN.

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; Parmele "abstaining"; Gardner, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of this case until February 2, 1983, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

#### OTHER BUSINESS:

John Piercy - City Development - Request for early public hearing

A letter was submitted from Dr. John Piercy, Director of City Development, requesting an early public hearing for property located at Yukon Avenue and 21st Street since this property will be utilized for the waste to energy facility (Exhibit "B-1").

Phil Richmond, Director of Solid Waste Management, was present. Mr. Gardner explained this property is presently in the County. In order to get bond financing through the City, it must be annexed to the City. When property is annexed to the City, it automatically comes in as Agricultural zoning, although it is zoned IM at this time. Therefore, City Development wants this to go on the map as IM and Board of Adjustment special exception is also needed. Before the City Commission can hear the case, it most be annexed.

Commissioner T. Young advised that the developers of that property are in reciept of a letter from him based on the fact the tract is in the County, with guarantees that the County will be doing some improvement work on Yukon Avenue to accommodate the truck traffic. This is the first he has heard the property will be annexed by the City and the commitment on road improvements would be void if the proposal is accepted. Representatives from the development were present and advised that the way the annex is proposed, Yukon Avenue itself would not be included and would remain in the County. Commissioner T. Young responded that this would not change his consideration on the tract.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-1-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Parmele, Petty, C. Young, "aye"; T. Young, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the request for early hearing on this item, to be heard on February 9, 1983, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

PUD #296-1 Ash (Pinehurst Dev. Co.) East of the SE corner of 17th Place and Ouincy Avenue

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment - Detail Site and Landscape Plans Review

The subject tract is located south of the southwest corner of Rockford Avenue and East 17th Place. It is approximately .8 of an acre in size and is vacant, except for one single-family dwelling. The applicant has received approval of a PUD to allow the development of a small townhouse project. During the rezoning process, the City Commission granted the applicant a larger area of RD zoning than was recommended by the Planning Commission. Because of this change and as a part of reviewing the Detail Site Plan, it was determined minor adjustments were needed on; 1) square-footage of development areas, 2) redesignate livability space, and 3) correct dimension errors. The applicant is now requesting approval of these changes and approval of their Detail Site and Landscape Plans.

### Minor Amendments

The applicant when developing his PUD made a miscalculation of the square-footage in each development area. In addition, the change made by the City Commission required changes be made in the livability space requirements. Finally, the above change also required some changes in the dimensions of the development area boundaries. Since none of these requests

### PUD #296-1 (continued)

significantly change the original PUD, the Staff can support them as being minor in nature.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the following Minor Amendments:

1. Net Area:

	Development Area "A": 6,566.96 so Development Area "B": 28,896.54 so	
	Total	35,463.50 square feet
2.	Minimum Livability Space:	
	Development Area "A": Development Area "B":	4,600 square feet 13,400 square feet
	Total	18,000 square feet
3.	North Boundary Dimension:	
	Development Area "A": Development Area "B":	69.5 feet 31.5 feet
	Total	101.0 feet

4. That on page 2 of the Development Text there should be a change along the east boundary of the map that a dimension should be 97.0 feet instead of 98.5 feet. This number was transposed incorrectly, but did not affect calculations.

Detail Site and Landscape Plans Review
The Staff has reviewed the Detail Plans submitted and compared these to the amended PUD and find the following:

Development Area "A"					
Item	Approved	Submitted			
Net Area:	6,566.96 square feet	6,566.96 sq. ft.			
Permitted Uses:	Existing Single-Family Structure	Same			
Maximum No. of Dwelling Units:	l unit	l unit			
Maximum Building Height:	Existing Height	Same			
Off-Street Parking:	RS-3 District	2 spaces			
Minimum Livability Space:	4,600 square feet	4,600 sq. ft.			
Minimum Building Setbacks:					
From North Property Lin From East Property Line From South Property Lin From West Property Line	: 15 feet e: 4 feet	21 feet 15 feet 5.5 feet 11 feet			

### Development Area "B"

Item	Approved	Submitted		
Net Area:	28,896.54 square feet	28,896.54 sq. ft.		
Permitted Uses:	Single-Family Attached Townhouse Dwellings on Individual Lots	Same		
Maximum No. of Dwelling Units:	7 units	7 units		
Maximum Building Height:	26 feet	35 feet*		
Off-Street Parking:	2 per unit 14 spaces	3.1 per unit 22 spaces		
Minimum Livability Space:	13,400 square feet	13,400 sq. ft.		
Minimum Building Setbacks:				
Rear: One Side: Other Side:	20 feet 5 feet 5 feet	20 feet 9 feet 12.5 feet		

<sup>\*</sup>This change is consistent with recent Code amendments.

In addition, the applicant has submitted a detail Landscape Screening Plan, which identifies the plant materials proposed around the perimeter of the project. The Staff feels that this Plan meets the conditions of the PUD concerning landscaping.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan and the Detail Landscape Plan, subject to the Plans submitted.

NOTE: The Detail Site Plan shows that several of the parking spaces are not meeting the required 20-foot depth, however, the distance is shown overall to have an 18-foot drive with 20-foot parking spaces. The Staff is assuming this is a drafting error which can be eliminated by the extension of the parking islands between the parking bays prior to the issuance of a building permit.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present:
On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Parmele, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Hennage, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minor amendment Detail Site Plan and Landscape Plan for PUD #296, subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation.

CDP #78-1 Terry L. Downing Lot 13, Block 1, Mayo Plaza Extended Addition

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment - Lot B, Block 1, Mayo Plaza Extended CDP #78 is located east of 129th East Avenue and south of 26th Street. It was approved for both single-family and multifamily uses. The applicant is requesting a reduction of the rear yard requirement to 15 feet for an addition to the back of an existing one-story house.

The tract is abutted on both sides of the front by existing single-family structures and on the back by a patio home development.

### CDP #78-1 (continued)

Since the request will meet all other Bulk and Area Requirements of the PUD or underlying zoning and is backing up to a higher density development, the Staff can support the request as minor in nature.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL to the reduction of the rear yard requirement to 15 feet, subject to the Plot Plan submitted, and the new addition be no higher than the existing structure.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Parmele, Miller, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Hennage, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minor amendment to CDP #78-1, subject to the Plot Plan submitted and the new addition be no higher than the existing structure.

PUD #190 Bill Jones - Area "C-2" - SW corner of 72nd Street and South Irvington Avenue

## Staff Recommendation - Detail Site and Landscape Plan Review

Development Area "C-2" of Planned Unit Development #190 is located south and west of the intersection of 72nd Street and South Irvington Avenue. It is 13.3 acres in size, vacant, and approved for 120 multifamily units. The applicant has submitted a Detail Site Plan and a Detail Landscape Plan for a 4.42 acre portion of the total tract and is requesting a site plan and landscape plan approval as was required by the PUD conditions.

The Staff has reviewed the plans submitted, and compared them to the PUD conditions for this area and find the following:

Item	Approved	Submitted	Remaining
Total Area:	13.2 acres	4.42 acres	8.88 acres
Maximum No. of Units:	120 units	35 units	85 units
Maximum Building Height:	35 feet	35 feet	NA
Minimum Livability Space:	2,000 sq. ft./ unit	2,200+ sq. unit	ft./ NA
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	2 per unit	79 spaces	NA
Minimum Building Setbacks:			
From arterial street, From nonarterial street.	35 feet 25 feet	NA 25 feet	NA NA

In addition, the Staff reviewed the plans submitted for other design factors such as building separation, driveway width, street width, and land-scaping, which were not specifically required by the original PUD.

We find that all information submitted is acceptable and recommend APPROVAL of the Detail Site and Landscape Plans, subject to the Plans submitted.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Parmele, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Hennage, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Site and Landscape Plans, as submitted.

PUD #292-2 - Design Properties - 7502 South Gary Place, Guier Woods Four East

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment - Lot 16, Block 1, Guier Woods Four E. Planned Unit Development No. 292 is located at 75th Place and South Harvard Avenue. It is 6.48 acres in size and has been approved for a private largelot single-family development. The applicant is requesting minor amendments to; (1) reduce the setback from 75 feet to 65 feet from the centerline of Harvard (the PUD has already allowed the standard 85-foot setback to be reduced to 75 feet); and (2) reduce the rear yard requirement from 20 feet to 15 feet.

The Staff has reviewed the PUD conditions and compared them to the Plot Plan submitted, and find that only a small portion of the back of the house encroaches into the 20-foot rear yard requirement, therefore, we can support that request as minor in nature. However, the Staff feels that a 5-foot reduction of the setback from the centerline of Harvard Avenue is all that is necessary.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of a reduction of the rear yard requirement of 20 feet to 15 feet and a reduction of the setback from the centerline of South Harvard from 75 feet to 70 feet on Lot 16, Block 1, Guier Woods Four East Addition, subject to the Plot Plan submitted.

The applicant was present and agreed with the conditions.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Miller, Parmele, Petty, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Hennage, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minor amendment to PUD #292, subject to the Plot Plan submitted.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Date Approved January 19, 1983

Cherry H. Kempe

Chairman

ATTEST:

Secretary