

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1455
Wednesday, May 11, 1983, 1:30 p.m.
Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Draughon Gardner Higgins Hinkle, Secretary Kempe, Chairman C. Young, 1st Vice- Chairman T. Young	Benjamin Miller Petty Inhofe	Chisum Compton Gardner Lasker	Linker, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, at 11:20 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG Offices.

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

MINUTES:

On MOTION of DRAUGHON, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, T. Young, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minutes of April 27, 1983 (No. 1453).

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts and Deposits:

The Staff advised this report is in order.

On MOTION of GARDNER, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, T. Young, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the month ending April 30, 1983.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. CZ-79 Present Zoning: AG-R
Applicant: Raymond Christians (Bevens) Proposed Zoning: CS
Location: SW corner 91st Street and 193rd East Avenue

Date of Application: March 21, 1983
Date of Hearing: May 11, 1983
Size of Tract: 5-1/2 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Louis Bevens
Address: 19214 East 91st Street Phone: 455-5537

Staff Recommendation:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: CZ-79:

The Broken Arrow Comprehensive Plan (District 19) designates the subject property Low Intensity -- Residential.

Accordingly, the requested CS Zoning District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 5-1/2 acres in size and located at the southwest corner of East 91st Street and 193rd East Avenue. It is wooded, flat and contains a metal building that appears to be used for commercial purposes (concrete and rock sales) and three single-family dwellings, and is zoned AG-R.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by mostly vacant land zoned AG. Slightly farther to the north is a single-family residence. To the east (Wagoner County) is vacant land, to the south is a single-family residence zoned AG-R, and to the west is a single-family dwelling zoned AG-R.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past zoning and Board actions have allowed a lot split on the southern portion of the tract, which contains the three single-family dwellings. The Board of Adjustment approved a home occupation exception for a beauty shop for a three-year period. On the north part of the tract is an existing metal building for which we have no records.

Conclusion -- The Development Guidelines would call for a medium-intensity node to occur at the intersection. However, the Guidelines also point out that existing land use conditions should be taken into consideration. It is difficult to determine what will occur east of the tract in Wagoner County. If commercial were to develop on that side of 193rd, a small amount of commercial might be supported in the future at the immediate intersection, comprising that portion of the property that contains the metal building. But, at this time, the Plan does not support medium intensity uses on the tract and the surrounding development is low intensity, residential, as called for under the Plan. Therefore, the Staff cannot support commercial zoning on this tract and would recommend DENIAL of the requested CS zoning.

It should be noted that the existing commercial use on the corner property can continue if it is a legal nonconforming use (there before 1966), but could not be expanded under its present zoning. The beauty shop operation can continue for approximately another year and a half as a home occupation, but should meet all the requirements of a home occupation as set out in the County Zoning Code, including no sign.

Mr. Gardner advised a letter was submitted from the Broken Arrow Planning Commission recommending denial of this application, which included a protest petition containing 8 signatures and a letter of protest (Exhibit "A-1").

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Louis Bevens owns the corner of 91st Street and County Line. This land has been brought up above the floodplain for about a year. His property at the corner has too much traffic for residential use. There is a commercial business on the far corner and there are at least another 7 or 8 businesses up and down the County Line Road. This area will not stay residential.

Commissioner T. Young asked about the commercial property at the corner and Mr. Bevens explained it is in Wagoner County. Mr. Gardner explained the recommendation for denial was not based on the lack of sewer or the fact the Broken Arrow Plan calls for residential, but on the basis the Plan calls for residential and it is developed residential. Immediately to the west is a very valuable home and there are several such homes to the west along 91st Street. There are three existing homes on the south-half of the subject tract. The Planning Commission has no control on the east side of the County Line because it is in Wagoner County.

Commissioner T. Young wondered about the proposed use of the property. Mr. Bevens explained he would tear down the existing building and construct a strip center.

In response to a letter submitted from the property owner immediately to the west concerning flooding, Mr. Gardner noted the creek originally ran through the property to a large extent. However, the creek has been reworked and now forms the western boundary of the subject property and across the southern boundary of the north 2-1/2 acres. The creek runs between the three single-family houses, which are a part of the subject application, and the north 2-1/2 acres. The future zoning potential of the very corner noted by the Staff would allow the type of center suggested by the applicant.

Mr. Bevens informed the Commission he owns the 2-1/2 acres on the corner and was persuaded to join this application with the property owner of the south 3 acres. They believed the Commission would approve a joint application if they could prove there is more than one property owner in the area wanting commercial. Mr. Bevens showed the location of the creek and explained it does not run through the property anymore, but runs to the back end.

Protestants: None.

Instruments Submitted: Letter from Broken Arrow Planning Commission containing protest petition and letter of opposition (Exhibit "A-1") 5.11.83:1455(3)

CZ-79 (continued)

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS on the north 2-1/2 acres of the 5-1/2 acre tract (317' x 343'):

LEGAL DESCRIPTION PER NOTICE

The East 317 feet of the North 343 feet of the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 24, Township 18 North, Range 14 East AND Commencing at the Northeast corner of Section 24, Township 18 North, Range 14 East; thence South 343 feet to the Point of Beginning; thence West 317.5 feet; South 411.59 feet; East 317.5 feet and North 411.59 feet thereof to the Point of Beginning, containing 3 acres, more or less, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION PER PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

The East 317 feet of the North 343 feet of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 24, Township 18 North, Range 14 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Z-5822 Klebs South of the SW corner of 81st Street and Elwood Avenue
AG to IL

A letter was presented from Mr. Robert L. Bainbridge, representing a protestant to this item (Exhibit "B-1") and requesting a continuance until May 25, 1983 or June 8, 1983. Mr. Bainbridge has just recently been retained and additional time is required for preparation.

Mr. Mike McHugh represented the applicant and has no objection to a continuance. He has been in contact with the protestants. Originally, a two week continuance was sought, but Mr. McHugh will be in trial, so is requesting a continuance until June 8.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, T. Young, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue Z-5822 until Wednesday, June 8, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Z-5823 Moskowitz (Arnold) NW corner of 91st Street and Yale Avenue
RS-3, CS to CS

A letter was submitted from Jody R. Westby requesting a continuance of this item due to the death of her father-in-law (Exhibit "C-1"). No date was specified.

Mr. Frank Moskowitz, the applicant, was present and would like to proceed with this item. The protestant's property is not within 300 feet of the subject property. The requested zoning is according to the plan and Mr. Moskowitz does not feel the protestant has a right to protest. He is on a tight schedule.

Commissioner T. Young asked when the letter was written and was told May 10th. Mr. Moskowitz stated the protestant has had 45 days to check on this request and she has never contacted Mr. Moskowitz. The abutting property owner is present to support the application. The protestant could be heard at the City Commission.

Commissioner C. Young felt any property owner has the right to protest, even if their property is not within the 300-foot radius. Even though this letter was not timely there are extenuating circumstances. One week does not seem unreasonable. MOTION was made by C. YOUNG, second by T. YOUNG to continue this item for one week.

Mr. Gardner advised the Commission that Mr. Charles Norman also wished to have his case continued because he is attending the same funeral and he would agree with a one-week continuance. However, he would request an early transmittal of the proceedings after the meeting so the additional week's delay would not interfere in the timing of the project. Mr. Moskowitz agreed an early transmittal would put him back on schedule and could agree to a continuance under that condition.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of Z-5823 until Wednesday, May 18, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center and to approve an early transmittal of the proceedings.

CZ-80 Pilgrim (Tower) SE corner of 191st Street and Garnett Road AG to RE

Mr. Jim Ferris was present for the applicant and requested a continuance. It has been determined there is a small cemetery on the tract and the developer must figure out how to deal with this problem. He requested a continuance until June 8, 1983, in order to solve this matter.

Mr. Greg Robinson, Route #1, Box #288, is interested in this case. He has no objection to the rezoning, but is concerned about the cemetery and would agree with the continuance.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of CZ-80 until Wednesday, June 8, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. Z-5824 Present Zoning: RS-3
Applicant: Tannehill (Hudson) Proposed Zoning: IL
Location: NE corner of 61st Street and Mingo Road

Date of Application: March 30, 1983
Date of Hearing: May 11, 1983
Size of Tract: 1-acre, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Tom Tannehill
Address: 1516 South Yorktown Place - 74120 Phone: 749-4694

Staff Recommendation:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District 1 -- Industrial Development encouraged.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 1-acre in size and located just east of the northeast corner of 61st Street and South Mingo Road. It is non-wooded, flat and contains one single-family dwelling. It is zoned a combination of OL and RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by various industrial uses zoned RS-3 and IL; on the east by a single-family dwelling zoned RS-3; on the south by a mixture of single-family dwellings converted to commercial and industrial uses zoned RS-3 and on the west by a commercial resale store zoned IL.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past zoning actions have established the frontage along 61st Street, both the north and south, to be transitioning to light office and light industrial.

Conclusion -- Based upon the surrounding land uses and existing zoning patterns and the Comprehensive Plan designation, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested IL zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Tom Tannehill was present for the applicant and informed the Commission he has requested a waiver of the platting requirements. This is a small tract and there is an existing structure on the property so easements are in place. Separate easement has been given to the City within the last 30 days for a 40" water line. A waiver would save the applicant the cost and time involved in platting the property. An additional 20 feet would need to be dedicated on 61st Street by separate instrument and the applicant is willing to meet this requirement.

Mr. Gardner explained a request for waiver must be processed through the Technical Advisory Committee and Mr. Wilmoth may be in the process of recommending this waiver. It is not on the agenda today.

Z-5824 (continued)

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned IL:

The West 100 feet of the East 406.6 feet of the South 431 feet of the West-Half of Lot 4, Section 31, Township 19 North, Range 14 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Application No. Z-5825

Present Zoning: RS-3

Applicant: Booker T. Alford

Proposed Zoning: CG or CS

Location: SW corner of 28th Street North and Peoria Avenue

Date of Application: March 30, 1983

Date of Hearing: May 11, 1983

Size of Tract: 115' x 130'

Presentation to TMAPC by: Booker T. Alford

Address: 1313 East Young Street - 74127

Phone: 583-2580

Staff Recommendation:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 2 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity -- No Specific Land Use and potential for Corridor.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the requested CS and CG Districts are not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 115' x 130' and is located at the southeast corner of what would be 28th Street North and Peoria Avenue. It is non-wooded, gently sloping, vacant and zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by vacant land zoned CS and proposed as the access to Gilcrease Expressway; on the east by a single-family neighborhood zoned RS-3; on the south by a single-family dwelling used as an auto repair facility and farther south a single-family neighborhood zoned RS-3 and on the west by a mixture of single-family dwellings and converted commercial activities zoned RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Previous zoning actions in the area have established spot zoning of CS and OL at the intersection of 27th Street North and Peoria Avenue. Other than that, in the area from the intersection of Apache to the intersection of the proposed Gilcrease Expressway along Peoria Avenue, the predominant use is single-family residential.

Conclusion -- Based upon the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding land uses, the Staff cannot support CS or CG zoning on this tract and would recommend DENIAL of either request.

Commissioner T. Young inquired what the Staff recommendation would have been if the application had been for CO zoning. Mr. Gardner explained CO zoning would not be practical on this tract because there is a 200' setback from the center of the street. It is not intended for small lot development. If the area is developed residentially, there is not much potential for CO zoning, unless the surrounding properties were included in the application. Such an instance is not likely to happen.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Booker T. Alford stated the 26 acres to the north is already zoned for commercial. The property to the south contains an existing garage

5.11.83:1455(10)

Z-5825 (continued)

that has been in business for more than 15 years. The property on the corner of 27th Street and Peoria Avenue is already commercial, showing there is already a block of commercially-zoned property.

This property is more suitable for commercial purposes and he would like to obtain the highest and best use, if possible.

Commissioner Gardner asked if there is a business located on the 26 acres to the north. Mr. Alford informed him it is all vacant.

It was determined that the commercial uses were scattered from Mohawk Boulevard to 27th Street North and not concentrated across the street from the subject tract.

Commissioner C. Young stated he has traditionally been opposed to spot zoning, but this area seems to already be "spotted" with commercial. However, he would not like to rezone any property commercial below 27th Street. There is also CH zoning in the area. Mr. Gardner noted a unique situation exists north of Admiral on both Peoria and Cincinnati because there are a lot of abandoned businesses. The best land use on these streets are the houses that are still there and maintained. A balance is needed so these houses are not affected.

Commissioner C. Young made a motion to approve CS on the basis the expressway is proposed, there is some commercial zoning to the south and across the street and a residence would not be desirable next to the expressway when it is built. Motion was seconded by Commissioner Higgins.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS:

Lots 1 and 2, Block 1, Winstead Addition, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Z-5826 Tannehill (Fail) NE corner of East 31st Street and 161st East Avenue
AG to CS, RM-0 and RS-3

Mr. Tom Tannehill was present, representing Mr. Never Fail. He is requesting a continuance in order to readvertise the entire property, which would take about four weeks. Mr. Gardner advised the earliest date possible would be June 8, 1983. Mr. Tannehill agreed. There were no other interested parties present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of Z-5826 until Wednesday, June 8, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. Z-5827
Applicant: Hogue (Akdar Temple Association)
Location: 20 East 21st Street

Present Zoning: RM-2
Proposed Zoning: OM

Date of Application: March 31, 1983
Date of Hearing: May 11, 1983
Size of Tract: 231.18' x 147.50'

Presentation to TMAPC by: James Hogue
Address: c/o Houston & Klein, Inc., P.O. Box 2967 - Phone: 583-2131
74101

Staff Recommendation

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 7 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity -- Office.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 231.18' x 147.50' in size and located just west of the southwest corner of Boston Avenue and 21st Street South. It is non-wooded and contains a parking lot for the Shrine Temple which is adjacent to the tract on the east and is zoned RM-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by Boulder Park zoned RM-2; on the east by the Shriner's Temple zoned RM-2; on the south by a single-family dwelling zoned RS-2 and on the west by an office structure zoned OM.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Previous zoning applications have established the frontage along 21st Street, both north and south, to be developed as office uses, either light office or medium office. The Board of Adjustment actions have allowed the Shriner's Temple, adjacent to the property, to expand and to allow the Shriner's Association to use the subject tract as a parking lot.

Conclusion -- Given the Comprehensive Plan designation, the surrounding land uses and existing zoning patterns, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested OM zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. James Hogue was present on behalf of the Akdar Shriner's Association. The requested OM zoning is in accordance with the Master Plan and is in conformance with the existing uses in the area. The Shriner's main concern is parking for their members. This zoning was requested in order to consider potential construction for a parking facility and using the existing building for offices. The Shrine is reaching the limit of what can be provided in the Temple building. There are no specific plans at this time.

Application No. Z-5827 (continued)

Protestants: Robert S. Boswell Addresses: 11 East 22nd Street
 Bernadine Jones 6 East 22nd Street
 Tom Layon 102 East 22nd Street.

Protestants' Comments:

Mr. Robert Boswell's property is directly behind the subject tract. He is concerned about what is proposed for this tract, mainly because he has two small children. He is also concerned about parking because of the residential homes and would like to see what the plans are. Mr. Boswell's home was purchased from the original owner, who had also sold the subject property to the Shriners with an agreement this be used for a parking lot and that no lights be installed higher than the fence, as well as no structure higher than this. Privacy would be a problem if a high structure is built. The agreement was verbal. It was also agreed the fence would be installed, as it has been. However, a Shriner's logo was placed on the back of the fence, which was not in the agreement.

Ms. Bernadine Jones understands that the Shriners and the Junior Chamber of Commerce operates under the grandfather clause. The rest of the area is residential. If this zoning is approved, the Commission would have to approve other office zonings. She does not wish to have businesses encroaching into this residential district.

Mr. Tom Layon owns property on the southeast corner of 22nd Street and Boston Avenue. A single-family residence exists on this property. The statements made by the previous protestant applies to his area of concern. The zoning in this area was discussed during the last Mapleridge Board of Directors meeting, of which Mr. Layon is a member, and they wish to protest this rezoning. The Association would request the office zoning be confined to the area west of Main Street. They are afraid this rezoning would cause a domino effect.

Commissioner T. Young pointed out that Mr. Layon is not in a single-family residentially zoned area and Mr. Layon was aware of this fact.

Commissioner C. Young pointed out the numerous higher intensity uses in the area. The Shriners evidently received permission from the Board of Adjustment for their site to be used in this manner. Commissioner C. Young suggested this be sent to the BOA or a small strip of RS-2 could be placed down the west boundary so traffic could not enter onto Main Street, only 21st Street.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Hogue explained the Temple building is under a variance and has been grandfathered for over 20 years. Commissioner C. Young noted the variance was approved because the building was a hospital at one time. The traffic is already heavy on 21st Street.

At the present time, the Shriners have about 3,000 members and parking is by far inadequate. The Jaycees need parking for their members, also. Parking is their primary concern. This request is compatible with other properties in the area and is in accordance with the Master Plan.

Chairman Kempe asked why the request was not for parking zoning and it is Mr. Hogue's understanding that OM would give him the most options of putting in a parking facility that would be most amiable for their needs. Mr.

Application No. Z-5827 (continued)

Gardner advised this would be a parking garage, not a parking lot. This would have to be at least a 2-story parking garage.

Commissioner T. Young did not feel there would a cost benefit in a two-story parking garage to support the Akdar Shrine Temple. There must be other uses. Mr. Hogue explained the Jaycees are faced with the same problem and the loss of all their parking facilities with the potential changes in the street. This would probably be a joint operation.

Commissioner Draughon felt the applicant had answered the protestants' question about what will be built and he felt it would be to the resident's advantage to have the cars off the streets.

Mr. Gardner, in answer to Commissioner C. Young's suggestion, did not think it advisable to deny access to Main Street. This would force traffic to wind through the neighborhood.

Commissioner T. Young wondered if an exception could be granted for a two-story parking garage in an RM-2 zoning district. Mr. Gardner answered in the negative. The Board would have to grant a variance to build a multi-story parking garage and it would have to be based on a hardship. OM is the most restrictive multistory category available.

Commissioner T. Young noted the property to the south recently purchased by the Jaycees is for residential use at this time in order to house the U. S. Jaycee president. This could change in the future, which is the reason he is concerned about the OM request. The area has a number of older, established homes. The high intensity zoning in place does not relate to the uses in many cases. The OM would give the applicants an opportunity to do more than build a parking garage. He does not see enough parking demand to cause a financial or economic feasibility to building a multistory parking lot. This has to be paid for some way. Commissioner Draughon pointed out the Shriners will pay for this, not the taxpayers. Commissioner T. Young felt this request is merely speculative and did not feel the property would be used for parking after the cost of building a parking garage was determined. If the parking garage is the intended use, he suggested the Commission consider P zoning.

Mr. Gardner explained there is a provision in the Zoning Code that if property abuts commercial, office or industrial, parking can be approved through the BOA. This property is zoned medium intensity and parking is a very low intensity. A P zoning would be taking away from the existing zoning. A PUD could be filed to obtain a parking garage.

Commissioner Higgins noted the office zoning in the area and stated she would prefer an office building instead of a large parking garage with loud cars and lights. She agreed this request is appropriate and MOVED the application be approved.

MOTION was seconded by Commissioner Draughon.

Special Discussion for the Record:

Chairman Kempe recognized that many of the existing uses are not what the zoning is in this area. There is still a lot of residential. She would prefer to see a specific plan from the Akdar Shrine as to the proposed uses, which would require a PUD.

Application No. Z-5827 (continued)

In answer to Mr. Draughon's query, Mr. Gardner explained that Board of Adjustment approval would probably be necessary because of the setbacks. A one-story building could be built 10 feet away from the south property line under OM zoning. These narrow pieces of property are almost undevelopable unless an application is filed with the BOA. There has been a change in the Ordinance where RM-2 can equate to OM, so under a PUD on the subject property, a parking garage could be built with the existing zoning. This solution is not used very often. The Commission would be better off to leave the zoning in its present classification. Otherwise, square-footage would be taken away.

Commissioner T. Young made a substitute MOTION to deny the application. Commissioner C. Young seconded the motion and wondered what restrictions could be placed in a PUD. Mr. Gardner advised landscaping, signs, setbacks and height could be controlled.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On SUBSTITUTE MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-1-0 (Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; Draughon "nay"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to DENY the requested OM zoning on the following described property:

Lots Four, Five, Six and Seven, Block Two, Third Amended Plat of Riverside Drive Addition to Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof.

PUD #321 Norman (Rhodessa Development Company) North and West of East 91st Street and South Yale Avenue (RD)

A letter was submitted from Jody R. Westby requesting continuance of this item (see Z-5823).

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of PUD #321 until Wednesday, May 18, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center and to approve an early transmittal of the proceedings.

CZ-81 Sylvester SE corner of Coyote Trail and U.S. Highway #51 AG to CG and RS

AND

PUD #322 Sylvester SE corner of Coyote Trail and U. S. Highway #51 (AG)

A letter was presented from Mr. Mack Sylvester, requesting a continuance of these items to June 15, 1983 (Exhibit "D-1"). This request was timely.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Hinkle, Kempe, T. Young, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Higgins, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of CZ-81 and PUD #322 until Wednesday, June 15, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. PUD #323

Present Zoning: (RE)

Applicant: Anderson

Location: South of Coyote Trail, between 241st and 257th West Avenues

Date of Application: March 31, 1983

Date of Hearing: May 11, 1983

Size of Tract: 12.2894 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: David Anderson

Address: Route 2, Box 410 - Sand Springs - 74063 Phone: 1-363-7674

Staff Recommendation:

Planned Unit Development No. 323 is located 1/4 mile west of the southwest corner of Coyote Trail and Dip Creek Road. It is approximately 12 acres in size, partially wooded and zoned RE. The applicant is now requesting PUD Supplemental zoning to allow 20 mobile home units be placed on the subject tract.

The Staff has some concern about the accessibility that each lot has for locating a mobile home unit on it; however, we have made a revised Site Plan based upon the applicant's submission. Given this revised Site Plan and the Text provided, the Staff can recommend APPROVAL of PUD #323, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant's revised Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval as being representative of the proposed development.

- 2) Development Standards:

Area:	12.289 acres
Permitted Uses:	Mobile Home Dwellings and Accessory Uses on; Block 1, Lots 1 thru 12; Block 1, Lots 14 thru 18; and Block 2, Lots 1 thru 3.

Lot 13, Block 1 is reserved for open space, garden area, recreation, possible future rural fire station uses.

Maximum No. of Units:	20 units
Minimum Livability Area per Mobile Home Space:	12,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	2 paved spaces per unit
Maximum Building Height:	1-story
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
From centerline of Coyote Trail;	85 feet
from private drive;	20 feet
rear yard.	10 feet
Separation Between Units:	25 feet
one side yard;	5 feet
other side yard.	20 feet

- 3) That internal streets shall be 24 feet in width and paved with an all-weather dust-free surface.
- 4) That all mobile home units shall be completely skirted with materials that are architecturally compatible with the unit

PUD #323 (continued)

- being skirted and installed in a manner that the unit appears to be placed on-grade.
- 5) That tie-down facilities shall be incorporated into concrete anchors so that guy lines can be installed under each mobile home at sufficient intervals to prevent upheaval of the unit during strong winds and storms.
 - 6) That common park/recreational facilities (which may include trails, playgrounds, community buildings and tot-lots) shall be provided. The area of these facilities shall not be less than 6% of the gross area of tract and located within Lot 13, Block 1.
 - 7) That the mobile home space shall have a minimum of 100 square feet of paved outdoor living area (patio).
 - 8) That each mobile home space shall have an enclosed storage accessory building to not less than 36 square feet, but no greater than 100 square feet.
 - 9) That one sign, not to exceed four feet in height, eight feet in length and 24 square feet in display surface area may be located along the north perimeter between the entrances to the park.
 - 10) That a Detail Site Plan, including space and unit configuration and street alignments shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC, prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 - 11) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied, including the incorporation within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the County of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. David Anderson submitted a drawing of his proposed project (Exhibit "E-1"), as well as copies of his application, back-up material and soil reports from the Health Department (Exhibit "E-2").

Mr. Anderson explained he purchased 94 acres and would like to put a trailer park on a portion of this acreage. He has cleaned up the prior patches and scrub oak trees. He feels the drawing submitted is the most feasible way to place the trailers and build this park. The terrain is difficult to work with. The drawing displayed by the Staff is new to him and he needs to study it. He does not plan on having trailers going in and out frequently. There are already some existing trailer spaces. Chain link fence has been installed in such a way that the fence can be pulled up in order to get trailers in and out.

Commissioner T. Young explained the Staff drawing would not affect the three existing trailer spaces. The Staff drawing will allow the same number of lots, but will have access onto an interior road, which would reduce the number of turns on Coyote Trail. This will help with the traffic.

Mr. Gardner explained that this is the ultimate design. The applicant has been out of touch. The Staff will be glad to work with him, but the design

PUD #323 (continued)

submitted is difficult and does not seem to fit the existing physical features. If the Commission wishes to continue this for one week, the Staff could field check the site and try to work with the applicant. Mr. Anderson assured the Commission he could be very flexible on the drawings and would appreciate any time the Staff could devote to his application.

Commissioner C. Young felt the applicant should have the time to study the Staff's recommendation. Within a week, a compromise might be reached.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of PUD #323 until May 18, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. Z-5829 and PUD #324 Present Zoning: RS-2
Applicant: Fletcher (Smith, Wickersham, McQuaig) Proposed Zoning: RM-T
Location: SE corner of 62nd Street and South Trenton Avenue

Date of Application: March 31, 1983
Date of Hearing: May 11, 1983
Size of Tract: 3 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Dennis Fletcher
Address: 1732 West Xyler Avenue - 74127 Phone: 582-7075

Staff Recommendation: Z-5829:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity -- Residential.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 3 acres in size and located south and west of the intersection of 62nd Street and South Trenton Avenue. It is non-wooded, flat and contains one single-family dwelling zoned RS-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2; on the northeast by duplexes zoned RS-3; on the east by single-family dwellings zoned a combination of RS-3 and RD; on the south by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2 and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past zoning actions have established that the area is transitioning from RS-2 District to a mixture of RS-3, RS-3 duplex exception, and RD zoning districts.

Conclusion -- Based upon the Comprehensive Plan designation, the surrounding land uses and the existing zoning patterns, the Staff cannot support the RM-T zoning. However, we would recommend APPROVAL of RD zoning.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #324

Planned Unit Development No. 324 is located south and east of the intersection of 62nd Street and South Trenton Avenue. It is approximately 3 acres in size, contains one single-family residence and has a Staff recommendation for RD zoning. The applicant is now requesting PUD Supplemental zoning to allow one detached and 27 attached single-family dwellings.

The Staff has reviewed the Outline Development Plan and has some concern about the availability of the livability space to all the units. The Code states that "Common Livability space shall be designed and located so as to be accessible to the dwelling units it is intended to serve". As designed, the screening fence separating Development Area "A" from Development Area "B" also separates the majority of the units from the area most likely to serve as a play or recreation area. However, we find that with

PUD #324 (continued)

revisions, the proposal is: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; (4) designed in a manner that provides proper accessibility, circulation and functional relationships of uses; and (5) is consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #324, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval.
- (2) Development Standards:

Development Area "A"

Net Area:	0.45 acre
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within RS-3 and open space recreational uses, i.e. pool, tennis courts, etc.
Maximum No. of Units:	1 existing unit
Maximum Height:	35 feet
Minimum Livability Space per Dwelling Unit:	2,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Setback from S. Trenton Avenue property line:	25 feet
Minimum Rear Yard:*	20 feet
Minimum Side Yard	5 feet
Off-Street Parking	2 spaces

*There is an existing workshop building within the 20-foot rear yard which may remain.

Development Area "B"

Net Area:	2.39 acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within an RM-T Residential Townhouse District
Maximum No. of Units:	27 units
Maximum Height:	35 feet
Minimum Land Area per Unit:	3,600 sq. ft.
Minimum Livability Space per Unit	2,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Setback from property lines adjacent to streets	10 feet - Ends of Buildings 25 feet - Backs and Fronts of Buildings
Minimum Side Yards:	5 feet - Ends of Buildings
Minimum Rear Yard:	20 feet
Minimum Setback from adjoining residential property:	10 feet - Ends of Buildings 25 feet - Fronts and Backs of Buildings & Garages
Minimum Off-Street Parking	2 Spaces/Unit

5.11.83:1455(21)

Application No. Z-5829 and PUD #324 Present Zoning: RS-2
Applicant: Fletcher (Smith, Wickersham, McQuaig) Proposed Zoning: RM-T
Location: SE corner of 62nd Street and South Trenton Avenue

Date of Application: March 31, 1983
Date of Hearing: May 11, 1983
Size of Tract: 3 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Dennis Fletcher
Address: 1732 West Xyler Avenue - 74127 Phone: 582-7075

Staff Recommendation: Z-5829:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity -- Residential.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 3 acres in size and located south and west of the intersection of 62nd Street and South Trenton Avenue. It is non-wooded, flat and contains one single-family dwelling zoned RS-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2; on the northeast by duplexes zoned RS-3; on the east by single-family dwellings zoned a combination of RS-3 and RD; on the south by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2 and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past zoning actions have established that the area is transitioning from RS-2 District to a mixture of RS-3, RS-3 duplex exception, and RD zoning districts.

Conclusion -- Based upon the Comprehensive Plan designation, the surrounding land uses and the existing zoning patterns, the Staff cannot support the RM-T zoning. However, we would recommend APPROVAL of RD zoning.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #324

Planned Unit Development No. 324 is located south and east of the intersection of 62nd Street and South Trenton Avenue. It is approximately 3 acres in size, contains one single-family residence and has a Staff recommendation for RD zoning. The applicant is now requesting PUD Supplemental zoning to allow one detached and 27 attached single-family dwellings.

The Staff has reviewed the Outline Development Plan and has some concern about the availability of the livability space to all the units. The Code states that "Common Livability space shall be designed and located so as to be accessible to the dwelling units it is intended to serve". As designed, the screening fence separating Development Area "A" from Development Area "B" also separates the majority of the units from the area most likely to serve as a play or recreation area. However, we find that with

PUD #324 (continued)

revisions, the proposal is: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; (4) designed in a manner that provides proper accessibility, circulation and functional relationships of uses; and (5) is consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #324, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval.
- (2) Development Standards:

Development Area "A"

Net Area:	0.45 acre
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within RS-3 and open space recreational uses, i.e. pool, tennis courts, etc.
Maximum No. of Units:	1 existing unit
Maximum Height:	35 feet
Minimum Livability Space per Dwelling Unit:	2,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Setback from S. Trenton Avenue property line:	25 feet
Minimum Rear Yard:*	20 feet
Minimum Side Yard	5 feet
Off-Street Parking	2 spaces

*There is an existing workshop building within the 20-foot rear yard which may remain.

Development Area "B"

Net Area:	2.39 acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within an RM-T Residential Townhouse District
Maximum No. of Units:	27 units
Maximum Height:	35 feet
Minimum Land Area per Unit:	3,600 sq. ft.
Minimum Livability Space per Unit	2,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Setback from property lines adjacent to streets	10 feet - Ends of Buildings 25 feet - Backs and Fronts of Buildings
Minimum Side Yards:	5 feet - Ends of Buildings
Minimum Rear Yard:	20 feet
Minimum Setback from adjoining residential property:	10 feet - Ends of Buildings 25 feet - Fronts and Backs of Buildings & Garages
Minimum Off-Street Parking	2 Spaces/Unit

PUD #324 (continued)

- (3) That one sign may be erected on each street frontage (total of 2). Each sign shall not exceed 32 square feet in surface area, nor 6 feet in height. Illumination, if any, shall be by constant light. Temporary real estate signs shall be permitted.
- (4) That a Homeowner's Association be established to maintain all common paved or open space areas. The owner of the one single-family unit in Development Area "A" shall be a member of this association.
- (5) That a Detail Site Plan for the total project be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, including a redesign of the southwest corner of the project to provide access to common livability space and splitting of the proposed buildings into structures that contain no more than five attached units.
- (6) That a Detail Landscape Plan for the total project be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy of any units in Development Area "B", including landscaped buffer areas and fencing as described in the text and shown on the Development Plan, except for the revisions necessary to meet the redesign requirement of accessible livability space in the southwest corner of the project.
- (7) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Dennis Fletcher informed the Commission that the intent is to place 27 townhouses in this area. It is vacant land at the present time. There are single-family dwellings abutting the property with underlying RD zoning and there are also duplexes.

These townhouses will be two-story with a rear yard and a 2-car garage behind each unit with access off of 62nd Street and one access off Trenton Avenue. He has met with most of the neighbors around this tract and has not met with much resistance. A few people are concerned with various aspects of the project, but he has tried to explain his intent.

The only problem he has with the Staff Recommendation is the condition for breaking the buildings apart to give the feeling of more open space. He feels there is enough off-setting that will develop enough separate character for each of these units that there is not much difference between splitting these up into 5 or 7 units. This will not be like row houses. Each one will be separate and distinct.

He has tried to keep the density down on this project. The maximum density on the entire 3 acres would be approximately 32 units under RD zoning and there are 27 units proposed in addition to the existing home. There is a 10-foot landscape buffer around the entire area, as well as a fence. Access has been limited and there will be no access from a street directly to the garages in the back. There is also a crash gate, which would afford more protection for the home owners.

PUD #324 (continued)

Commissioner C. Young wondered if Development Area "A" would be fenced from the other development area and Mr. Fletcher stated a 6-foot screening fence was planned, but one of the Staff recommendations was to open this.

Commissioner C. Young asked how many RS-3 units could normally be placed on the 3 acres and Mr. Gardner advised under a duplex exception, 27 units could be built. Without a duplex exception, 5 units could be constructed on an acre for a total of approximately 15 on this tract.

<u>Protestants:</u>	Karen Thomas	Addresses:	6135 South Trenton Avenue
	Mark Faries		6212 South Trenton Avenue
	F. C. Cupps		6225 South Trenton Avenue
	David Kroll		6121 South Troost Avenue

Protestants' Comments:

Mrs. Karen Thomas felt 27 units was a lot of units on 3 acres. She was concerned because of the increase in traffic off 61st and off of Trenton; the need for water facilities such as hydrants, since the majority of the properties have wells; and finally, the value of property.

Mr. Mark Faires noted there is no sewer in this area. Runoff is a problem and there are only little ditches on either side of the road. Mason High School installed holding pools because of the drainage. There are already numerous townhouses in the area and this project would be in the middle of existing single-family residential. The streets are narrow and busy. The intersections are also narrow and drops off. He does not feel this will be a benefit to the neighborhood.

Mr. F. C. Cupps has no objections to the plans. However, the concern of the neighborhood is drainage. He requested adequate facilities be provided to take care of the drainage. Mason High School was built 3 or 4 feet above level. He has been assured by the applicant that the PUD requirements would take care of this problem.

Mr. David Kroll owns three duplexes on Troost Avenue. He had discussed this proposal with several of his neighbors and there are several concerns. The main concern again is the floodplain. He has lived in these duplexes for the last 10 years and the water runs over the roads into the yards. The storm sewer seems to be inadequate.

The other concern is the traffic. The streets are narrow and are not curbed. Residents of this project would have to use Troost and there are already 28 families living on Troost within 5 acres. He suggested a lower density on this tract.

Mr. Gardner pointed out the hydrology report contained in the agenda packet. The applicant will be required to furnish a drainage plan and on-site detention. Detention can be accomplished with curbed streets to trap water and the green space.

Commissioner C. Young explained to the protestants that the City benefits with in-fill development such as this because roads do not have to be built and more utility lines do not have to be built. The existing duplex development added more intensity when it was built. The drainage problem is serious and has to be handled. If it is not, the development will not

PUD #324 (continued)

be built. More water cannot run off this property than runs off now. This is up to the hydrologist.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Fletcher felt there would be some resistance to this development. This property is vacant and has been cultivated for many years. People like to have the benefit of open space adjacent to their property without having to own it, but something was destined to be done with the property. There is an easement already for the street. It was granted many years ago to develop this area. This easement has been utilized to gain access to the property.

Water and sewer is in place adjacent to the property and he has checked with the Water and Sewer Department and there is adequate sewer disposal to handle this development. There is electric service encircling the property and there is telephone and cable television coming in. It is a minor disturbance to develop the property.

He feels they have adequately addressed the water problem. This will be developed under the PUD requirements and a hydrology engineer will be hired. He cannot solve the drainage problems in the whole area, but will not create any more problems.

Houses in the area range from \$55,000 to \$80,000. These proposed townhouses would sell for \$75,000 to \$80,000 and Mr. Fletcher does not feel this will be a detriment to the area.

Commissioner Higgins asked Mr. Fletcher if he agreed with the Staff recommendation to break up the units. Mr. Fletcher stated he would like to keep the submitted configuration. This was intentionally designed at a lower density and felt by breaking up the fronts of the buildings, it would eliminate the "row" effect and would like to keep the concept as submitted, if possible.

Commissioner T. Young felt this proposal was too many units to place in an RS-2 developed residential area. This is not a classic in-fill because it would require sewer to be installed and would require some improvement to Trenton. The drainage would be a substantial concern. He would be supportive of development on this property, but could not support more than 17 or 18 units. He could not support RD on the entire tract and could not support the PUD as proposed.

Commissioner Higgins was under the impression there was sewer available. Mr. Gardner informed her there is sewer available, but Commissioner T. Young point out it would still have to be brought in.

Mr. Fletcher clarified the situation. The sewer runs along the property but he would have to hook on. No extension would be necessary.

Chairman Kempe asked the Staff if the subject tract were zoned RD in the same pattern as the abutting property, would this cut down on the number of units even with the PUD? Mr. Gardner agreed. The pattern to the east was for townhouses but was never developed. When the market would allow single-family, it was developed as such.

PUD #324 (continued)

Commissioner T. Young wondered if RS-3 would be a consideration under the advertisement. Mr. Gardner stated it could be considered. Commissioner T. Young asked the Staff what sort of zoning pattern would be appropriate if the Commission wanted only 18 units on the tract. Mr. Gardner figured a strip about 50' wide wrapping around the property under application would reduce it to close to the 18 units. The PUD would have to be changed only as far as the number of units. There is no reason he could not meet the minimum setbacks and would probably be greater with more open space.

Commissioner C. Young agreed the 27 units with the existing house might be too many units. He suggested a combination of RS-3 and RD that would allow 21 units, or 20 plus the existing house.

Commissioner Gardner recognized Mr. Fletcher, who explained he is trying to save the existing structure, which is a beautiful, stone home. Initially, this was going to be removed. He would like to save as many units as possible, but another option would be to eliminate the house and open the rest of the tract to spread the units out and keeping the same number of units.

Commissioner T. Young suggested a zoning pattern that would allow 20 units and let the applicant take a week or two to devise a PUD that would accommodate the lesser density.

Commissioner C. Young agreed with 21 units and wanted to know what the rest of the Commission thought. Chairman Kempe could agree with 20 additional units and keep the existing structure. Commissioner T. Young had suggested 20 in case the existing structure is removed. Commissioner Higgins could not agree; she would rather keep the existing structure because it will look better from the street to have the older home. Commissioner Gardner was prepared to support the PUD as submitted, but agreed with the Staff that the units should be broken up so it does not look like "row houses". With the comments made by the residents, he would be willing to go along with the compromise to reduce it to 21 units. Commissioner Hinkle would also like to see a lesser density, mainly because the open space would be needed for recreation to keep the children out of the streets.

Mr. Gardner informed the Commission that the density they are discussing could be accommodated under RS-3 and this would keep it away from an unusual zoning pattern.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present. Z-5829

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RS-3:

The E/2, N/2, W/2, SE/4, NE/4, NW/4, LESS the North and South 25' for Streets, and the S/2, W/2, N/2, W/2 of the SE/4, NE/4, NW/4, LESS the South 25' and West 25' for Streets and the N/2, S/2, W/2 of the SE/4, NE/4, NW/4, LESS the West 25' for Streets ALL in Section 6, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

PUD #324 (continued)

TMAPC Action: 7 members present (PUD #324)

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of PUD #324 until Wednesday, May 25, 1983, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

SUBDIVISIONS:

For Final Approval and Release:

Chimney Hills South, Block 40 Amended (PUD #215) (1483) 91st Street and
South 77th East Avenue (RS-3)

AND

Compton Addition (182) NW corner of 66th Place and South Peoria Avenue.
(CS)

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

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plats for Chimney Hills South, Block 40 Amended and Compton Addition and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #187-7 Danny Dick 7520 East 64th Place, Lot 11, Block 8, Shadow Mountain

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment:

The subject tract is located at 7520 East 64th Place. The applicant is requesting a .9-foot encroachment into the 25-foot setback required from the right-of-way of 64th Place.

The Staff can support this request as being minor in nature and recommends APPROVAL of a 24.1 foot front setback on Lot 11, Block 8, Shadow Mountain, subject to the plot plan.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Draughon, Gardner, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Benjamin, Miller, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to approve this minor amendment for PUD #187, Lot 11, Block 8, Shadow Mountain, subject to the plot plan submitted.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Date Approved

May 25, 1983

Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

Marilyn Hinkle
Secretary

