

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1476
Wednesday, October 5, 1983, 1:30 p.m.
Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Beckstrom Connery Hinkle, Secretary Kempe, Chairman Woodard C. Young, 1st Vice- Chairman T. Young	Draughon Flick Higgins Inhofe	Compton Gardner Lasker Martin Wilmoth	Linker, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, October 4, 1983, at 11:07 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the minutes of September 21, 1983 (No. 1474).

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Kempe reminded the Commission of the Four State Planning Conference to be held October 27-29, 1983, in Tulsa.

Director's Report:

Mr. Lasker stated the Brookside Special Study was researched and prepared by a collaborative effort between the Development Coordination Division and various other Planning Divisions of INCOG.

Mr. Rich Brierre, assistant Director for Regional Planning, presented the Brookside Area Special Study to the Commission and submitted a copy of the findings (Exhibit "A-1") and a copy of the two page Executive Summary of the Study (Exhibit "A-2"). The study came as a result of the Brookside Residential Association's concern for on-street parking in residential areas created by club and restaurant patrons in the Brookside area. The study deals with the magnitude of the parking problem and identifies public and private actions that might alleviate the problem.

The area studied in this instance encompassed 32nd Place on the north, Rockford on the east, 38th Street on the south and Madison on the west.

Director's Report: (continued)

The primary focus centered on the property north of 35th Place, encompassing an approximate 10-block area. The Staff considered the existing zoning patterns in the surrounding area.

Mr. Brierre explained the findings set out in the Executive Summary and then proceeded to discuss the recommendations which are categorized in three groups. The Staff suggested six short-range solutions which could be implemented within 60 days or less, an intermediate range solution which could be implemented within 60 to 90 days and two possible long-range solutions which could be implemented within 3 to 6 months.

The Staff recommended that the Report be forwarded to the City and County Commission and refer it to the Rules and Regulations and Comprehensive Plan Committee. Mr. Brierre also suggested that the two Committees meet on Wednesday, October 12, 1983, prior to that meeting and to refer the Report to the Greater Tulsa Council and then set a public hearing date for October 19, 1983, for public input relating to the Plan and recommendations which have been made.

Commissioner C. Young commended the Staff's work on the Brookside Area Study. He requested that the Staff consider the possibility of blocking off 34th Street, between Peoria and Rockford Avenues on the east and 35th Street and 35th Place as was done further down on Peoria Ave.

Commissioner T. Young suggested that the concrete median which runs from Brookside Bank south past the Stonehorse shop to 35th Street be removed to allow for diagonal parking on at least one side and maybe both sides of Peoria Avenue.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to receive the Brookside Area Special Study and to set public hearing on the Brookside Area for October 19, 1983 at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheimer Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Chairman Kempe advised there would be a meeting with the Rules and Regulations Committee and Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee at 11:30 a.m., on Wednesday, October 12, 1983.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Preliminary Plat:

Raintree II Amended Addition (PUD #341) (182) SW corner of 66th Place and
South Peoria Avenue (RM-2)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Mike Taylor.

This tract is being processed as a PUD in order to provide phasing and separate lots. There were too many lots being created to accomplish this by lot-split. The overall plan is the same as previously reviewed on Raintree II, except that the buildings are on separate lots. A Detailed Site Plan Review is required in connection with the PUD.

Since the PUD is not scheduled for review by the TMAPC until September 28, 1983, the Staff recommended the T.A.C. review the plat, but not transmit it to the Planning Commission until October 5, 1983.

In discussion, the Staff and T.A.C. recommended that all the language and specific easements be clarified on the face of the plat, particularly mutual access easements and Sections 1.2.1 and 1.3.5 of the covenants.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the preliminary plat of Raintree II Amended Addition, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Preliminary Plat of Raintree II Amended, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of PUD #341 shall be met prior to release of the final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants, or on the face of the plat. Include PUD approval date and references to Sections 1100-1170 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
2. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to, or related to property and/or lot lines. Show 10' building line and easement parallel to 66th Place.
3. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat.
4. Pavement repair within restricted water line easements as a result of water line repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner of the lot(s).
5. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat.

Raintree II Amended Addition (continued)

6. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by the City Commission.
7. Access points shall be approved by the City and/or Traffic Engineer.
8. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Traffic Engineering Department during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of the plat.)
9. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
10. Add the specific PUD requirements which as number of units, livability space, setbacks, parking, etc., in Section II of the covenants.
11. A "letter of assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of the final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6 (5) of the Subdivision Regulations.)
12. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of the final plat.

Gleneagles North Addition (183) West side of South Mingo Road, at East 63rd Street (CO)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Mike Taylor.

The Staff advised that since the Corridor zoning was approved, a site plan review and advertising, etc., is required. The Corridor zoning has much more stringent setbacks and will require waivers. The applicant was advised by the Zoning Staff that a more expeditious way to accomplish the developer's goal was for an RM zoning with Board of Adjustment approval. As of September 29, 1983, the applicant had not filed an application for corridor site plan review. Noon is cut-off date for the November 9th meeting. Therefore, the Staff had no objection to the T.A.C. review of this plat, but it should not be reviewed by the Planning Commission until after the site plan has been reviewed. Therefore, the Staff recommended a continuance at the Planning Commission level to a date no sooner than November 9th, and preferably November 16th, which is a Land Division meeting.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of Gleneagles North Addition until November 16, 1983, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Steeplechase Addition (PUD #337) (2783) 101st Street and South Kingston Ave.
(RS-1)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Gary Howell.

This plat has a sketch plat approval, subject to conditions. A copy of the minutes of August 25, 1983, was provided, with the Staff comments as applicable.

The applicant was requesting preliminary and final approval, but as of September 29, 1983, the City Commission had not reviewed the PUD. It would be premature for final approval until after the City Commission approval.

The Traffic Engineer required "Limits-of-No-Access" provision in the covenants and to be shown on the face of the plat.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the preliminary plat of Steeplechase Addition, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the preliminary plat of Steeplechase Addition, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of PUD #337 shall be met prior to release of the final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants, on the face of the plat. Include PUD approval date and references to Sections 1100-1170 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
2. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with the Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to, or related to property and/or lot lines.
3. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of the final plat.
4. Pavement repair within restricted water line easements as a result of water line repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner of the lot(s).
5. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by the City Commission.
6. Street names shall be approved by the City Engineer. Show on the plat as required and designate "Private".
7. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefore, shall be approved by the City-County Health Department. (Percolation tests required prior to preliminary approval.)
8. The owner or owners shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each

Steeplechase Addition (continued)

- lot: type, size, and general location. (This information is to be included in the restrictive covenants.)
9. A Corporation Commission letter (or Certificate of Nondevelopment) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before the plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on the plat on any wells not officially plugged.)
 10. The Zoning Application (Z-5876) shall be approved before final plat is released, or if not approved for RS-1, a revised plan(s) should be submitted conforming to the applicable zone.
 11. Show "9 lots, 6.030 Acres" on the face of the plat near the location map. Identify the 50' x 50' area in 101st Street as "Roadway Dedication". Identify adjacent land as "unplatted".
 12. A "letter of assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to the release of the final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6 (5) of the Subdivision Regulations.)
 13. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of the final plat.

REQUEST TO WAIVE PLAT:

Z-3647 Terrace Drive Addition (793) SW corner of 13th Street and South Lewis Avenue (CS)

This is a request to waive a plat on Lot 1, Block 10 of the above named plat. The property contains two buildings and a garage that are to be retained and used for offices or commercial. Additional parking will be provided to meet the Zoning Code and a plot plan has been submitted for review. It should be noted that most of this block was rezoned in 1970, but due to the many individual owners and already platted lots, it has not been assembled into one development. Lot 14 to the south of this request was reviewed by the T.A.C. in August 1977, and a waiver of plat granted. (Use proposed was a billboard.) This current request would also result in a request to waive the Subdivision Regulations requiring conformance with the Major Street Plan, since only 30' of right-of-way exists at one point, from the centerline of South Lewis Avenue. A greater amount of right-of-way exists both to the south and around the curve into 13th Street. If additional right-of-way was required at the narrowest point, the 50' from the centerline requirement would go through the existing building about two feet.

The Staff notes that the legal description on the plot plan contains a "split line", but no application was made for a lot-split. (It may have been split prior to Planning Commission jurisdiction.) The east tract would have less than 150' of frontage on an arterial street and would require Board of Adjustment approval, as well as Planning Commission approval. (The applicant advised the Staff later that the lot had been split prior to TMAPC jurisdiction.)

In summary, this request is for waiver of the plat for this one lot. This also involves:

Z-3647 (continued)

- (a) Waiver of the Major Street Plan requirements,
- (b) grading and drainage plans through the permit process. (City Engineer), and
- (c) utility easements and/or extensions if necessary. (Need south 11' as utility easement.)

The applicant was not represented at the T.A.C. meeting, but was present at the Planning Commission meeting.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the waiver of plat on Z-3647, subject to the conditions summarized by the Staff.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the request to waive the platting requirements for Z-3647, subject to the conditions listed above.

Z-5587 Morland Second Addition (2893) North side of East 51st Street at
Richmond Avenue (OMH, OM)

This request is to waive plat on approximately the east 499' of Lot 2. It has been rezoned for offices from its former use as an apartment complex. (Site of Stratford House fire.) The T.A.C. and Staff see no objection, subject to the following:

- (a) Grading and drainage plans through the permit process (on-site detention required),
- (b) change of access points, subject to approval of the Traffic Engineer (vacate existing "mutual access" shown on plat),
- (c) additional utility easements and/or extensions of facilities including easements to total 17½' on north and south and 11' on east and west, and
- (d) applicant reminded to check with Water and Sewer Department to make sure sewer taps from former buildings have been plugged.

The applicant was represented by Mike Taylor.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the waiver of plat on Z-5587, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the request to waive the platting requirements for Z-5587, subject to the conditions outlined by the Staff.

Z-5287 & Z-5861 Conway Park Addition (2193) SW corner of 31st Street and
South Toledo Avenue (OM)

The applicant was represented by James Brackett at the T.A.C. meeting, but was not present at the Planning Commission meeting.

Z-5287 & Z-5861 (continued)

This is a request to waive plat on Lot 1 (Z-5287) and Lot 2 (Z-5861) in Block 5 of the above named plat. The applicant has submitted a plot plan showing the existing buildings and easements. Buildings will remain and be used as offices. The Staff sees no objection to the request as submitted. The Traffic Engineer may require an access control agreement on 31st Street and City Engineer may require grading plans if any grading and drainage is done, through the permit process. In review of the plot plan it was noted that part of the parking area overlapped into 31st Street right-of-way. This was existing parking, but the applicant was advised to determine if a "Reverse Parking Agreement" had ever been approved. Also, additional utility easement on the west was required to total 15'.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the waiver of plat on Z-5287 and Z-5861, subject to the conditions:

- (a) Reverse parking agreement for 31st Street and/or relocate parking all within platted lots; and
- (b) additional utility easement on the west side of the lots.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; T. Young, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the request to waive plat for Z-5287 and Z-5861, subject to the conditions outlined by the Staff.

Z-5880 Yorkshire Estates (2993) 3500 Block of South Yale Avenue
(RS-2 to RM-1 pending)

The Chair, without objection, tabled consideration to waive plat of Z-5880.

CHANGE OF ACCESS:

Briarglen Plaza (2194) East side South 129th East Avenue, South of 31st Street (CS)

The Chair, without objection, tabled consideration of Briarglen Plaza.

Sutherland First Amended (1293) North side of East 21st Street, West of Mingo Road (CS, RS-1)

The purpose of this request is because the main entry to Sutherland Lumber Company was moved east. A mutual access easement was provided parallel to 21st Street and one access point was eliminated, which reduces the total access points from three to two. The Traffic Engineer and Staff recommended approval.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the requested change of access for Sutherland First Amended.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-15953 Chuck Ramsey (1783) East of the SE corner of 81st Place and South
Delaware Avenue (RS-3)

This is a request to split two existing duplexes down the party walls to permit separate ownership of each side. (Lots 3 and 4, Block 2, Southwood Terrace). This is similar to many other duplex splits and the Staff and T.A.C. sees no objection, subject to the conditions.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-15953, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-15953, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Board of Adjustment waiver of bulk and area requirements to permit zero side yards in connection with the lot split, and
- (b) maintenance agreement for commonly owned utilities/access.

L-15955 Ben D. Hufft (414) West of the NW corner of North 145th East Ave.,
and East 122nd Street North (AG)

This is a request to split a 3.2 acre tract into two equal tracts of 1.6 acres each with 110' of width. The Staff sees no objection since there is another tract that has been split across the street that also has 110' of frontage, and even less than the acreage in this proposal. Approval is recommended, subject to the Board of Adjustment approval, Health Department approval of septic systems and any utility easements needed for service.

The applicant was not represented.

(Not a condition for approval, but the applicant is advised that even though his lot split may be approved, this is no guarantee that he can obtain an additional water tap from Washington County Rural Water District #3 until improvements to the system allow more taps.)

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-15955, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; Connery, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-15955, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Board of Adjustment approval, and
- (b) Health Department approval, (including availability of water tap).

L-15956 Toby Powell (3193) NW corner of 55th Place and Quincy Avenue (RS-3)

This is a request to split a duplex on the south-half of Lot 7, Block 6, J. E. NOCHOLS ADDITION. The Board of Adjustment has already approved the split, subject to approval of the TMAPC. (Case #12428 indicated that the approval was for a reduction of lot width from 60' to 47.5' and the actual stem-wall survey indicates one tract would be 44.5' wide. This may require another action or amendment by the Board of Adjustment.) The Staff and T.A.C. sees no objection to the split, subject to maintenance agreement concerning common utilities and granting any utility easements needed for service.

The applicant was not represented.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-15956, subject to the conditions:

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-15956, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Maintenance agreement, and
- (b) west 11' for utility easement.

L-15963 Leon Files (1083) NE corner of 73rd Place and South Darlington Ave.
(RS-3)

This is a request to split an existing duplex on Lot 12, Block 1, Woodcrest Estate to permit separate ownership of each side. The Staff sees no objection, subject to maintenance agreement for common utilities and Board of Adjustment approval of the application.

The applicant was represented by Tom Kivell.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-15963, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-15963, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Maintenance agreement, and
- (b) Board of Adjustment approval.

L-15966 Hathaway Group, Ltd. (3294) East of the SE corner of 51st St.,
and Garnett Road (IL)

This request will create a "flag lot" in the rear of an existing industrial building. The rear lot will have 65' of frontage on 51st Street and covers an existing platted access point so that no change will be necessary. There are existing perimeter utility easements. The Staff sees no objection to the waiver of frontage from 150' to 65' because no additional access will be needed and this is a small platted subdivision between two larger plats. (Engineering Department may require a drainage easement(s) to tie with the platted easements on either side. Approval would be subject to Board of Adjustment and subject to any additional utility

L-15966 (continued)

and/or drainage easements.)

The applicant was not represented.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-15966, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-15966, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Board of Adjustment approval of frontage,
- (b) F.E.M.A. approval required on south tract through the City Engineering Department (regarding flood insurance) and
- (c) additional 2 1/2' utility easement on the east to total 17 1/2'.

L-15973 Wesley Cline (2194) NE corner of 39th Place and South 130th East Avenue (RM-1)

This request is similar to a duplex split, except that the building is a four-plex being split into four separate lots. The westerly lots will be separated from sewer service. Most buildings containing more than two units (duplexes) are separated by a condominium agreement that does not require a lot split or approvals of the City to convert. The lot remains platted as is and the owners are regulated by the "Unit Ownership Act". The Staff would prefer that the applicant use that approach. However, if he does wish to pursue an actual split, he is in effect creating a "townhouse development" in the RM-1 District. The frontages would meet the minimum set forth for a townhouse plat, but since this isn't being replatted as a "townhouse development" Board of Adjustment approval will be required. A sewer main extension may be required, as well as a maintenance agreement for commonly owned utilities. (For the record, it appears that the garage on the west unit encroaches into the utility easement and the building line along 130th East Avenue.)

The applicant was not represented.

Upon further discussion the T.A.C. had no objection to this split.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-15973, subject to the conditions.

Commissioner T. Young had a question on what was being waived and Mr. Wilmoth stated there would be a question if there would be a waiver involved because the applicant is not filing a townhouse plat, but it is just an ordinary lot split. Mr. Gardner advised if it were a townhouse plat the width would meet the requirements. The lots within themselves as individual lots have less frontage than the requirement when not dealing with a townhouse plat. Mr. Linker, Legal Counsel, stated he was unsure if there was a waiver involved because it is an unusual instance.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no

L-15973 (continued)

"abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-15973, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Board of Adjustment approval, and
- (b) maintenance agreement.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION:

L-15936 (2703) Wilford Pryer	L-15991 (2492) U-Tote-Um, Inc.
15952 (2492) Paul Knoxx	15994 (2603) Michael Fine
15972 (1664) Bixby Ranch Estate	*15995 (1293) Gerald Snow
15984 (1283) Great Skate, Inc.	15996 (2383) Standard Brands
15987 (593) Joyce Tawater	15997 (1493) Frontier Investment
15988 (3092) Densil Williams Corp.	15999 (3294) Midway Development Co.
15989 (493) Marlar Cook	*16000 (3093) 21st Investment Co.

Mr. Wilmoth advised all the lot splits are in order, but wanted to point out various facts concerning L-15995 and L-16000 which he also felt were in order. He suggested that two motions be made for the lot split ratification.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") that the approved lot splits listed above with the exception of L-15995 and L-16000 be ratified.

L-15995

Mr. Wilmoth advised this is a corner lot located at 14th Street and 83rd East Avenue.

Mr. Gardner advised this particular lot does not have 30' of frontage on the handle, but as it flares out it does have 30' of frontage. Technically the lot meets the Ordinance since the average width is 100' or more, but the Staff merely wanted to bring this aspect before the Commission's attention.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve Lot Split L-15995.

L-16000

Mr. Wilmoth advised this lot is located at the northwest corner of 51st Street and Lewis Avenue. The lot split is in a C shape and there is no access on 51st Street. The lot contains 150' of frontage on Lewis Avenue and drops back to about 80' and has 180' of frontage on 51st Street.

Mr. Gardner stated the Planning Commission must judge if this lot split meets the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code. The previous lot split was considered by the Board of Adjustment because of the configuration of the split was denied. The Board of Adjustment also denied a variance of the Ordinance dealing with the size of the sign on this piece of property. If the property were vacant the applicant could put the sign on the property as a matter of right.

The Planning Commission recently amended the Zoning Code although the Ordinance has not been published yet to limit vacant unimproved lots to the smaller of outdoor advertising signs. As far as the intent of this Board is concerned it seems the smaller of the two would apply.

This Board has made a decision and the Staff feels they should meet the Code that is being published. It is a question if the lot split meets the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code. Mr. Gardner suggested that the applicant speak to the various issues raised. An additional fact is, the Code requires 150' of frontage on an arterial street, but the property is situated between two arterial streets. Would he be required to have 150' of frontage on both streets or just one?

Commissioner T. Young felt this particular lot split was a hardship situation. Reviewing the flexibility which must be maintained, the Commission must take into consideration the physical facts such as the property is up against Skelly Drive and I-44 is on the north and proposed widening of Lewis and 51st makes this a unique circumstance. Commissioner Young would agree with the Staff's prior approval on the application and felt the spirit and intent of the Code is being followed, given the physical facts of the tract.

Chairman Kempe stated she would like some legal advice concerning the 150' of frontage on an arterial street and Mr. Linker, Legal Counsel, stated he would need more time to research that particular issue. Mr. Linker stated the sign issue was not brought before the Planning Commission, but before the Board of Adjustment as it was basically a different presentation. The Planning Commission has adopted an Ordinance limiting signs on tracts similar to the one in question and if the Planning Commission approves this lot split a condition might be imposed to limit the sign as the proposed ordinance provides.

Commissioner C. Young was in agreement with the legal opinion that the sign be limited to the sign size recently acted upon by the Planning Commission.

Mr. John Moody, attorney, represented Mr. John Bumgardner and Tom Gable, and proceeded to explain the process of this lot split application up to this point. Mr. Moody stated that the lot to the north contains approximately 18,410 square feet and the south tract contains approximately 18,490 square feet which is midway between a 150' x 100' and a 150' x 150' size tract. Mr. Moody felt the subject tract meets the frontage requirements. A reciprocal agreement has been entered into between the parties where they will be using only the existing curb cuts with the reciprocal easement and will not be using additional curb cuts. The sign issue will be complied with by Mr. Bumgardner, the owner of the tract.

There was limited discussion whether the dry cleaners and convenience store presently located on the tract would remain. Mr. Moody stated the applicant does not intend to remove the cleaners. Mr. Gardner stated if there is an improved building on the lot being split-off, the sign issue does not come up unless the applicant is willing to tear the structure down. He stated if the sign is at the handle on the north lot the sign issue should not be a part of this discussion, unless he is willing to tear it down. Mr. Moody quickly calculated the figures and it appears the building is within the area of the second lot split, so there would be an improved building on the property.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to approve L-16000.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application Nos. Z-5878 and PUD 338 Present Zoning: CS, RS-3, OL and P
Applicant: Norman (St. John Medical Proposed Zoning: OH
Center)
Location: NE corner of East 21st Street and South Utica Avenue

Date of Application: August 4, 1983
Date of Hearing: October 5, 1983
Size of Tract: 10.87 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Norman
Address: 909 Kennedy Building Phone: 583-7571

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-5878

The District 6 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District-- Low Intensity.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 10.87 acres in size and located at the NE corner of 21st Street and South Utica Ave. It is zoned RS-3 and contains St. John Medical Center.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by a mixture of office, hospital, and residential uses zoned OM and RS-3, on the east by a mixture of commercial, hospital, and residential uses zoned CS, OL and RS-3, on the south by Utica Square Shopping Center zoned CH and on the west by multi-story higher intensity office use zoned CH.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past BOA actions have allowed the St. John Medical Center within RS-3 zoning. Past zoning actions have allowed the intersection to develop as high intensity commercial and office uses.

Conclusion -- Based on the tract's designation as a "may-be-found", the Staff reviewed the surrounding area for land uses or zoning patterns that would support the requested OH zoning. Abutting the subject tract on the south and west are large tracts of CH zoning which might be used to support the request, but neither area is developed as high intensity commercial. However, the tract to the west is developing at an intensity equal to OH, even though it is zoned CH. Because of this, the Staff can support OH on the subject tract only to the extent that it exists on the tract to the west.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of OH on the south 394.5 feet of the west 577.5 feet and OM on the remainder. The application does not include the existing CS area.

PUD #338 and Z-5878 (continued)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: (PUD #338)

Planned Unit Development No. 338 is located at the northeast corner of 21st Street and South Utica Avenue. It is approximately 17 acres in size and with approval of the Staff's Recommendation for Zoning Case Z-5878, would have an underlying zoning of RS-3, OL, OM and OH.

The purpose of the current rezoning and Planned Unit Development application is to present for the first time a consolidated land use plan which includes the existing and previously approved facilities and the proposed additional elements of St. John Medical Center. To provide additional facilities for prevention, rehabilitation, educational services and ambulatory patient care, St. John Hospital's purpose is to construct a Medical Center Support Building on the northeast corner of 19th Street and Victor Avenue in the near future, then additional floor area will be added to the main building later.

The Staff reviewed the proposal and find that it 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, and (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #338, subject to the following conditions:

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

Development Zone "A" Standards:

1. Land Area
 - a. Net 431,328 sq. ft. (9.9 acres)
 - b. Gross 512,985 sq. ft. (11.8 acres)
2. Permitted Uses Hospital and Related Uses,
Office and Commercial
3. Maximum Building Area
 - a. Hospital 1,795,122 sq. ft.
 - b. Commercial 19,460 sq. ft.
4. Maximum Building Height
 - a. North-Half 175 feet
 - b. South-Half 200 feet
5. Building Setbacks None
6. Off-Street Parking Requirements
 - a. Hospital 1/bed*
 - b. Commercial 1/225 sq. ft.*
7. Open Space** 15 %

*Required off-street parking may be located in either Zone "A, B, or C".

**Includes landscape areas, plazas and pedestrianways, but does not include buildings, parking or driveways.

PUD #338 (continued)

Development Zone "B" Standards:

1. Land Area
 - a. Net 92,400 sq. ft. (2.12 acres)
 - b. Gross 119,790 sq. ft. (2.75 acres)
2. Permitted Uses Medical Offices, Clinics, Laboratories, Education, Preventive and Conference Facilities, Outpatient Rehabilitation Facilities, Parking and Customarily Related Facilities.
3. Maximum Building Area 115,000 sq. ft.
4. Maximum Building Height 65 feet
5. Building Setbacks
 - a. From centerline of Victor Ave. 25 feet
 - b. From centerline of E. 19th St. 30 feet
 - c. From centerline of Wheeling Av. 188 feet
 - d. From north boundary 100 feet
6. Off-Street Parking Requirements 1/250 sq. ft.*
7. Open Space** 15 %

*Required off-street parking may be located in either Zone "A, B, or C".

**Includes landscaped areas, plazas and pedestrianways, but does not include buildings, parking or driveways.

Development Zone "C" Standards:

1. Land Area
 - a. Net 60,100 sq. ft. (1.38 acre)
 - b. Gross 82,982 sq. ft. (1.9 acre)
2. Permitted Uses Parking
3. Maximum Building Area As permitted in the Parking District.
4. Maximum Building Height As permitted in the Parking District.
5. Building Setbacks As required in the Parking District.
6. Open Space* 10%

*Includes landscaped areas, plazas and pedestrianways, but does not include buildings, parking or driveways.

Development Zone "D" Standards:

1. Land Area
 - a. Net 15,800 sq. ft. (.36 acre)
 - b. Gross 23,920 sq. ft. (.55 acre)
2. Permitted Uses Two single-family dwelling units.
10.5.83:1476(16)

PUD #338 (continued)

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 3. Maximum Building Area | As permitted in the RS-3 District. |
| 4. Maximum Building Height | As permitted in the RS-3 District. |
| 5. Building Setbacks | As required in the RS-3 District. |
- (3) That signage design and location shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to installation.
- (4) That a Detail Site Plan, by Development Zone, be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a building permit, including final circulation plans.
- (5) That a Detail Landscape Plan, by Development Zone, be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy. This plan shall be not less than that shown in the Outline Development Plan.
- (6) 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. Gardner advised that Mr. Norman spoke to the Staff concerning the possibility of having two cul-de-sac streets running north and south immediately north of Area "A" and on either side of Area "B". It was also requested that 19th Street be made into a cul-de-sac. The Staff has processed all the necessary material through the Traffic Engineering and City Engineer Department who has not objection to the two north/south streets, but would have objection to closing 19th Street which serves as an east/west collector street. The Staff would agree with the Traffic Engineering Department. Mr. Gardner stated the two north/south streets could not be closed as recommended without the property owners' support. If it is completed the overall Master Plan would be improved. It helps identify where the hospital starts and stops and where the neighborhood starts and stops. The Staff feels there are major advantages of cul-de-sacing the two north/south streets, but feel the east/west street is needed for both internal and through circulation.

Commissioner Carl Young read a letter submitted from the District 6 Steering Committee who took no action on this application (Exhibit "B-1"). There were several concerns addressed in the letter.

Charles Norman, attorney, represented St. John Medical Center. A PUD Development Text was submitted (Exhibit "B-2"). The subject tract consists of approximately 10 acres and contains approximately 9,000 sq. ft. of buildings not including two parking garages. There is presently CH zoning

on two sides of the tract, along the west side of Utica and the south side of 21st Street. The application is for OH on this entire corner, but he would propose that approximately 1/2 of the property be zoned OH and the remainder to be zoned OM. St. John Medical Center does not have any plans in the foreseeable future for further development within the superblock, but might be eliminating the parking garage on 21st and changes might occur to the retail area on 21st Street. If expansion is undertaken the hospital facility would contemplate duplicating the tower or enlarging it to the south.

Development Area "A" deals with the extreme long-range future because no plans for expansion of the bedcare facility is planned at this location. With respect to the zoning pattern, Mr. Norman was in concurrence with the Staff Recommendation. He requested that there be no height restriction right at the corner because it is isolated from any area by existing development. The Staff has recommended that it be limited to 200' in height and the applicant would have no objection, but if some time in the future a plan is developed for a tower in excess of 200', the applicant would wish the Commission to consider that restriction.

Development Area "A" is a means to confirm and validate what is already in place and to permit future expansions of hospital care facility within that block.

Development Area "B" is the location of the existing child care facility which is being moved to a location at the corner of 17th and Utica by a recent approval of the Board of Adjustment. This area will be the site for the proposed hospital support service building and the uses will be limited to those stated in the PUD Text. There are no changes proposed for Development Area "C and D". The purpose for including these Areas in the PUD was to present to the Commission an overall development plan for the Medical Center Complex.

As a part of this overall Development Plan a study was undertaken concerning the traffic conditions in the area. PUD Exhibit "E" indicates the traffic movements presently possible in the vicinity of the Medical Center. In 1979 the District 6 Planning Team suggested that a study be done to analyze the potential of isolating the medical area to some degree, from the surrounding residential areas. The Study has been made and the proposal suggested was that three streets be closed, 19th, Wheeling and Victor. The cul-de-sacs would be constructed entirely on property owned by the Medical Center. Nineteenth Street is a through street from Utica to 21st Street and represents a collector street. There has been a lot of objection in the past of traffic on 19th Street both east and west of Utica. In order to close one or all three of the streets as proposed, a petition signed by 100% of the owners of abutting property from 19th Street to the next intervening street which is 17th Place on both Victor and Wheeling, would be required. If the PUD is approved the petition will be circulated in an attempt to close the three streets and would then be brought before the City Commission. St. John Medical Center would pay the cost of installing the cul-de-sacs.

Mr. Norman briefly went over the development in Area "B", which would occur first. He described the building setbacks and that there will

PUD #338 & Z-5878 (continued)

be a one-story basement level and 5 stories above ground. The basement level is necessary to make a connection for the north tower for patients in wheel chairs. There will also be some enclosed people bridges between buildings and above the street.

The proposed landscaping plan is very attractive and would be an asset to the property with a 6' high screening fence on the north and 3 1/2' wall on the street side.

Protestants: Dorothy O'Donovan Address: 1755 South Victor Avenue.

Protestant's Comments:

Mrs. O'Donovan stated her property is the north boundary of Development Area "B". Mrs. O'Donovan was concerned about the cul-de-sac on Victor and questioned when it would be constructed. She also raised a question about lighting on the parking lot behind the support building.

Mr. Norman advised the four property owners on Victor must consent to the proposed cul-de-sac and if that would occur the applicant would recommend that it be closed prior to any new construction in that area. On the west side of Victor there will be landscaping installed. The approval will be contingent upon the City Commission's action.

Mr. Norman advised the parking on the north side is extremely limited. There is no provision in the PUD Text concerning lighting and Mr. Norman suggested that the Commission impose a condition that all lighting in Development Area "B" be directed downward and away from the property to the north. He advised the details of the lighting would be submitted with the Detail Site Plan.

There was limited discussion as to the cul-de-sac on Victor and Mr. Gardner suggested that a condition of approval possibly be that upon completion of the parking garage to the west the cul-de-sac be put in place prior to any construction on the new facility. The Staff would be supportive of closing the two north/south streets, Wheeling and Victor, but are not supportive of closing 19th Street and those closing will be dependent on the City Commission action.

Instruments Submitted: Letter from the District 6 Steering Committee (Exhibit "B-1")
PUD Development Text (Exhibit "B-2")

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned OH on the south 394.5 feet of the west 577.5 feet and OM on the remainder:

Z-5878 LEGAL PER NOTICE:

All of Block 1, except Lots Thirteen, Fourteen, Fifteen, Reddin Third Addition, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof, AND

Z-5878 & PUD #338 (continued)

the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter, Section 7, Township 19 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Z-5878 LEGAL PER PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

OH: The South 424.5' of the West 607.5' of the SW/4 of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of Section 7, Township 19 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma

OM: All of Block 1, except Lots 13, 14, 15, Reddin Third Addition, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof, AND the SW/4 of the SW/4 of the SE/4, Section 7, Township 19 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, LESS and EXCEPT the South 424.5' of the West 607.5', thereof.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present (PUD #338)

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for Planned Unit Development, subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation with a 7th condition added, which requires exterior outdoor lighting plan to be submitted for approval in the Detail Site Plan Review:

PUD #338 LEGAL PER NOTICE:

The Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 7, Township 19 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, AND,

- a. All of Block One, except Lots Thirteen, Fourteen, Fifteen, Reddin Third Addition, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof; and
- b. Lot Seven through Eighteen, Block Three, Edgewood Place Addition, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof; and
- c. Lots One through Five, Block Two and Lots One through Five, Block Three, Reddin Third Addition, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof; and
- d. Lots Thirteen and Fourteen, Block Two, Edgewood Place Addition, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof.

PUD #338 LEGAL PER PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

SAME as Legal Per Notice.

Application No. PUD 253-A

Present Zoning: CS and OL

Applicant: Jonesen (Sanditen Investment, Ltd.)

Location: East of the SE corner of 51st Street and Harvard Avenue

Date of Application: August 18, 1983

Date of Hearing: October 5, 1983

Size of Tract: 2.2 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Roy Johnsen

Address: 324 Main Mall

Phone: 585-5641

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: (PUD #253-A)

Planned Unit Development No. 253-A is located at the southwest corner of 51st Street and South Marion Avenue. It is 2.2 acres in size, zoned a combination of CS and OL, and contains 3 structures. The original PUD #253 was 1.3 acres in size and two structures, this proposal has been expanded westerly to include the third structure and the 2.2 acres. The bases of this proposal is to permit limited retail uses in Building #1 which is now limited to office use.

The Staff reviewed the Outline Development Plan and can support this proposal only with restricted commercial uses and signage and find that with these changes it is (a) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (b) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area; (c) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; and (d) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #253-A, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval.
- (2) That the easterly most suite be restricted to office use.
- (3) Development Standards:

Area (Gross)	2.17 acres
(Net)	1.58 acres

Permitted Uses: Building No. 1 and 2

As included within Use Unit 11 Office and Studios; Use Unit 13 Convenience Goods and Services; Use Unit 14 Shopping Goods and Services, but excluding convenience grocery and restaurant.

Building No. 3

As permitted within a CS Commercial Shopping District, but excluding convenience grocery, and the uses included within Use Unit 16 Gasoline Service Stations.

Maximum Floor Area:

Building No. 1

5,772 sq. ft.

10.5.83:1476(21)

PUD #253-A (continued)

Building No. 2	3,452 sq. ft.
Building No. 3	5,272 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Height:	1-story
Other Development Standards:	As established by PUD #253 and Minor Amendments thereto.

(4) Signs:

Ground Signs:

No more than two (2) ground signs shall be permitted and shall be located at the principal entry on 51st Street.

Display Surface Area;
Maximum per sign. 60 sq. ft.
Height (Maximum) above
grade of abutting St. 6 feet

Wall or Canopy Signs:

Aggregate display surface area not exceeding one and one-half (1 1/2) square feet per each lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed shall be permitted, provided that wall signs for non-office use areas in Building #1 shall be limited to locations on the lower inset fascia of the existing canopy of each building frontage. Signage for the office use on the east portion of Building #1 shall be submitted for review and approval by the TMAPC prior to installation.

- (5) 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. Roy Johnsen submitted ten (10) photographs of the subject tract for the Commission to review (Exhibit "C-1") and briefly explained them and the surrounding area. The original PUD when submitted in February 1981, was designed to give better entry into the Sanditen Complex and to enhance the area. Mr. Johnsen pointed out the original subject property of PUD #253. At the original filing, the principal use sought for Building #2 was for a convenience grocery store. The neighborhood's objection to that use was the hours of operation and other functional aspects, but the use was approved. Building #1 was specifically limited to office use, but since the original approval the project has been constructed and it has been decided not to lease Building #2 as a convenience grocery. Mr. Johnsen added that Buildings #1 and #2 are connected by a breezeway. The landscaping and screening of the property were briefly discussed.

PUD #253-A (continued)

The proposal today is for limited retail use of Building #1 and there would be no increased impact on the neighborhood. There will be no new buildings constructed and no change in the landscaping.

There were some concerns voiced by the neighborhood at a previous meeting which Mr. Johnsen addressed. One concern expressed was drainage and the owner of the property has negotiated with the neighbor most affected. At the outset of the initial proposal concerning the PUD all the drainage from the parking area was to flow between the two buildings then west behind the buildings and finally on south to Joe Creek. The parking area was reshaped and as a result of the change in plans the inlet was never put in, but the principal purpose of the change was to redirect the flow. Mr. Johnsen felt the drainage behind the building could be improved and more dirt could be brought in so the flow will be enhanced. Mrs. Ice, a concerned neighbor, has agreed to have her property graded and filled to help alleviate any drainage problem existent on her property.

Another concern raised by an abutting property owner was one of privacy. Building #2 has no windows and Building #1 has five windows. The applicant has agreed to opaque the windows if it is commercially used or extend the screening fence approximately 18" to provide more privacy to the residential property owners. There is a hedge along the existing screening wall which will allow for privacy if the hedge is maintained.

The applicant had originally requested limited retail use of the entirety of the buildings, but the Staff had suggested that the easternmost suite not be restricted to limited retail office use, but rather limited to office use. He would request that they be permitted the commercial use on that portion.

The way the PUD Text was submitted certain use units were permitted, but excluded convenience grocery and restaurant from Buildings #1 and #2 and did not include the use unit which would permit taverns. That condition would be acceptable to the applicant. Building #3 is presently occupied by a Yogurt store and computer sales and has been excluded from convenience grocery and service station use. The Staff recommended that the easternmost suite which is 27' be restricted to office use. The Staff has recommended permitting Use Unit 11 with the exclusion of copying services, prescription pharmacies, funeral homes and broadcasting and recording studios and the applicant would be in concurrence with those restrictions.

Mr. Johnsen closed his remarks by addressing the sign issue.

Protestants:

Rita Icenogle	Addresses: 5140 South Marion Avenue
Mrs. C. E. Ice	3705 East 51st Place
Minnie Cottingham	3805 East 51st Place

Protestants' Comments:

Mrs. Icenogle stated she was not opposed to the zoning as represented by Mr. Johnsen, but was concerned that Building #1 be limited to daytime hours and that taverns, convenience stores, restaurants be excluded and that the noise level, activities and traffic be addressed by the Commission. She voiced the concerns of the neighborhood concerning drainage

PUD #235-A (continued)

and expressed her concern with the lighting on Building #3 which would affect her property.

Mrs. C. E. Ice addressed the question of drainage and advised she had some water problems on her property, but had been assured that the applicant and engineer have taken care of that problem. She had no other concerns and was supportive of the proposed zoning.

Mrs. Cottingham stated she has no objection to the zoning change, but was concerned with the privacy and drainage problems. She stated she has been assured that those problems will be corrected by the applicant. She stated she would prefer that the screening wall not be extended, but rather opaque the windows.

Discussion ensued concerning the lighting of Building #3 which seemed to have the most negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Johnsen again assured the Commission that the screening wall could be extended and then discussed the landscaping plan. When it is fully mature it will be very substantial and should alleviate any concerns of privacy or lighting.

Instruments Submitted: 10 photographs of the subject property (Exhibit "C-1")

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Flick, Higgins, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for Planned Unit Development, subject to the Staff's Recommendations deleting Condition #2, and to include the following exclusions of Use Unit 11 for Buildings #1 and #2; 1) taverns, 2) liquor stores, 3) copying services, 4) prescription pharmacies, 5) funeral homes, and 6) broadcasting and recording studios; and that the sloping of ground between Buildings #1 and #2 be changed to provide for westerly drainage:

Lot 2, Block 1 of Southern Hills Mall Addition Amended and a tract of land beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 1, Block 1 of Southern Hills Mall Addition Amended; thence South $0^{\circ}-01'-05''$ West a distance of 230'; thence North $89^{\circ}-56'-49''$ West a distance of 160'; thence North $0^{\circ}-01'-05''$ East a distance of 280'; thence South $89^{\circ}-56'-49''$ East a distance of 160'; thence South $0^{\circ}-01'-05''$ West a distance of 50' to the Point of Beginning, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #288-2 - Lot 5, Block 1, Eight Acres

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment

The subject tract is located in a private single-family development consisting of 16 large lots previously containing Holland Hall Middle School.

The applicant is requesting to amend the 25-foot building setback requirement to approximately 18 feet to allow encroachment of the dwelling in the west and north yards. A similar amendment was granted in June of 1983, to allow a 4-foot encroachment into a required rear yard on Lot 6.

After review of the request, the Staff finds the request minor in nature and in substantial compliance with the original PUD Development Standards. Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested amendments, subject to the applicant's submitted site plan becoming part of PUD #288.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Flick, Higgins, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the requested minor amendment to PUD #288-2.

PUD #306

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

The subject tract is approximately 273.5 acres of presently unimproved land located between 91st Street and 101st Street on both sides of South Delaware Avenue, and is approved for a variety of residential, office and commercial uses. The applicant is now requesting some minor amendments to the bulk and area requirements and Detail Site and Landscape Plans Review of Development Areas "A & C", and part of "D" (Phases 1 and 2 of a 3 phase development).

In the initial PUD approval the applicant was unsure of what the exact setbacks and other bulk and area requirements might end up being. Because of this, he requested each area be assigned the most closely related zoning district's bulk and area requirements and that if minor refinement was necessary, it could be handled at the detail review stage of the process.

The Staff has reviewed the submitted Detail Development Standards and find that there is no significant departure from the General Standards approved. Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Development Standards as follows:

DEVELOPMENT AREA "A"

Land Area Summary:

Gross Area (includes 1/2 of adjacent street R/W) 12.66917 acres
91st Street R/W 0.92449 acres

10.5.83:1476(25)

PUD #306 (continued)

Maximum No. of Dwelling Units	262 units
Permitted Uses:	Attached residential dwelling units and related accessory uses such as off-street parking private drives, clubhouses, recreational facilities, including tennis courts and swimming pool and open space areas.
Maximum Building Heights	35 feet
Minimum Building Setbacks	
From College Place and 95th Street R/W	20 feet
From North Lot Line	15 feet
From Lot Line From Development Area "E"	11 feet
Minimum Landscaped Open Space Area per D.U.	600 sq. ft.*
Minimum Parking Requirements	
Enclosed Parking Space per Unit (Garage)	1
Off-Street Parking per Unit**	.5 (1 bedroom unit) 1 (3 bedroom unit)

*Landscaped Open Space area includes landscaped areas, landscaped parking islands, landscaped yards and plazas and pedestrian areas, but does not include parking, buildings or driveway areas.

**Off-Street Parking may include stacking space outside of garage in areas where distance from garage to private street exceeds 18 feet.

In addition, the Staff reviewed the Detail Site Plan for Development Area "D", Phases 1 and 2 and find the following:

DEVELOPMENT AREA "D" - Phase 1

<u>Item</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Submitted</u>
<u>Land Area Summary:</u>		
Gross Area (includes 1/2 of College Place R/W)	9.27 acres	9.27 acres
College Place R/W	0.58 acre	0.58 acre
Net Area	8.69 acres	8.69 acres
Maximum Number of Dwelling Units	196 units	152 units
Permitted Uses:	Attached residential dwelling units and related accessory uses such as off-street parking, private drives, clubhouses, recreational facilities including tennis courts and swimming pool and open space areas.	Same
Maximum Building Heights	35 feet	Same
Minimum Building Setbacks		
From College Place	20 feet	20 feet
From North Boundary Line	15 feet	15 feet
From West Boundary Line	15 feet	15 feet
From South Lot Line	15 feet	15 feet
Minimum Landscaped Open Space Area per D. U.	600 sq. ft.*	Exceeds

PUD #306 (continued)

Minimum Parking Requirements		
Enclosed Parking Space per Unit (Garage)	1	
Off-Street Parking per Unit**	.5 (1 bedroom unit)	
	1 (2 bedroom unit)	Exceeds

*Landsaped Open Space area includes landscaped areas, landscaped parking islands, landscaped yards and plazas and pedestrian areas, but does not include parking, buildings, or driveway areas.

**Off-Street Parking may include stacking space outside of garage in areas where distance from garage to private street exceeds 18 feet.

DEVELOPMENT AREA "D" - Phase 2

Item	Approved	Submitted
<u>Land Area Summary:</u>		
Gross Area (includes 1/2 of College Place and 95th St., R/W)	12.35 acres	12.35 acres
College Place and 95th St. R/W	1.06 acre	1.06 acre
Net Area	11.29 acres	11.29 acres
Maximum No. of Dwelling Units	262 units	228 units
Permitted Uses:	Attached residential dwelling units and related accessory uses such as off-street parking, private drives, clubhouses, recreational facilities, including tennis courts and swimming pool and open space areas.	
		Same
Maximum Building Heights	35 feet	Same
Minimum Building Setbacks		
From College Place and 95th Street R/W	20 feet	20 feet
From North Lot Line	15 feet	15 feet
From Lot Line From Development Area "E"	11 feet	11 feet
Minimum Landsaped Open Space Area per D.U.	600 sq. ft.*	Exceeds
Minimum Parking Requirements		
Enclosed Parking Space per Unit (Garage)	1	
Off-Street Parking per Unit**	.5 (1 bedroom unit)	
	1 (2 bedroom unit)	Exceeds

*Landsaped Open Space area includes landscaped areas, landscaped parking islands, landscaped yards and plazas and pedestrian areas, but does not include parking, buildings or driveway areas.

**Off-Street Parking may include stacking space outside of garage in areas where distance from garage to private street exceeds 18 feet.

PUD #306 (continued)

Based upon the above review, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plans for Phases 1 and 2 of Development Area "D" and we would note that the remaining Phase of Development Area "D" which is south of 95th Street will require a detail set of standards and site plan prior to issuance of a building permit. The maximum number of units in this area should not significantly vary from 177 units.

The Staff would request a one week continuance on the Detail Site Plan Review for Areas "A & C", and the Detail Landscape Plan Review for Areas "A & C" and Phases 1 and 2 of Area "D".

Also, the Staff would note that a major portion of Development Area "D" is within the proposed right-of-way for the Creek Expressway. All parties are aware of this factor and have decided to proceed with their project even though future construction might destroy a large part of the development. This would be the first development of greater intensity than RS-3 to occur within the proposed right-of-way and could become a major stumbling block for future construction.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Flick, Higgins, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Standards for Development Areas "A & C" and Phases I and II of Development Area "D".

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Flick, Higgins, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan for Phases I and II of Development Area "D".

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Flick, Higgins, C. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to continue the Detail Site Plan Review for Development Areas "A and C" and Detail Landscape Plan for Development Areas "A & C" and Phases I and II of Development Area "D".

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Date Approved

October 19, 1983

Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

Marilyn Hinkle
Secretary