

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION  
 MINUTES of Meeting No. 1481  
 Wednesday, November 9, 1983, 1:30 p.m.  
 Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall  
 Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Beckstrom Connery Draughon Flick Hinkle, Secretary Kempe, Chairman Woodard C. Young, 1st Vice- Chairman T. Young	Higgins Inhofe	Compton Gardner Lasker Martin	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, November 8, 1983, at 11:05 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 1:31 p.m.

MINUTES:

Commissioner Draughon advised the Minutes of October 26, 1983, concerning Z-5887 on page 10 should be corrected on the motion. The record should reflect that the vote on Z-5887 was 6-1-0 rather than a 7-0-0 vote.

On MOTION of FLICK, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Kempe, C. Young, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, T. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Minutes of October 26, 1983 (No. 1479) as corrected.

CLARIFICATION OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 19, 1983, AS RELATES TO EXPRESSWAY DELINEATION.

Mr. Gardner advised that the Staff and Legal Department had made a suggestion that the practice of showing the proposed expressway on the location map be continued on the face of the plat. The Staff felt it was the Commission's intention that the delineation be included in the motion, but it was excluded from the actual motion.

The Commission agreed that it was their intent that the practice of showing the delineation on the key map be continued. The Staff informed that a motion is needed to clarify the Planning Commission action on the October 19, 1983, Minutes on page 3. The motion would be modified to retain the delineation on the key map.

Commissioner C. Young, who made the original motion, was in concurrence with the Staff's suggestion and stated that was his intent.

Clarafication of Minutes of October 19, 1983 (continued)

TMAPC Action: 8 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-1 (Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; Beckstrom, "abstaining"; Higgins, T. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to retain the delineation on the location map as it was the intent of the original motion.

REPORTS:

Comprehensive Plan Committee Report:

Commissioner Hinkle, Chairman of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, advised that the Committee met prior to the Planning Commission meeting to discuss Special District #4 which contains the Tulsa County Fairgrounds. The Committee received a draft of the Special Study for their review. There will be a public forum on Monday, November 21, 1983, at 7:00 p.m., in the Education/Cabaret Building to discuss the future plans for the Fairgrounds. A public hearing will be held on Wednesday, November 23, 1983, at 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Director's Report:

Mr. Lasker advised the annual Leadership Retreat sponsored by the Council of Indian Nations Area Chambers, INCOG and Metropolitan Tulsa Chamber of Commerce will be held on Monday, November 21, 1983, at the Camelot Hotel. The theme of the retreat will be "The Future Revisited". It was requested that the forms be submitted to the Staff and the registration fee for the Commission members will be paid by INCOG.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. CZ-97 Present Zoning: AG  
Applicant: Kelley Proposed Zoning: CS  
Location: NW corner of 86th Street North and Highway #75

---

Date of Application: September 22, 1983  
Date of Hearing: November 9, 1983  
Size of Tract: 5.91 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: William R. Kelley  
Address: Route 1, Box 492 - Sperry, Oklahoma Phone: 834-5971

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: CZ-97

The Comprehensive Plan for North Tulsa County designates the subject property Special District 2 (Transitional extension of the Cherokee Industrial District) and Potential Corridor.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 5.91 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of Highway #75 and 86th Street North. It is partially wooded, gently sloping, contains one mobile home and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by vacant land zoned RMH, on the east by Highway #75 (Cherokee Expressway), on the south by what appears to be an illegal or nonconforming office use in a mobile home and several single-family dwellings zoned RE, on the west by mostly vacant land and a few scattered residences zoned AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- There have been no zoning or BOA actions on the tract or within the surrounding area which would necessitate approving commercial zoning at this location.

Conclusion -- Even though the Comprehensive Plan identifies that the area of the subject tract has the potential to develop commercially as requested, the same Comprehensive Plan and the Development Guidelines specifically state that existing conditions and uses shall be considered in implementing the plan in order to provide existing developments protection and insure compatibility. In this case both the northeast and southwest corners of the expressway intersection have developed as single-family residential. In addition, there are several scattered single-family dwellings in the area.

Approval of commercial zoning will adversely affect the value and livability of the single-family homes to the south and therefore we base our recommendation for DENIAL of CS on that basis.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Kelley advised that the Planning Commission previously permitted him to construct houses on the south side of the subject tract. Mr. Kelley later purchased the property across the street where he now proposes to construct a convenience service station. The homes in the area range

Application No. CZ-97 (continued)

from #150,000 to \$200,000 in value and Mr. Kelley stated he owns a house in that area. Mr. Kelley stated that he is disturbed many times a day by individuals who are in need of a telephone, water or gasoline, and therefore, he feels a convenience store would be appropriate in the area. Five photographs of the abutting property were submitted (Exhibit "A-1") and a plat was also submitted (Exhibit "A-2").

The access into the property would be located off the access road which is presently in place and would not be from 86th Street North. The closest commercial property is approximately one mile north of the subject property.

Mr. Gardner stated the reason the Staff recommended denial of the application is because of the houses located to the south of the tract which Mr. Kelley previously developed. The Staff felt the houses are deserving of protection. It is the Planning Commission's responsibility to protect the single-family residences in the area.

Protestants: None.

Interested Party: Bill Wines                      Address: P. O. Box 35 - Owasso, Oklahoma

Interested Party's Comments:

Mr. Wines submitted a map showing the intersection at 86th Street North and Highway #75 (Exhibit "A-3"). Mr. Wines stated he was in support of the application and felt the convenience store would be an asset to the neighborhood.

Commissioner T. Young did not feel that the entire 6-acre tract would be needed for the development of the convenience store and felt the Commission should exercise some caution to see that the zoning line on the east side does not extend to the state right-of-way. Mr. Kelley advised that he has provided right-of-way on both sides of 86th Street for intersection improvements.

Commissioner C. Young stated he, too, was troubled with the amount of acreage requested and advised that any amount of commercial zoning less than 10 acres could be considered appropriate based on the physical facts of the tract.

There was limited discussion concerning the access into the subject tract.

Discussion then ensued concerning the amount of property which would be appropriate for CS zoning. It was suggested that the property be rezoned CS on that portion of the tract which lines up with the second of the two houses across 86th Street North and the first property line across the Cherokee Expressway.

Commissioner Beckstrom stated he could not support an action which limits the use of the property as was just described because of the odd-shape of the lot. He felt as the area develops there will be a need for some 10-acre commercial sites to serve the area.

It was then suggested by Commissioner Flick that the use of the land be extended to line up with the third lot on 86th Street owned by Mr. Kelley.

Application No. CZ-97 (continued)

Instruments Submitted: Five Photographs of the abutting property (Exhibit "A-1")  
Plat (Exhibit "A-2")  
Map of the intersection at 86th Street North (Exhibit "A-3")

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-1-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Flick, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; Hinkle, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS which includes all of the land south of a line which lines up with the north property line of the second of the two houses across the Cherokee Expressway and that the west line should be lined up with the third residential lot east of the Cherokee Expressway on the south side of 86th Street.

LEGAL PER NOTICE:

The W/2 of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of Section 21, Township 21 North, Range 13 East of the I.B. & M., Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof AND, beginning 165' West and 614' North of the Southeast corner of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of the SE/4; thence North 46'; West 166.6'; South 570'; Northeast 16.4' Northeast on a curve 276.1'; Northeast 270.2' to the beginning, Section 21, Township 21 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

LEGAL PER PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

The South 330' of the W/2 of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of Section 21, Township 21 North, Range 13 East of the I.B. & M., Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof AND, beginning 165' West and 614' North of the Southeast corner of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of the SE/4; thence North 46'; West 166.6'; South 570'; Northeast 16.4' Northeast on a curve 276.1'; Northeast 270.2' to the beginning, Section 21, Township 21 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.



Application No. CZ-98 (continued)

Protestants' Comments:

Mr. Kenneth W. East, attorney, represented himself and other landowners in the area. Mr. East submitted a protest petition bearing 109 signatures of property owners in the surrounding area (Exhibit "B-1"). It was believed that if the zoning application were permitted to allow this substantial number of mobile homes it would greatly affect the property owners who have substantial acreage and investment. If the mobile homes were placed on large lots of at least 2½ or 3 acres the landowners would not oppose the application. Mr. East advised that there are at least 13 mobile home parks or developments from Highway #97 going west to 225th West Avenue and from Highway #51 to 61st Street. The area does not have access to proper fire protection, police protection or adequate water supply and sewage facilities. If the application is approved it will prove to be one of the greatest negative impacts for the area.

Ms. Charlene Cobb represented Mr. William C. Jackson who owns several hundreds of acres surrounding this location and his fourth largest piece of property is located in the immediate area. Mr. Jackson's concern deals with the negative impact on his agriculture operation. Ms. Cobb submitted a map with the yellow area indicating Mr. Jackson's property and the red area representing the property under application (Exhibit "B-2"). There is a 33' easement running down to the subject property which Mr. Jackson does not feel would be sufficient for the traffic or utilities involved in maintaining the residential mobile home subdivision.

Mr. Hight stated he owns a home located southeast of the subject tract and he opposes the zoning application because it will cause extreme detriment to the property values in the area. He also stated that the area cannot support the instantaneous type of development such as a mobile home subdivision. The site distances are extremely inadequate on the many curves and hills in this location. The closest fire protection facilities are located approximately 4.8 miles away with access on very narrow winding roads. Mr. Hight also mentioned the water pressure problems and fire protection service inadequacies.

Mr. Eaton stated he opposed the zoning requested and merely reiterated the statements which were previously made by the other protestants. His greatest concerns dealt with the water pressure and decrease in property values. He stated he was opposed to any kind of development in the area due to inadequate facilities.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Steve Coons, 1223 Forest Drive, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, addressed the Commission and felt there had been some misunderstanding concerning the zoning request. The maximum number of mobile homes which would be placed on the tract would be a total of 26. There will be a lake in the area which the developers will create and will enhance the neighborhood. The lots will be sold to the individuals and will not be leased. They will be sold for approximately \$10,000 and will be platted. Restrictions will be filed with the plat that no livestock or chickens will be permitted on the lots, a business operated out of the home will not be permitted and no commercial real estate can be operated in this addition.

Application No. CZ-98 (continued)

Mr. Coons stated he talked with Vernon Smith, public works manager for Sand Springs, concerning the availability of water and water pressure in the surrounding area. Mr. Smith requested that the applicants run a hydrostatic test on the supply of water and if it did indicate that it would support 26 mobile homes there would be no problem. A 6" line would be run into the property to be used solely for the mobile homes and would not be connected to the existing 2" water line which serves Coyote Trail.

Mr. Coons did not feel that the proposed number of mobile homes would warrant a situation of hiring additional police and fire protection officials. As developers of the property Mr. Coons and Mr. Calton intend to maintain the addition and require that the owners of the individual lots abide by the restrictions which are filed with the plat.

Mr. Beckstrom stated he could not be supportive of RMH zoning. He suggested that the applicant come back before the Commission using a Planned Unit Development for the mobile home subdivision provided road access could be provided. The developers were also reminded that 20 mobile homes would be permitted on the property as a matter of right.

Commissioner C. Young stated he was supportive of AG zoning as presently exists on the property, but could not support AG-R or RMH zoning. Commissioner Connery was in agreement with Commissioner C. Young's statement.

Instruments Submitted: Protest Petition (Exhibit "B-1")  
Location Map (Exhibit "B-2")

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to DENY the request for RMH zoning and that the property remain zoned under the AG classification on the following described property:

The SE/4 of the NW/4 of Section 31, Township 19 North, Range 11 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, containing 40 acres, more or less.



Application No. Z-5859-SP-1

Present Zoning: C0

Applicant: Anderson Development

Location: SE corner of Mingo Road and 71st Street South

---

Date of Application: October 12, 1983

Date of Hearing: November 9, 1983

Size of Tract: 3.83 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Larry Kester

Address: 4960 South Memorial Drive

Phone: 665-0130

Staff Recommendation -- Corridor Site Plan Review:

The subject tract is located at the southeast corner of 71st Street and South Mingo Road. It is approximately 3.83 acres in size, vacant, zoned C0, and the applicant is requesting Site Plan Review. The applicant is proposing a small suburban shopping center with a maximum floor area of 47,113 square feet.

The Staff has reviewed the submitted Site Plan and Text and find the proposal to be: (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; (d) designed in a manner that provides proper accessibility, circulation and functional relationships of uses; and (e) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the Corridor Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan, subject to the following conditions:

(1) That the applicant's Plans and Text be made conditions of approval.

(2) Development Standards:

Land Area (Gross): 4.44 acres  
(Net) : 3.83 acres

Permitted Uses: Use Units 5, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, \*16, 19 and a Post Office.

Maximum Floor Area: 47,113 square feet

Maximum Building Coverage: 28.2%

Maximum Building Height: 35 feet

Minimum Building Setbacks:

From centerline of 71st St.; 100 feet  
from centerline of Mingo Rd:

North 550 feet, 100 feet  
South 152.8 feet, 200 feet

from South and East Boundaries. 25 feet

Minimum Off-Street Parking: 1 space per 225 square feet of floor area.

\*No outside work performed and no outside storage of materials.

Z-5859-SP-1 (continued)

- (3) That signs shall be subject to the conditions of Section 820.2 (c) with location and design approved by the TMAPC prior to installation.
- (4) That building elevations be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a building permit, including the screening of trash collection areas, and utility meters that are attached to walls. The elevations shall show that the south wall is of the same general architectural character as the north and west walls.
- (5) That a Detail Landscape Plan be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy, including requirement for a screening fence along the east boundary line if residential is ever developed abutting the tract, and also, the screening of any roof top heating and cooling equipment, and that the south boundary require a screening fence and the screening of roof top heating and cooling equipment if the area to the south is developed residential.
- (6) That no building permit shall be issued until the property has been included within a subdivision plat, submitted to, and approved by the TMAPC, and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the CO conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa Beneficiary to said covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Larry Kester was present and briefly reviewed the fourth and fifth conditions with the Staff to assure him of the intention of the Staff Recommendation. Mr. Kester then stated he was in concurrence with the recommendation.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the Detail Site Plan be approved, subject to the conditions recommended by the Staff on the following described property:

A tract of land in the NW/4 of the NW/4 of Section 7, Township 18 North, Range 14 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the Northwest corner of Said Section 7; thence East along the North line thereof 309.9'; thence South parallel with the West line of Said Section 702.8'; thence West parallel with the North line of Said Section 309.9'; thence North along the West line of Said Section 702.8' to the place of beginning in Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Application No. PUD 344 Present Zoning: (AG)  
Applicant: Meyer (Blunt)  
Location: East of the southeast corner of 126th Street North and Garnett Road

Date of Application: September 29, 1983  
Date of Hearing: November 9, 1983  
Size of Tract: 30.75 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Jack Spradling  
Address: 5840 South Memorial Drive Phone: 622-7274

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located on the south side of 126th Street North, 1/2 mile east of Garnett Road. It is 30.75 acres in size, vacant and recommended for a combination of RS, RE and FD zoning. The applicant is now requesting PUD supplemental zoning to develop a mobile home park at traditional RS standards.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Outline Development Plan 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 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 #344, 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"

Gross Area:	18.75 acres
Permitted Uses:	Residential single-family dwelling units and appropriate accessory uses as permitted as a matter of right in the RMH District.
Maximum Dwelling Units.	84 dwelling units
Maximum Structure Height:	1-story
Minimum Livability Space, per Dwelling Unit:	4,000 square feet
Minimum Lot Area, per Dwelling Unit:	6,900 square feet.
Minimum Lot Width:	60 feet
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	2 paved spaces per unit
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
From centerline of 126th St.,	85 feet
front yard (minimum).	20 feet
Units placed parallel to St.;	
side yards,	5 feet
rear yard.	20 feet

Units placed perpendicular  
to street:

One side yard,	5 feet
other side yard,	20 feet
rear yard.	10 feet

The area indicated is approximate; slight variations may occur during development of construction documents.

DEVELOPMENT AREA "B"

Gross Area: 12 acres

Permitted Uses: Park storm water drainage, sanitary sewer lagoon accessory uses, such as parking, picnicking, shelters, and pump stations. Several acres of the land are located in the Corps of Engineers designated 100-year flood area. The flood areas will be contained within the park area.

- (3) That one identification sign may be erected on 126th Street. The sign shall not exceed 32 square feet of display surface area, nor 15 feet in height, and illuminations, if any, shall be constant light.
- (4) That internal streets shall be 24 feet in width and paved with an all-weather, dust-free surface.
- (5) That all mobile home units shall be completely skirted with materials that are architecturally compatible with the unit being skirted and installed in a manner that the unit appears to be placed on-grade.
- (6) 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.
- (7) That an improved playground or tot-lot be provided within the open space Area "B" convenient to the improved lots.
- (8) That a six-foot security fence shall be erected and maintained on the perimeters of the lagoon.
- (9) That each mobile home space shall have a minimum of 100 square feet of paved outdoor living area (patio).
- (10) That each mobile home space shall have an enclosed storage accessory building not less than 36 square feet in size or greater than 100 square feet.
- (11) 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.

PUD #344 (continued)

- (12) That a Detail Landscape Plan, including location and design of sign and landscaping along north perimeter shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to the occupancy of any units.
- (13) 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. Spradling was present on behalf of the applicant and stated he is in agreement with the Staff Recommendation. A site plan was submitted (Exhibit "C-1").

Protestants: None.

Instruments Submitted: Site Plan (Exhibit "C-1")

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; 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:

The NE/4 of the NW/4, LESS right-of-way and the South 305 feet thereof of Section 5, Township 21 North, Range 14 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Application No. Z-5892 (continued)

Mr. Robert Nichols, attorney, represented developers, homeowners and builders in the surrounding area who are opposed to the zoning application. Mr. Nichols submitted a protest petition signed by 29 property owners in the area (Exhibit "D-3") and four (4) photographs showing some of the houses in the immediate area (Exhibit "D-4"). Mr. Nichols raised some concern about the development of the tract as it relates to that part of the tract east of the floodway. He stated he agreed with the Staff's Recommendation and the statement relating to density in the area. He requested that the section east of the flood area be zoned to RS-2. It was felt that the compromise of the zoning application will alleviate much of the concern about density and will preserve approximately 15 acres to the east at RS-2 standards.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Perkins stated that one area south of the subject tract is currently zoned RS-3 and being developed into 60' lots with small square-footages which he nor Mr. Schermerhorn had anything to do with. He stated he would be willing to meet with the surrounding property owners concerning the minimum square-footage of the tracts and homes. At present the economy market is leaning toward smaller lots.

The subject tract contains 45 acres, but approximately 40 acres could not be developed because of the floodway. If RS-3 zoning were permitted it would allow 160 lots to be developed and RS-2 zoning would permit a total density of 120 lots. The difference between the two zonings would be 40 lots of which 10 would be located on the east side of the creek and 30 on the west side which would actually constitute two separate developments. Mr. Perkins again stated he would be willing to talk to the neighbors concerning the square-footage minimums and the maximum density for the tracts.

Commissioners Comments:

Commissioner C. Young believed that both the protestants and applicant suggested that there be a compromise worked out by zoning the tract a combination of RS-2 and RS-3, he was in support of that compromise. If a compromise of RS-2 and RS-3 zoning were created it would protect the RS-2 neighborhood to the north and east. He suggested that a strip of land covering two lots in width to the north by zoned RS-2 with the remainder of the tract being zoned RS-3.

Commissioner T. Young suggested that the entire tract be zoned RS-2 because the RS-3 zonings to the south and southwest are actually developed on larger lots than the RS-2 tracts north and east of the application. He felt the Commission was faced with a decision of preserving the character of the neighborhood in the community. He felt the market place will improve in the near future and placing a smaller lot development here would be inconsistent with the area. It was suggested that the Commission be careful in using the market place determination to affect a zoning decision.

Commissioner Flick stated he was in agreement with the suggestion made by Mr. C. Young as he felt the strip 2 lots in depth on the north and east boundary being zoned RS-2 would protect the character of the surrounding neighborhood with the remainder being zoned RS-3.

Commissioner Beckstrom suggested that the application be continued to allow the applicant and protestants time to agree on the line between

Application No. Z-5892 (continued)

RS-3 and RS-2 as both sides made statements that they were willing to compromise on the zoning.

TMAPC Action: 9 members present.

On MOTION of C. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-1-1 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; T. Young "nay"; Connery, "abstaining"; Higgins, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RS-3 Less and Except the Floodway, a 290' wide strip on the north property line, and that property east of the Floodway. That portion identified to be in the Floodway will remain AG and the remainder of the tract shall be RS-2:

LEGAL PER NOTICE:

The NE/4 of the NE/4 of the SW/4 and the E/2 of the NW/4 of the NE/4 of the SW/4 of Section 16, Township 18 North, Range 13 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, AND the N/2, NW/4, SW/4; AND W/2, NW/4, NE/4, SW/4; AND that part of the S/2, N/2, SW/4, being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point 33' East of the NW corner of the S/2, N/2, SW/4 of Section 16, Township 18 North, Range 13 East; thence 250' in a Southerly direction parallel to and 33' East of the West line to a point; thence Easterly 1,000' parallel to the North line to a point; thence Northerly 250' to a point; thence Westerly 1,000' to the point of beginning of Section 16, Township 18 North, Range 13 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof.

LEGAL PER PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

To be furnished by the applicant and City Engineering Department.

FOR FINAL APPROVAL AND RELEASE:

Executive Center Amended Addition (PUD #289) (983) SW corner of 71st  
Street and Yale Avenue (OM, OL, RS-3)

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

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, C. Young, T. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plat of Executive Center Amended Addition and re-lease same as having met all conditions of approval.

Woodniche Addition (PUD #327) (1183) 81st Street and South 78th East Ave.  
(RS-3)

The Staff advised that all letters have not been received for final release and approval.

The Chair, without objection, tabled this item from the agenda.

Woodside Village I, II\*, III\* (PUD #306) (2093) 91st Street and South  
College Place (RM-2, RM-1)

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

Mr. Bill Jones stated his objection to the requirements concerning proposed expressway delineation.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Flick, Higgins, C. Young, T. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plat of Woodside Village I, II\*, III\* and re-lease same as having met all conditions of approval.

\*Subject to documentation of expressway information as approved by TMAPC.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #341 - Landscape Plan and Sign Review:

Staff Recommendation:

Planned Unit Development No. 341 is located at the SW corner of 66th Place and South Peoria Avenue. It is 5.634 acres in size, has an underlying zoning of RM-2, and has been approved for multifamily use under a PUD. It has received Detail Site Plan approval and the applicant is now requesting Detail Landscape Plan and Sign location and size approval.

The Staff has reviewed the submitted Plans and find that they meet the intent of the approved conditions and are consistent with the purposes of the PUD Chapter of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

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



PUD #341 (continued)

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Flick, Higgins, C. Young, T. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Landscape Plan and Sign review, subject to the Plan submitted.

PUD #324-2 (Development Area "B") - Minor Amendment:

Staff Recommendation:

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 has been approved for two development areas. The first, Development Area "A", is restricted to one single-family detached dwelling and the second, Development Area "B", is restricted to 20 single-family detached dwellings. The applicant is now requesting to amend various setback requirements since his project has become detached single-family instead of the originally proposed attached single-family.

The Staff feels that the minimum side yard setback between a building and dedicated public street should be a 15-foot minimum and, therefore, cannot support the requested 10-foot side yard setback from a public street. In an RS-3 development without a PUD, a 25-foot setback is required from nonarterial streets. In the past under PUD supplemental zoning, 15-foot side yard setbacks have been allowed.

After the above review, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the following:

Building Setbacks:

Perimeter;	20 feet, except side yards adjacent to Trenton Ave., and 62nd St., may be 15'.
Rear Yard;	20 feet
Side Yard (interior lots);	5 feet
Front Yard:	
Public Street.	No units will front onto public streets.
Private Streets:	
Front of Building;	10 feet
Front of Garage.	20 feet

Mr. Visintainer was present and asked questions concerning the perimeter on the building setbacks. There was limited discussion concerning the 15' setback for Trenton Avenue and 62nd Street. There was some confusion as to what the applicant was actually requesting and what was shown on the plans.

The Chair, without objection, continued this item for one week to allow the applicant and Staff an opportunity to discuss this minor amendment request.

Z-5773-SP-1 - Landscape Plan and Sign Review:

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located 1/2 mile south of the southeast corner of 61st Street and South Mingo Road. It is 2.3 acres in size, zoned C0, and has received Detail Site Plan approval. The applicant is now requesting Landscape Plan and Sign review.

The Staff has reviewed the submitted Sign design and location and Detail Landscape Plan. Based upon this review, the Staff can support them as being consistent with the conditions of the Corridor Site Plan approval and that they meet the intent of the Corridor Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Landscape Plan and Sign design.

Bill Hutson was present but had no comments.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Hinkle, Kempe, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Flick, Higgins, C. Young, T. Young, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Landscape Plan and Sign review, subject to the Plan submitted.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Date Approved

November 23, 1983

Cherry Kempe  
Chairman

ATTEST:

Marilyn Hilde  
Secretary