

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1493
Wednesday, February 8, 1984, 1:30 p.m.
Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Beckstrom, 2nd Vice-Chairman Connery Draughon Flick Hinkle, Secretary Woodard C. Young, Chairman	Higgins Kempe Rice Inhofe	Compton Gardner 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, February 7, 1984, at 11:35 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

MINUTES:

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Flick, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Minutes of January 25, 1984 (No. 1491).

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts and Deposits:

The Commission was advised this report is in order.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Flick, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the month ending January 31, 1984.

Committee Reports:

Chairman Young advised that the Rules and Regulations Committee will have a meeting in Room 213 of City Hall immediately following this meeting to discuss the Outdoor Advertising Sign Proposal.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #243 (Lots 23 and 24, Glenoak Subdivision)

Staff Recommendation -- Detail Site Plan Review

The subject lots are located in Glenoak Subdivision which is just north of the northeast corner of 61st Street and South Harvard Ave. It was approved for a duplex development with one single-family dwelling and 25 duplexes (51 dwellings total). The applicant has changed his original proposal to include more single-family detached dwellings than approved. Therefore, he is required to receive TMAPC approval of a new Detail Site Plan or Plans.

The Staff reviewed the Plans submitted for Lots 23 and 24 and find that Lot 23 was the lot originally planned to have a single-family dwelling located on it and, in addition, the following:

Item	<u>Lot 24</u> Approved	Submitted
Permitted Uses:	Single-family attached or detached	Detached Single-family
Minimum Lot Size:	7,000 sq. ft.	± 8,004 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Height:	26 feet to top of top plate	Same
Minimum Livability Space:	6,000 sq. ft.	5,044 sq. ft.(a)
Minimum Setbacks:		
Front:		
Residence:	20 feet	20 feet
Garage:		
Front entry:	20 feet	20 feet
Side entry:	10 feet	NA
Side:		
Between buildings:	15 feet	13 feet(b)
Rear:	20 feet	8 feet(c)
Minimum Parking:	2 enclosed spaces	2 enclosed spaces

Item	<u>Lot 23</u> Approved	Submitted
Permitted Uses:	Single-family attached or detached	Detached Single-family
Minimum Lot Size:	7,000 sq. ft.	± 8,280 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Height:	26 feet to top of top plate	Same
Minimum Livability Space:	6,000 sq. ft.	5,203 sq. ft.(a)
Minimum Setbacks:		
Front:		

PUD #243 (continued)

Residence:	20 feet	10 feet(d)
Garage:		
Front entry:	20 feet	20 feet
Side entry:	10 feet	NA
Side:		
Between buildings:	15 feet	33 feet
Rear:	20 feet	2 feet(c)
Minimum Parking:	2 enclosed spaces	2 enclosed spaces

(a) The PUD conditions required an average of 6,000 sq. ft. of open space per dwelling unit be provided even though the underlying zoning (RS-2) requires only 5,000 sq. ft. Since this is a voluntary requirement and since the two lots in question are among the smallest in the project and the larger lots will provide greater amounts of open space, the Staff can support the livability space provided.

(b) Lot 24 had previously been set up to be one of two duplex lots with a zero lot line between the units. Since it is now proposed to be a single-family lot, a 7½ foot side yard setback will be required to insure that a 15-foot building separation will be maintained. However, in this case there are two small extensions that encroach two feet into the side yard. The Staff feels this is minor and can support the side yard as shown.

(c) Both lots are not meeting the 20-foot rear yard required by the PUD; however, they back up to significant areas of open space which forces adequate rear yard building separations and provides for private outdoor living spaces for each dwelling.

(d) The PUD conditions allow a side entry garage to set back only 10 feet from a street; however, it requires the main structure to set back 20 feet. On Lot 23 the front corner of the dwelling encroaches into the 20-foot setback but does not exceed what would be allowed for a side entry garage. Since this encroachment does not affect abutting lots, exceeds the minimum required for side entry garages, and is only a corner of the dwelling, the Staff feels it is minor.

Based upon the original concept of a tightly designed private residential community and the above review, the Staff can recommend APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plans for Lots 23 and 24, Glenoak Subdivision, subject to the Plans submitted.

We would note that changing from a duplex proposal to a single-family or mixed proposal will necessitate several minor changes on each lot as review is required. We would also note that some of the very small lots could be rendered undevelopable if caution is not taken by the developer or adjoining lots.

PUD #243 (continued)

Chairman C. Young asked if the Commission would be giving up any of the other approval conditions that were accomplished through a PUD as opposed to straight zoning. The Staff answered in the negative.

Chairman C. Young was also concerned with the minimum livability space as presently proposed and was concerned that it would set a precedent. The Staff stated that they were not troubled by the new request. The applicant can not meet the 6,000 sq. ft. minimum livability space on individual lots but can meet the 6,000 sq. ft. overall. Since the applicant has switched from a duplex development to a single-family development they are trying to maintain the requirements on the individual lots.

The Commission was also concerned that the Staff might be bending over backwards to accommodate this change, but the Staff did not feel that way and advised the Commission they would still have to review each lot. The Staff is satisfied that this project meets the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Flick, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan for Lots 23 and 24, Glenoak Subdivision, subject to the Plans submitted.

PUD #281 (Development Area "A" -- Phase II and Development Area "B" -- Phase II)

Staff Recommendation -- Detail Site Plan Review

Planned Unit Development No. 281 is 90.48 acres in size and Development Areas "A and B" are located north and south of 65th Street on the west side of South Mingo Road. These two development areas were combined and have been developed as three phases-- Phase I being the westernmost phase, Phase III being the easternmost phase located adjacent to Mingo Road, and Phase II being located inbetween Phases I and III. Detail Site Plans have previously been approved on all phases; however, Phase II was recently granted a minor amendment for a lot-split. As a requirement of lot-split approval, the old Site Plan was deleted and a new one was required for the Phase prior to the issuance of a building permit. The applicant is now requesting Site Plan approval.

During the review it was discovered that a minor amendment had been granted on Phase III to reduce the setback between the buildings and parking from 20 feet to 12 feet. Since this is an extension of Phase III, the same amendment is needed for this Phase also. It was considered minor before, and the Staff would still consider it minor because the Zoning Code does not specifically require any setbacks from parking.

The Staff has compared the submitted Detail Site Plan to the approved standards of the lot-split approval and the above modifications and find the following:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Submitted</u>
<u>Development Area "A"--Phase II</u>		
Land Area (Net):	±5.52 acres	±5.52 acres
Permitted Uses:	Attached residential and accessory uses	Same
Maximum Units:	144 units	144 units
Maximum Building Height:	2 stories	2 stories
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From 65th Street (ROW):	25 feet	25 feet
From North Boundary:	20 feet	20 feet*
Between Buildings:	15 feet	5 feet*
Between Parking and Buildings:	12 feet	12 feet*
Minimum Livability Space:	3.12 acres	3.30 acres
Minimum Parking Spaces:	1.5 spaces for 1 bedroom or less, or 2 spaces for 2 or more bedrooms	Same

PUD #281 (continued)

Development Area "B"--Phase II

<u>Item</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Submitted</u>
Land Area (Net):	±2.25 acres	±2.25 acres
Permitted Uses:	Attached residential and accessory uses	Same
Maximum Units:	40 units	40 units
Maximum Building Height:	2 stories	2 stories
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From 65th Street (ROW):	25 feet	25 feet
From South Boundary:	20 feet	20 feet
Between Buildings:	15 feet	15 feet
Between Parking and Buildings:	12 feet	15 feet*
Minimum Livability Space:	1.10 acres	1.1 acres**
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	1.5 spaces for 1 bedroom or less, or 2 spaces for 2 or more bedrooms	Exceeds

*We would note that there appears to be four specific areas where the development standards are not being met, however, in all cases small adjustments to building placement can eliminate these problems.

**There is an excessive number of parking spaces and slightly less than necessary livability space. Excess parking to be eliminated to meet both requirements.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan, subject to the recommended modification, the plan submitted, and the buildings being adjusted and parking eliminated where necessary in the permit review process to meet the standards approved.

Mr. Compton stated the Staff would request that a revised site plan showing the changes and including the development standards be submitted to the Staff.

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Flick, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan, subject to the recommended modification, the plan submitted, and the buildings being adjusted and parking eliminated where necessary in the permit review process to meet the standards approved, and subject to the applicant submitting a revised site plan showing the changes.

PUD #111-B (Phases II and III)

Staff Recommendation -- Detail Site and Landscape Plan Review

The subject tract is located at 136th East Avenue and 31st Street. It is 10.9 acres in size and approved for an attached single-family townhouse development. The applicant is now requesting Detail Site and Landscape Plan review on Phase III and a minor amendment to allow a 16-foot rear yard instead of the required 20-foot. Also, he is requesting Detail Site and Landscape Plan review on Phase II. However, building permits have been issued and all the buildings in Phase II are under construction. This occurred because the permits were issued in error without receiving proper zoning clearance.

After reviewing both site plans and landscape plans and comparing them with the approved or amended development the Staff found the following:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Approved Remaining</u>	<u>Phases II & III Submitted</u>	<u>Remaining</u>
Area:	±8.35 acres	±4.22 acres	±3.63 acres
Uses:	Attached Single-Family Town- houses	Same	Same
Maximum No. of Units:	86 Townhouses	54 Townhouses	32 Townhouses
Minimum Livability Space:	900 sq. ft. a Unit	Same	Same
Maximum Building Height:	35 feet	Same	Same
Minimum Setbacks:			
From Right-of-Way of 31st Street:	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet
From Internal Streets:	10 feet	10 feet	10 feet
From Building to Building:	10 feet	10 feet	10 feet
Rear Yard:	20 feet	20 feet*	20 feet
Front Yard:	24 feet	24 feet**	24 feet

*There are several structures in Phase III that might have a problem meeting the 20-foot rear yard requirement, however, the most extreme case would be a reduction to 16 feet. The Staff feels this is minor.

**There are four locations in Phase II and four locations in Phase III where the 24-foot front yard setback is not being met. They are generally staying with 20 feet. This same amendment was granted in Phase I for four units, also.

The applicant has also met the PUD condition for submitting a Detail Site Plan. The Staff reviewed the Landscape Plans for Phase II and Phase III and find them to be consistent with the intent of the PUD requirements.


PUD #111-B (Phases II and III) continued

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site and Landscape Plans for Phase II and Phase III and minor amendments, subject to the above modifications and the Plans submitted.

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan and Landscape Plan for Phases II and III and minor amendments, subject to the above modifications and Plans submitted.


There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

Date Approved February 22, 1984



Chairman

ATTEST:



Secretary