

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
 MINUTES of Meeting No. 1511
 Wednesday, June 27, 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	Compton	Linker, Legal
Higgins	Draughon	Gardner	Department
Kempe, 1st Vice-Chairman	Flick	Kedzie	
Rice	Hinkle	Martin	
Woodard	C. Young	Matthews	
T. Young			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, June 26, 1984, at 11:38 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, 1st Vice-Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:55 p.m.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. Z-5959 Present Zoning: RS-3
 Applicant: Hinkle (Independent School District #1) Proposed Zoning: CS
 Location: SW corner of 45th Place and Peoria Avenue

Date of Application: May 1, 1984
 Date of Hearing: June 27, 1984
 Size of Tract: 7.299 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Norman
 Address: 909 Kennedy Building - 74103 Phone: 583-7571

Mr. Gardner advised that it would be appropriate to amend the Comprehensive Plan to Medium Intensity, No Specific Land Use should this be approved.

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

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

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 7.299 acres in size and located at the SW corner of 45th Place and Peoria Avenue. It is non-wooded, flat, and contains a public school zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by a strip commercial center zoned CS, on the east by an apartment complex and mixed commercial uses zoned RM-2 and CS, on the south by mixed commercial activities zoned CS, and on the west by a public school zoned RS-3.

Z-5959 (continued)

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Previous zoning action has allowed commercial zoning along Peoria Avenue.

Conclusion -- Based on the Comprehensive Plan and because the subject tract is abutted on three sides by commercial zoning, the Staff can support CS zoning and recommend APPROVAL of the rezoning request.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman presented the case for Mr. Roy Hinkle who represented the purchaser of the property from the Board of Education. The applicant does support the Staff Recommendation and requested that the Commission approve the zoning as requested. Mr. Norman submitted an aerial photograph of the subject property (Exhibit "A-1").

Protestants: None.

Instruments Submitted: Aerial Photograph (Exhibit "A-1")

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; T. Young, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS:

A part of the East 995.00' of the South 474.00' of the ANNIE MAY GRANT TRACT "B" of the L. J. F. Rooney survey of Annie May Grant (nee: Abdo) and Harry N. Abdo Lands, and the East 995.00' of the Annie May Grant (nee: Abdo) and Harry N. Abdo Lands, all in Section 25, Township 19 North, Range 12 East, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, being described by metes and bounds as follows, to wit: COMMENCING at a point on the East line of Grant Tract B, Said Point being 474.00' North of the Southeast corner of Said Tract; thence South 0°-12'-39" West along the East line of Grant Tract B, a distance of 30.00'; thence South 89°-59'-59" West parallel with the South line of Grant Tract B, a distance of 50.00' to the POINT OF BEGINNING: thence South 0°-12'-39" West parallel with and 50.00 feet perpendicularly distant from the East line of Grant Tracts B and C and the centerline of South Peoria Avenue, a distance of 630.00'; thence South 89°-59'-59" West a distance of 120.00'; thence South 0°-12'-39" West a distance of 160.00' to a point on the South line of Grant Tract C, 170.00' West of the Southeast corner of Said Tract C; thence South 89°-59'-59" West along the South line of Grant Tract C, a distance of 306.82'; thence North 0°-12'-39" East parallel with the East line of Grant's Tracts B & C, a distance of 790.00'; thence North 89°-59'-59" East, a distance of 426.82' to the POINT OF BEGINNING, and containing 317,985.64 square feet or 7.299 acres, more or less.

Application No. PUD 360

Present Zoning: CS and RM-0

Applicant: Poe and Associates (Tri-Angle)

Location: NW corner of 91st Street and Memorial Drive

Date of Application: March 15, 1984

Date of Hearing: June 27, 1984

Size of Tract: 20 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Randy Heckenkemper

Address: 10820 East 41st Street, Suite 101 - 74146 Phone: 665-8800

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is approximately 20 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of 91st Street and South Memorial Drive. The tract is vacant and has an underlying zoning of CS and RM-0. The applicant is proposing PUD supplemental zoning in order to spread the commercial uses over the total tract.

It has become fairly common for a five-acre CS node to be spread over a ten-acre tract by using a PUD and restricted development standards. However, it is not accepted practice to spread 10 acres of intensity (217,800 square feet) over a 20-acre tract. We are very concerned with setting this kind of precedent without complete assurance that all precautions will be taken to protect surrounding land uses and the integrity of the Development Guidelines.

In this specific case the subject tract is abutted on the north by an oil pipeline substation and a vacant tract zoned AG, and farther north is a drainage detention area zoned RS-3. These conditions provide an extremely good land use buffer to the north. In addition, east of the tract the 10-acre CS node was shortened east and west but elongated north and south because of Memorial Drive (Highway #64). The extension to the north plus the addition of the RM-1 buffer goes beyond the subject tract and also provides an extremely good land use buffer to the east. The problems with this tract lie to the south and west. If extension of the commercial uses are allowed to the west (which was denied to the east), then pressure will be placed on the vacant residential land to the west to be zoned either commercial or office and the corridor south of the tract to be used as additional commercial. It should be noted here that Corridor does not equal commercial; in fact, the majority of the developed Corridor land to date has been built as residential. The southeast corner now zoned Corridor would also be due consideration for equal commercial uses based upon this decision.

Given the above review, the only way the Staff could support the request is to restrict land use, require greater building setbacks, landscaping, fencing, and architectural design restrictions within the western portion of the tract.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

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

Land Area (Gross):	20.00 acres
(Net):	16.65 acres

PUD #360 (continued)

Permitted Uses: As permitted in the CS District, except within the West 200 feet which shall be restricted to Use Units 11 and 14.

Maximum Floor Area: Includes all areas under the roof. 217,800 square feet

Maximum Building Height: 35 feet/2 stories, except within the West 200' height shall be restricted to 20'/1-story.

Minimum Building Setback:

From Centerline Memorial Drive: 200 feet
From Centerline 91st Street: 200 feet
From West Property Line: 60 feet
From North Property Line: 40 feet

Minimum Setback of Paving from West Property Line: 40 feet

Minimum Internal Landscape Open Space: 15%

Minimum Off-Street Parking: Per Code requirements for each use.

Signs: Per Section 1130.2 (b)

- (3) That a Detail Site Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
- (4) That a Detail Landscape Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy, including significant landscaping with large plant materials along the west property line and a screening fence along the north and west property lines.
- (5) That the north and west elevations of the proposed building be architecturally similar in character to the fronts of the building. Special attention shall be given to the west elevations to insure compatibility with residential.
- (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. Bob Gardner stated that the applicant has submitted a letter concerning the type of uses that would be permitted (Exhibit "B-1"). The applicant has requested that within the west 200' they be permitted to have not only Use Units 11 and 14 but also Use Unit 13, less and except these uses which are considered to be activities that are not necessarily limited to daytime activities such as convenience grocery, drug stores and liquor stores.

Mr. Heckenkemper, project land planner, stated that Mr. Looney, the president of Triangle Development Company and his brother who are owners of the property are present to answer any questions asked by the Commission. The subject tract is approximately 20 acres in size and is a relatively flat

PUD #360 (continued)

piece of property. Mr. Heckenkemper stated he has done some environmental studies on the slopes and topographic analysis of the site. He stated that the three soil types on the property are compatible with the construction of a shopping center. An exhibit was shown of the surrounding zoning and an illustrative site plan for the project. The project contains 217,800 square feet of floor area and has a unique concept with an atrium effect similar to what has occurred at the Kensington Mall which is enclosed for climate control access to all the individual shops with locations for 2 or 3 different anchors. The applicant is utilizing one of the corners for about 20,000 square feet of retail shopping and similar uses.

The applicant has had conversation with Perry Hood, developer of Chimney Hills South and Chimney Hills Homeowners Association which consists of about 450 families and have very good rapport with them. They have expressed their support of the proposal.

Mr. Heckenkemper stated he was basically in concurrence with the Staff Recommendation. The landscape plan was shown to the Commission which includes a 6-foot privacy fence on the west as well as on the north property line. Mr. Heckenkemper then described the landscaping for the project. It was advised that the applicant is minimizing use of trash receptacles, meter boxes, and conduits above the site line from adjacent property. The project carries the same general architectural theme in the front as in the back. Access to the back of the shopping center is not only a service area but is provided for the neighbors around it who will use the shopping center.

Interested Party: Cheryl Garrett Address: 8604 South 68th East Avenue

Interested Party's Comments:

Mrs. Garrett, president of Chimney Hills Estates Homeowners Association and also representative for Chimney Hills South blocks 1-30, stated that Mr. Heckenkemper has reviewed the project with the Chimney Hills Estates Homeowners Association who has no objection to the proposal. She stated that her concerns were similar to the ones expressed by the Staff but felt that those concerns had been addressed. She submitted a letter addressing these concerns (Exhibit "B-2").

Instruments Submitted: Letter from the applicant (Exhibit "B-1")
Letter from Ms. Garrett (Exhibit "B-2")

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughton, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for Planned Unit Development, subject to the conditions recommended by the Staff:

Blocks 1 and 2, 91st and Memorial Plaza Addition to the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Proposed Amendments to the Tulsa County Zoning Code, Section 1690.1

Mr. Gardner presented the proposal which comes from the District Attorney's office. It basically has to do with requirements for appeals to the District Court. An exhibit was submitted to the Commission which contains the present language and the proposed amended language (Exhibit "C-1"). Mr. Gardner then explained the procedure which is presently followed when an appeal is filed with the District Court. He then explained that with the City Board of Adjustment, the policies that come from the City Commission in the adoption of the Zoning Code are carried out by the Board of Adjustment and then defended by the Legal Department in any law suit. Mr. Gardner then read the exact wording of Section 1690.1 as presently exists and the proposed language.

Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building, felt that the recommendation made by the District Attorney would be a major deviation from the practice of appeals from the Board of Adjustment that have been established by municipal Boards of Adjustment over the past 60 years. The original powers of zoning comes under the Title 11 Statutes pertaining to cities and towns, and the procedure for appealing from the City Board of Adjustment is about the same as set forth in Section 1690.1 of the County Code. He stated that there is no specific procedure of appealing a decision from the Board, however, the County Commissioners in adopting the existing Tulsa County Zoning Code adopted the present procedure which is the same as the City Board of Adjustment. The District Attorney is concerned about their authority to do that but apparently believes the County can adopt a different procedure than the one that has already been adopted.

Mr. Norman stated he is opposed to the recommendation because of the familiarity by attorneys, the applicants and property owners with the well-established rules. More important than this, the recommendation would require an appellant from the Board to file a legal civil suit which would include all property owners within 300' as defendants which would be placing a burden on those property owners to make inquiry and hire an attorney. This would put a great deal of concern in peoples minds in making them a party to any kind of law suit. It would also eliminate the standard of a new trial and provide for a review on the record only. It was felt that the applicant before the County Board would have the potential to bring before the County Board witnesses and have a court record, creating an atmosphere of a judicial hearing unlike the present procedure. Mr. Norman stated he would be happy to participate in any study committee or consultation with the Board of County Commissioners or any other procedure that would be of assistance. He strongly recommended that the City Commission not make a recommendation to the County Commission to adopt this amendment.

John Sublett, 1776 One Williams Center, stated that he, too, was opposed to the recommendation made to amend Section 1690.1 of the Tulsa County Zoning Code. He referred to an instance where an appeal was filed from the County Board of Adjustment and there was such a hieatus between the appeal provision and the specific category of statutes. Mr. Sublett felt that there are three sets of statutes under Title 11 with the Tulsa County Board of Adjustment being the only one to follow this particular set of statutes. He felt that whoever drafted the County Code made an inadvertent difference between the other two statutes. He felt that the County would have to provide a court reporter if this route was followed. He felt that

Public Hearing: (continued)

this type of proceeding is much like citizen participation, and this does not lend itself to that type of presentation where one would make a record and submit to the District Court and review it the same as in the Supreme Court where it is all done by paperwork. He does not feel this type of proceeding lends itself to that type of treatment on appeal. He felt that the trial de novo should be preserved.

Mayor Young advised that the proposed amendment was in part initiated by himself as a County Commissioner. He felt that an inadequacy in the County Code exists and that it also exists in the Tulsa City Zoning Code. He advised the Commission of a case which came before the County Board of Adjustment with a request to place an oil well in the applicant's back yard. The Board turned the request down, but the applicant filed an appeal in District Court, and none of the surrounding residents were notified. As a result, the Court overturned the Board's decision. He felt that there needs to be some method to allow the people to have the opportunity to be given notice and have the opportunity to present their case in front of the judge so all evidence is heard and all concerns are addressed. He felt strong that we should protect the citizens and felt that the judge should hear all evidence available.

Mr. Norman stated that the applicant submits the names of property owners within 300' of his property when making the Board of Adjustment application, and it was his opinion that the same individuals could be contacted once an appeal is filed.

Commissioner Rice suggested that the INCOG Staff and Legal Departments from the City and County work on this amendment whereby we can assure that the interested parties are notified. He, too, felt that there was an inadequacy in the City and County Codes. First Vice-Chairman Kempe agreed that we should not take action on this item today but direct the Staff to undertake further study of this matter with the City and County Legal Departments, Board of County Commissioners, Rules and Regulations Committee and other interested parties and report back to the Planning Commission on their findings.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughton, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to continue consideration of this matter until July 11, 1984, at 1:30 p.m. in the Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center in order for a Staff Recommendation to be made on this matter.

Proposed District 8 Plan Amendment:

Mrs. Dane Mathews submitted copies of the proposed plan amendments (Exhibit "D-1"). This proposal is to create a special district which is created in recognition of an area by some unique features and requires more careful planning. In this case, the area in question lies between Mooser Creek and 71st Street and between the Okmulgee Beeline and the Arkansas River. This area contains the Turkey Mountain Wilderness area and a large amount of potential marketable land. For this reason it was felt that it is important that the land be planned as a whole and develop with an overall plan. There have been some text amendments done

Public Hearing: (continued)

on this area, and the district is recommending a body of text amendments relating to the Turkey Mountain Urban Center Special District.

The purpose of the special district is to recognize the unique physical features of the area. The Planning Team and Staff feel that this district should provide a visual and physical anchor for the River Parks development. It was also felt that a detailed plan should be done for this area. It has been suggested that Elwood Street be looked at for possible realignment. The plan also calls for protection of the River buff area. It has been requested that there be access to a north-south collector street to serve existing development between 67th Street and 71st Street. There will also be health services conveniently located for all residents of District 8.

Mr. Jim Biffle stated he had been contacted by the property owners in this area to plan for a compatible use of this majestic area known as Turkey Mountain. The property presently is very much underutilized, and it has been determined that its slopes and soils are developable. He felt that the area can be best utilized as a New Town/In-Town type of concept. Mr. Biffle then began to describe the plan in much detail. He stated that the New Town/In-Town area would include residential development around and throughout, a shopping center including restaurants and offices with a pedestrian system, a trail system, and a golf course, etc. Mr. Biffle stated he had reviewed the plan with the River Parks Authority, and they acted favorably toward the proposal.

There are numbers of reasons for the creation of this Special District which includes a unique site that can gain national attention and will be an asset to the economic development of Tulsa and hopefully will create new jobs. It is a project of major magnitude. Mr. Biffle then read a quote describing the area. He stated there are several reasons for the New Town/In-Town concept. There are various cities which have employed this concept and it has proved to be very notable. District 8 could use a strong focal point to achieve balanced growth and its share of metropolitan growth and development. It would provide a new opportunity for job opportunities in the area and would create a linkage to the River Lakes Park system with a working, living, and shopping environment that could be established in the River Parks without requiring River Parks property.

Mr. Dennis Hall, 3036 West 78th Street, stated he was supportive of the creation of the special district. He stated he has an indirect interest in the project because he lives in the area and his business is located within this area. He felt that this proposal is the beginning of development in an area that has been long in coming. He felt that this will accomplish many things in Tulsa, namely, balanced growth along an existing expressway in an area that is relatively close to the core of the City. This is a large development and lends itself to a good circulation of traffic and a good pattern of development that comes with large developments rather than piecemeal types of development.

Mr. John Ferris, 3021 West 68th Place South, Chairman of District 8, submitted the resolution prepared by the District dated March 28, 1984, signed by Mr. Ferris and Mr. John Hall, Vice Chairman, (Exhibit "D-2").

First Vice-Chairman Kempe advised that the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee had two meetings on District 7 and 8 Plan Amendments, but there

Proposed District 8 Plan Amendment: (continued)

was not a quorum at either meeting so there is no recommendation from that Committee.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to close the public hearing concerning the District 8 Proposed Plan Amendments.

Mayor Young stated he was strongly opposed to the special district designation. He stated he has never heard proposed plan amendments or the creation of a Special District tied to a specific development proposal. It was felt that Mr. Biffle had specific financial interest and has developed this proposal and sought a special district designation to complete a development concept done by himself. Mr. Ferris is the son of Craig Ferris who owns a substantial amount of the area to be designated Special District. A stated goal of the River Parks Authority is to continue to acquire that land particularly on the top of the Turkey Mountain area to preserve it as open space.

Mrs. Higgins stated that she did not understand that the recommendation was tied to this plan. It was stated that there needs to be a Special District, but she did not feel that we should vote on the concept yet. Mrs. Matthews stated that she is not asking the Commission to vote on any kind of site plan of intensity designation. The only thing that the Commission would vote on today would be to create a Special District. The genesis of the amendment was a request to create a special district, and the site plan would be before the Commission at a later date. The Staff has not formally reviewed the site plan and would not endorse it at this point. The District felt that by creating a special district they have set out Turkey Mountain as a sensitive area and felt that it needs to be preserved and protected at all cost.

Mr. Beckstrom stated he was concerned with the issues which the Mayor raised and would not be in support of the proposed amendments.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 2-4-0 (Beckstrom, T. Young, "aye"; Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to DENY the proposed amendments to District 8.

Mrs. Kempe stated that she was concerned about calling the proposal Turkey Mountain Urban Center Special District all the way through. She stated she was generally in favor of a special district recognizing it as a sensitive area. She suggested that the Commission might strike out the wording "Urban Center". Mr. Beckstrom stated that he could not support the proposed amendments as presented today but might be supportive of a different approach.

Commissioner Rice felt that the Commission is dealing with a unique piece of property and that it should be treated separate and apart from any other plan. He felt this is a perfect example of what should be considered a special planning district. His suggestion was that the plan be sent back to the Staff to resolve some of the questions and problems and come back with another approach.

Proposed District 8 Plan Amendment: (continued)

First Vice-Chairman Kempe directed the Staff to address the District 8 proposed amendments further and report back to the Commission.

District 7 Plan Update and Amendments

Mrs. Dane Matthews submitted copies of the proposed plan amendments to District 7 (Exhibit "E-1"). She then addressed the comments to specific changes to the plan. There are four areas called out on the map. Area A, as shown on the previous map, is shown as a high intensity area and with the update it is still shown as a high intensity area. The map stays the same, but the text has been changed to delete the references to the downtown extension. Area B, an irregular shaped piece of property, is an area called a Special Development District and it is an area that serves as a gateway to District 7 and seems to need encouragement for development or redevelopment. The Planning Team felt that this area should be a special development district. Area C, the Stonebraker Heights Office-Residential area, is basically the same with its uses restricted to RM-2 and OL. Area D is a medium intensity, largely residential area. The Team did not want spot zoning or a higher intensity type of encroachment.

The concerns expressed by the Planning Team were to protect the existing development and encourage quality new development incentives where necessary to improve Area B. It was felt that a site plan for the entire portion covered in Area B be presented before any kind of changes or redevelopment takes place. The Team felt that a citizens planning team should be developed to review and make recommendations in developing the site plan. Another concern of the Planning Team was that of through traffic in the area. In Area D it was suggested that two of the streets be cul-de-saced with one being Cheyenne Avenue at 21st Street and the other being 19th Street at Riverside Drive. The City currently has a motor pool located behind the fire station on 13th Street, and it was felt that was not the highest and best use of the land and, therefore, felt it should be relocated. The Team is also concerned about the adequacy or inadequacy of the infrastructure and have a policy that public utilities will be maintained and improved to meet the needs of the district.

Norma Turnbo, 1822 South Cheyenne Avenue, District 7 representative to Greater Tulsa Council, stated that this is a good plan. This plan recognizes the need to keep the integrity of the neighborhood and to preserve the historical nature of the area.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

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

On MOTION of BECKSTROM, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to approve the Proposed Amendments to the District 7 Plan.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Z-5965 Jones (M & M Investments) NW corner of 71st Street and Utica Avenue
OM to CS, & FD

It was advised that Mr. William Jones, attorney for the applicant, submitted a letter requesting a continuance of the zoning application from June 27, 1984, to August 15, 1984, in order to permit the preparation and filing of a Planned Unit Development covering the subject property (Exhibit "F-1"). Mr. Gardner advised that the Staff recommended the zoning request be accompanied with a Planned Unit Development application stating specific uses for the property.

Mr. John Sublett, 1776 One Williams Center, attorney representing the Southridge Office/Condominium Park which has an interest in this application. He requested that he be notified when the application is brought back to the Commission for consideration. He stated he has no objection to the continuance request.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to continue consideration of Z-5965 until Wednesday, August 15, 1984, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. Z-5966 Present Zoning: CS, RS-1
Applicant: INCOG Staff Proposed Zoning: CS, FD
Location: NE corner of 91st Street and Lewis Avenue

Date of Application: May 10, 1984
Date of Hearing: June 27, 1984
Size of Tract: 2.08 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Bob Gardner
Address: 707 South Houston - 74127 Phone: 584-7526

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity -- No Specific Land Use.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 2.08 acres in size and located at the northeast corner of 91st Street and South Lewis Avenue. It is partially wooded, flat, contains a horticulture nursery and zoned CS and RS-1.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by mostly vacant land zoned CS, on the east by an industrial use zoned IL, on the south by vacant land zoned CS, and on the west by vacant land proposed for Riverside Expressway zoned OL and AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past zoning action zoned a portion of the subject tract RS-1 in 1970, because of a mapping error. Prior to 1970 the entire tract was zoned retail commercial (U-3D).

Conclusion -- The tract is totally surrounded by medium intensity uses and is designated for medium intensity use by the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, it was incorrectly zoned by a mapping error. Because of these reasons, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested CS zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Gardner advised that this is a mapping error which occurred in 1970. The subject property was zoned U-3D which is equivalent to CS zoning prior to 1970. He stated he has a copy of the actual zoning ordinance where this is contained, but for some reason only a portion of the property was mapped CS and not the entire property when the comprehensive mapping was done. This error was not discovered until the applicant was ready to consummate the sale of the property. It was the Staffs' error in the mapping, therefore, we filed the application to correct the error.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS.

Z-5966 (continued)

A tract of land, containing 2.0810 acres, that is all of the Southerly 250.20' of the S/2 of the W/2 of the W/2 of the SE/4 of the SW/4 and the Southerly 250.20' of the S/2 of the E/2 of the E/2 of the E/2 of the SW/4 of the SW/4 lying Easterly of South Lewis Avenue, all in Section 17, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, Said Tract of Land being more particularly described as follows, to wit: Starting at the Southeast corner of the SW/4 of Said Section 17; thence South $89^{\circ}-47'-32''$ West along the Southerly line of Section 17 for 990.00' to the "POINT OF BEGINNING" of Said Tract of Land, Said Point being the Southeast corner of the W/2 of the W/2 of the SE/4 of the SW/4, as evidenced by the Westerly line of "Delaware Square", a subdivision of the E/2 of the SE/4 of the SW/4 and the E/2 of the W/2 of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of Section 17, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; thence North $0^{\circ}-24'-34''$ East along the Easterly line of the W/2 of the W/2 of the SE/4 of the SW/4 and along the Westerly line of "Delaware Square" for 250.20'; thence South $89^{\circ}-47'-32''$ West and parallel to Southerly line of Section 17 for 386.46' to a point on the Easterly Right-of-Way line of South Lewis Avenue, as recorded in Book 140, Page 394, in the County Clerk's office of Tulsa County; thence South $0^{\circ}-04'-38''$ West along said Right-of-Way line for 145.32' to a point on the existing centerline of South Lewis Avenue; thence South $32^{\circ}-11'-46''$ East for 0.00' to a point of curve; thence Southeasterly and Easterly along said centerline, on a curve to the left, with a central angle of $58^{\circ}-00'-42''$ and a radius of 223.00', for 225.79' to a point on the Southerly line of Section 17; thence North $89^{\circ}-47'-32''$ East along Said Southerly line for 195.35' to the "Point of BEGINNING" of Said Tract of Land.

Application No. Z-5967 and PUD #367

Present Zoning: RM-1

Applicant: Norman (Conard)

Proposed Zoning: CS, FD

Location: West side of South 108th East Avenue, North of East 33rd Street

Date of Application: May 17, 1984

Date of Hearing: June 27, 1984

Size of Tract: 11.23 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Norman

Address: 909 Kennedy Building - 74103

Phone: 583-7571

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 17 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity -- No Specific Land Use.

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

Staff Recommendation: Z-5967

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 11.23 acres in size and located 500 feet south of the southwest corner of 108th East Avenue and 31st Street South. It is non-wooded, gently sloping, vacant, and zoned RM-1.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on the north by mini-storage zoned OL, on the east by multifamily residential zoned RM-1, on the south by a single-family neighborhood zoned RS-3, and on the west by the Mingo Valley Expressway.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past zoning actions prior to the Development Guidelines, have allowed CS zoning to extend further into the subdistrict than would be considered today.

Conclusion -- Based upon the Comprehensive Plan and the abutting zoning patterns the Staff cannot support CS zoning on the subject tract, therefore, we recommend DENIAL of the requested CS zoning.

For the record, the applicant has also filed a companion PUD and would need slightly less than six acres of CS to accommodate his project. If the Commission is persuaded to support a change in zoning only the northwest corner of the property should be considered.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #367

The subject tract is 11.22 acres (net) in size and located just south of the southwest corner of 31st Street and 108th East Avenue. It has an underlying zoning of RM-1, and the applicant has requested CS zoning on a portion of the tract with PUD supplemental zoning which will allow him to construct an Office/Warehouse/Commercial Trade Center.

Because of the Comprehensive Plan and the interior location the Staff could not support standard unrestricted CS zoning, however, if properly designed the proposed use appears to be appropriate at this location where it has good visual contact from the expressway and good access to 31st Street. If the Planning Commission feels that these factors support

Z-5967 and PUD #367 (continued)

a portion of the tract being zoned CS in order that this specific PUD could be developed, the Staff would recommend that not more than 5.7 acres be zoned CS and that it be in the northwest corner of the tract, thereby forcing this or any other applicant to use a PUD to develop the tract. In addition, we would recommend the following conditions:

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

Area (Gross):	510,401 square feet 11.717 acres
(Net):	488,562 square feet 11.216 acres

Permitted Uses:

1. Offices and studios, and accessory uses permitted in Use Unit 11.
2. Display, sale and servicing of scientific, business and office machines, equipment, furnishings and supplies, including occupancies such as cameras and photographic supplies, computers, data processing and air conditioning equipment, elevator parts and service, solar heating and auto parts (wholesale and dealer showrooms only), office furniture and equipment and dealer showrooms, office supplies and storage systems, computer software and servicing companies, medical and clinical equipment and supplies, print shops and equipment, mail services, plumbing and lighting supplies and equipment, food preparation supplies and equipment, telephone and communications systems, supplies and services, banking support services such as clearing houses, business forms, dental supplies, decorating fabrics, wall coverings and accessories (dealer and wholesale only), wholesale landscape plants (interior sales only, air freight and armored car services, gourmet food preparation supplies (wholesale and dealer showroom only), electrical supplies, equipment and pumps (wholesale and dealer showroom only), miscellaneous electrical equipment, home remodeling supplies such as windows, sliding doors, and kitchen equipment, and other similar service and supply businesses.
3. Warehouses and storage facilities for the storage, repair, service and distribution of the machines, equipment, products and supplies displayed and sold within the Trade Center, provided no exterior storage shall be permitted.
4. Convenience goods and services including restaurants provided such uses shall be limited to the north 350 feet of the Trade Center.

Maximum Permitted Floor Area--All Uses: 216,000 square feet

Maximum Permitted Floor Area:

6.27.84:1511(15)

Z-5967 and PUD #367 (continued)

Offices and studios and display and sale of items set forth in Paragraph 2 above.	216,000 square feet
Maximum Permitted Floor Area:	
Warehouses and storage for distribution, servicing and repair of the machines and equipment as described in Paragraph 2 above.	112,000 square feet
Maximum Permitted Floor Area:	
Convenience goods and services including restaurants provided such uses shall be limited to the north 350 feet of the Trade Center.	12,000 square feet
Maximum Building Height: S. 200 feet	18 feet*
Maximum Building Height: Remainder of site	22 feet*
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
From South property line	90 feet
From East property line (South 108th E. Ave.)	80 feet
From West property line (Mingo Valley Expressway)	65 feet
From North property line	50 feet
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space:	10%**
Off-Street Parking: As required in the permitted Use Units and for specific uses.	

*Height above finished floor elevation measured at front entrance.

**Internal landscaped open space includes street frontage landscaped areas, landscaped parking islands, landscaped yards and plazas and pedestrian areas but does not include any parking, building or driveway areas.

- (3) That within the South 150 feet of the property no free-standing lights in excess of 10 feet in height shall be permitted. All lighting within the South 150 feet of the property shall be directed away from the adjacent residential area.
- (4) Signs for the project shall meet the standards of the PUD Ordinance of the City of Tulsa and in addition, those requirements outlined in the applicant's text.
- (5) That a Detail Site Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a building permit, including a redesign of the internal circulation (major entrance) so that truck traffic will enter the exit at the northeast corner of the tract and that traffic flow to the southern part of the tract using 108th East Avenue be minimized.

Z-5967 and PUD #367 (continued)

- (6) That a Detail Landscape Plan be approved by the TMAPC and installed prior to occupancy, including all landscaping as shown and discussed in the Outline Development Plan.
- (7) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman represented Roy Conard who is the owner of the subject property and Trammel Crow Company who will be the purchaser and developer of the Freeport Trade Center. Mr. Norman presented photographs showing the location and configuration of the subject property (Exhibit "G-1"). The property abuts the Mingo Valley Expressway and has excellent exposure from the expressway. The applicant is proposing to develop a trade center which would be a combination of similar projects which Trammel Crow Company has developed in other cities. The project will provide office frontages with all offices oriented to the exterior of the property with interior storage facilities opening to a court yard where delivery trucks could make deliveries and ship out parts.

The subject property is adjacent to a mini-storage warehouse complex that exists immediately north, with an apartment complex to the east and a single-family neighborhood to the south with 13 single-family lots abutting the south boundary of the property under construction.

Mr. Norman then addressed some of the permitted uses under the PUD and stated that the project would be limited to the display, sale and service of scientific business and office machines, equipment, furnishings and supplies. The storage portion of the project would be limited to something less than half of the total building area within the project. Mr. Norman gave examples of the type of occupancies that would be permitted for the project such as food supplies, electrical equipment and supplies, however, for wholesalers and dealers only.

Mr. Norman briefly described the detail landscape plan. He stated they have obtained written approval from their neighbors with the exception of one. He submitted letters from the owners of the multifamily project directly to the east (Exhibit "G-2") and from Security Bank (Exhibit "G-3"). Mr. Norman stated he had spoken with the owner of the mini-storage warehouse to the north and he has no objection to the proposal. Mr. Norman stated that he had also received a favorable written notice from 12 of the 13 single-family homeowners located to the south (Exhibit "G-4"). The owner of Lot 13 has expressed his support of the development but wished to state his support in person at the meeting.

The subject property is presently zoned RS-1 and more than 340 multifamily units could be constructed on the property without approval of the PUD or zoning request. He stated that the only difficulty with the application is that it is an interior location, and the Staff did not feel they could recommend the CS zoning that would make it necessary to permit all the activities described in the PUD. In order to accomplish the PUD the applicant needs to receive approval of 5.7 acres of CS zoning

Z-5967 and PUD #367 (continued)

out of the more than 11 acres included in the PUD. Mr. Norman stated that he had suggested to the Staff that the request be approved for 5.7 acres located on the interior portion of the property adjacent to the expressway, in order that if for any reason the PUD should not be constructed as approved there would be no CS zoning with access to a public street and, consequently, it would not be usable except within a PUD. Therefore, Mr. Norman requested that the Commission approve the 5.7 acres of CS zoning as amended without access to 108th Street.

There was brief discussion concerning the floodplain determination for the subject area. Mr. Gardner advised that the Staff wants the south access point to be a secondary access for small trucks primarily and not the larger trucks that would come in from the north. Mr. Norman stated that if the Commission agrees to that recommendation they would redesign the entrance working with the Staff.

Commissioner Rice stated that he was very familiar with this area and felt that the proposal is an excellent treatment of the area.

Instruments Submitted: 11 Photographs (Exhibit "G-1")
Letter from a Property Owner (Exhibit "G-2")
Letter from Security Bank (Exhibit "G-3")
Letter from 12 Property Owners (Exhibit "G-4")

TMAPC Action: 6 members present

On MOTION of BECKSTROM, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS at the northwest corner for 5.7 acres:

LEGAL PER NOTICE

Z-5967:

Lot 3, Block 1, Valley Glen South, an Addition to Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof, Less beginning at the Northwest Corner; thence due East 90 feet; thence South 34°-54'-13" West a distance of 157.27 feet; thence North 00°-00'-05" West a distance of 128.98 feet to the point of beginning, containing 4.07 acres, more or less; AND

part of the NW/4 of the NE/4 described as beginning at the Southwest Corner of Lot 3, Block 1, Valley Glen South; thence South 18°-15'-22" West a distance of 430.44 feet; thence due East 830.01 feet; thence due North 408.77 feet; thence due West 695.17 feet to the point of beginning, in Section 19, Township 19 North, Range 14 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof, containing 7.16 acres, more or less, LESS and EXCEPT the South 200 feet thereof.

LEGAL PER PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
To be furnished by the applicant.

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

Z-5967 and PUD #367 (continued)

Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for Planned Unit Development as recommended by the Staff.

PUD #367:

Lot 3, Block 1, Valley Glen South, an Addition in Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof, LESS beginning at the Northwest Corner; thence due East 90 feet; thence South $34^{\circ}-54'-13''$ West a distance of 157.27 feet; thence North $00^{\circ}-00'-05''$ West a distance of 128.98 feet to the point of beginning, containing 4.07 acres, more or less, AND

part of the NW/4 of the NE/4 described as beginning at the Southwest Corner of Lot 3, Block 1, Valley Glen South; thence South $18^{\circ}-15'-22''$ West a distance of 430.44 feet; thence due East 830.01 feet; thence due North 408.77 feet; thence due West 695.17 feet to the point of beginning, in Section 19, Township 19 North, Range 14 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof, containing 7.16 acres, more or less.

Application No. CZ-110 Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: Miller, Jeffers (Coyote Hills, Inc.) Proposed Zoning: RS
Location: Between West 41st Street & Coyote Trail (Southeast of Discoveryland)

Date of Application: May 15, 1984
Date of Hearing: June 27, 1984
Size of Tract: 482.5 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: John Sheridan
Address: Rt. 2, Box 40, Haskell, Oklahoma - 74436 Phone: Unknown

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: CZ-110

The District 23 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates a part of the subject property Rural Residential. The majority of the tract is not covered by an adopted Comprehensive Plan.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning District", the requested RS District is in accordance on that portion covered by the Plan Map. On that portion not covered by a Plan the Development Guidelines would identify as being a subdistrict and suitable for zoning no greater than RS.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis -- The subject tract is approximately 482.5 acres in size and located between 41st Street South and 51st Street South just east of Coyote Trail. It is wooded, rolling, vacant and zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis -- The tract is abutted on all sides by mostly vacant land containing scattered single-family dwellings and mobile homes, the majority of which front and have access to 41st and 51st Streets and Coyote Trail. This land is mostly zoned AG and RE.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary -- Past zoning actions have established residential densities to no greater density than RE.

Conclusion -- Based upon Comprehensive Plan and Development Guideline designation, the physical facts of hilly topography and lack of public sewer facilities, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of RE zoning and DENIAL of RS.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Sheridan represented the applicant and stated he was in concurrence with the Staff Recommendation. He also stated that the owner of the property proposes to come back to the Planning Commission with a PUD proposal for the property.

Protestants: Richard Jones Address: Rt. 3, Box 22-J, Haskell, Ok.

Protestant's Comments:

Mr. Richard Jones stated he was opposed to RS zoning as requested or RE zoning as recommended by the Staff. He stated that the reason for his objection is because the water and sewer facilities are inadequate in the area. He also stated that there is not adequate fire and police protection in the area.

Application No. CZ-110 (continued)

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Sheridan advised that the applicant plans to bring in an 8" water line to serve the property which would satisfy part of the protestant's concern.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RE:

The East-Half of the Northeast Quarter (E/2 NE/4) and all that part of the E/2 SE/4 lying East of the Coyote Trail, in Section 25, Township 19 North, Range 10 East, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, LESS and EXCEPT the following described property to wit: All that part of the S/2 S/2 S/2 E/2 NE/4 and the NE/4 SE/4 lying North and East of the Coyote Trail, in Section 25, Township 19 North, Range 10 East, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof, containing 160 acres, more or less.

The Northwest Quarter (NW/4) and the West-Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (W/2 SW/4 SW/4 NE/4, and the West-Half of the East-Half of the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (W/2 E/2 SW/4 SW/4 NE/4), all in Section 30, Township 19 North, Range 11 East, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof and the Southwest Quarter (SW/4) LESS the E/2 SE/4 SE/4 SW/4, Section 30, Township 19 North, Range 11 East, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof, containing 322.5 acres, more or less.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #340-1

Staff Recommendation -- Minor Amendment:

The subject tract is located just north of the northeast corner of Allegheny Avenue and South Yale Avenue, at 35th Street South. It is .93 acres in size, zoned RM-1 and has been approved under the PUD for a one-story office building. It has received Detail Site Plan approval and now the applicant wishes to extend the eaves and a planter into the setback 1-foot farther than allowed by the Code. The allowable projection by the Code is 2 feet over setback lines; this application is for 3 feet over the building line for overhang and planter on the west side (Yale frontage) and 3 feet overhang for eave only on the east side (rear yard).

The Staff can support this as being minor and recommends APPROVAL, subject to the elevations submitted.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to approve the minor amendment to permit the overhang and planter.

PUD #159-7

Staff Recommendation -- Minor Amendment:

The subject tract is located just south of the southeast corner of 33rd West Avenue and 61st Street South. It is one of three tracts approved for multifamily use and has received Detail Site Plan approval. The applicant is now requesting to be allowed to convert two residential units into a childrens day care center.

The Staff has reviewed the request and find that the proposed location of the facility would be on the northern edge of the complex adjacent to a proposed commercial area and that the use is identified by the Code as a Use Unit 5 and would be allowed by exception in all residential districts. Also, the PUD Ordinance allows a certain amount of accessory nonresidential uses within a residential area.

We feel that this use is an appropriate nonresidential accessory use within a multifamily complex and that its proposed location is consistent with good land use relationships. Therefore, we recommend APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) That enrollment be restricted to children that reside in this complex only.
- (2) That the size of the center be no greater than the two residential units shown on the submitted plans.
- (3) That it be located as shown on the submitted plans.
- (4) That it be an approved day care facility with licensed instructors.

PUD #159-7 (continued)

- (5) That advertising be limited to the apartment complex identifying that it provides this service to its residents.
- (6) That its hours of operation be limited to the period from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
- (7) That signage be limited to one door sign no more than 6 square feet of display surface area in size and non-illuminated.
- (8) That all plans and text submitted by the applicant be made a condition of approval.

Mayor Young asked why there was a limitation on the hours of operation and Mr. Compton advised that the applicant is in concurrence with these hours and by not limiting it to the customary working hours may conflict with the residential use of the apartment complex.

Vanessa Parris, 6339 South 33rd West Avenue, apartment manager of Overlook Apartments, stated that she supports the day care facility to have supervision of children in the complex who are unattended. This service would also cut down on vandalism and would promote the apartment complex.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Higgins, Kempe, Rice, Woodard, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Draughon, Flick, Hinkle, C. Young, "absent") to approve the minor amendment to permit a day care center.

Sooner Addition (3314) North side of East 66th Street North, East of North
129th East Avenue (RMH)

Request from Phil Frazier to set a rehearing for preliminary plat which was denied. Rehearing date was requested for July 18, 1984, after notification of abutting landowners and other interested parties and agencies.

Due to a lack of quorum, the Commission continued consideration of this item to Wednesday, July 11, 1984, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

Date Approved July 18, 1984

[Signature]
Chairman

ATTEST:

[Signature]
Secretary