

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1536
Wednesday, January 2, 1985, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Connery Draughon Higgins, 2nd Vice- Chairman Kempe, Chairman Paddock, Secretary Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman Woodard	VanFossen Rice Young	Compton Frank Gardner Holwell Malone	Linker, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Monday, December 31, 1984, at 2:08 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Cherry Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no, "abstentions"; VanFossen, Rice, Young, "absent") to APPROVE the Minutes of December 12, 1984 (No. 1534), as amended: Page 2, first sentence under Discussion should read "Mr. Connery advised he would abstain from voting as he did not feel that a 10-minute presentation gave him enough information for casting a vote" instead of "Mr. Connelly".

On MOTION of CONNERY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-1 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, "abstaining"; VanFossen, Rice, Young, "absent") to APPROVE the Minutes of December 19, 1984 (No. 1535), as amended: Page 7, "For Ratification of Prior Approval" the vote should read "9-0-1" with Wilson "abstaining".

Committee Reports:

Rules and Regulations Committee:

Mr. Paddock advised the Rules and Regulations Committee had a meeting prior to the Planning Commission meeting to continue updating the Commission's Rules and Procedures and Code of Ethics and would continue its meeting immediately after the Planning Commission meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Compton presented an amendment to the Major Street and Highway Plan concerning the Riverside Corridor for consideration by the Planning Commission. He advised these amendments had been approved "in part" by both the City and County Commissions with the following changes being approved by the City Commission on December 7, and by the County Commission on December 18:

- (A) Deletion of the "expressway" designation on the Riverside Corridor from its intersection with I-44 south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to its intersection with the Creek Expressway at approximately 96th Street and South Delaware Avenue;
- (B) The designation of "parkway" was placed on the same segment; and
- (C) The Parkway Standards were adopted except the word "minimum" was deleted from the right-of-way width.

Mr. Compton noted that both segments of the Riverside Corridor, the northern segment (Skelly Drive (I-44) to Denver Avenue), and the southern segment (96th Street and South Delaware Avenue to 131st Street and South Memorial Avenue) have been returned to the Planning Commission for readvertisement and additional study.

He informed that the northern segment has been advertised for a series of designations and cross-section standards to give all concerned the flexibility for making decisions. He further informed that Staff recommends a two to four-week continuance on this segment in order to allow the TMATS Policy Committee and the Mayor's Task Force on Riverside Drive the opportunity to review and comment and informed Staff is concerned that an interim right-of-way width would be put in place until the Task Force has completed its analysis and a final decision has been made on the right-of-way width. He also informed Staff is concerned that an adequate right-of-way width would be utilized if development occurs prior to the final decision but advised the right-of-way issue could be further continued to the next hearing.

Mr. Compton informed Legal was uncertain the southern segment of Riverside had been properly advertised the first time, so it was readvertised and is now ready for action by the Planning Commission. It has been advertised to be designated, as "Parkway", from approximately 96th Street and South Delaware south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to 131st Street and then east to the intersection of 131st Street and South Memorial Drive. He informed Staff recommends approval of this alignment, but advised, for the Commission's information, that 121st Street is a designated primary arterial with a proposed bridge across the Arkansas River to the west bank and this would appear to be a more appropriate termination of the future Riverside Parkway.

PUBLIC HEARING (Cont'd)

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends continuance of the Public Hearing concerning the northern segment of the Riverside Corridor (Denver Avenue to Skelly Drive) until January 30 and recommends approval of the designation of the southern segment of the Riverside Corridor (96th Street and Delaware to 121st Street or 131st and Memorial Drive) as "Parkway".

TMAPC Action: 7 Members Present -- Items 6 (a) & (b) of the Agenda
(Northern segment Riverside)

On Motion of CONNERY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Rice, VanFossen, Young "absent") to continue consideration of items (a) and (b) above until Wednesday, January 30, 1985, in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Comments and Discussion -- Item 6(c) of the Agenda (Southern segment Riverside)

Ms. Higgins questioned if the suggested change for the termination of the parkway designation at 121st Street rather than 131st Street had been presented to the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee Policy Committee. Mr. Compton advised this had not been presented to the Policy Committee but informed Staff felt the committee would be in favor of this change. He advised this could be continued until after the Policy meeting on January 10. Ms. Higgins informed she could not vote without some reason for this change.

Ms. Wilson informed the Transportation Policy Committee had unanimously voted for the 131st Street recommendation and she advised she felt this item should be continued.

Ms. Higgins requested that the Policies and Procedures Advisory Board have someone present at the January 30 meeting or that a letter be sent to the Planning Commission as to what action the Board recommends. Chairman Kempe informed she would attend the TMATS meeting on January 10 and would report its recommendation to the Planning Commission.

TMAPC Action: 7 Members Present -- Item 6(c) of the Agenda
(Southern segment Riverside)

On Motion of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Rice, VanFossen, Young "absent") to continue consideration of item (c) above until Wednesday, January 30, 1985, in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Final Approval and Release:

Pecan Tree Park (PUD 278) (3193) SW Cr. E. 55th & S. Lewis (OL)

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

On Motion of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Rice, VanFossen, Young "absent") to APPROVE the Final Plat of Pecan Tree Park (PUD #278) (3193) and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 267-2

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment - 30' Tall Pole Sign

The Valley South Shopping Center is located at the southeast corner of the intersection of South Sheridan and East 101st Street with a Texaco Service Station being located in the northwest corner of this PUD at the street intersection. The service station includes gasoline sales, food sales and a car wash. The car wash was approved as a part of the PUD as a recent minor amendment. PUD 267 was approved by the TMAPC on November 18, 1981 and by the City Commission on December 15, 1981. The applicant is requesting a 30 foot tall sign which will be located at the corner. The approved Detail Site Plan indicated one 8 foot x 10 foot ground sign to be proposed at this location. The "Sign Standards" approved for the PUD limit ground signs to two (2) in number on each arterial with a maximum height of 16 ft. and a maximum area of 180 sq. ft. — the proposed sign has a display area of 176 sq. ft. which complies with the PUD. The PUD restricts the maximum height of buildings within the development to 26 feet for the south 300 feet of the west 400 feet, and 20 feet for the remainder of the site.

Directly across the intersection, at the northeast corner, PUD 339 was approved by the TMAPC on September 28, 1983. A condition of approval requested by that applicant, and granted at the TMAPC meeting, was approval for a 30-foot tall pole sign at the corner. However, recognizing the nature of the Valley South development, Staff cannot recommend approval of a sign that exceeds the maximum height of buildings within the center.

Therefore, Staff recommends DENIAL of the request as submitted, but APPROVAL of a sign that would not exceed 26 feet in height with a display area not greater than 176 square feet.

PUD 267-2 (Cont'd)

NOTE: The Staff notified the abutting property owners of this particular request, although, the basic nature of the request is confirmed to be minor by this review.

Staff Comments:

Mr. Frank informed this location had been "field-checked" and it was determined that the 30' sign currently in place, was visible from the residential area on the eastern center boundary and on the south side of 101st. The sign is visible from two rear yards. The sign is also slightly visible from the residential area at the southwest corner of the shopping center, although, not as visible as from the other corner. The sign cannot be seen from the rear yards of the properties behind McCartney's because of the 26' height of the buildings. In regard to the question raised in the previous hearing about the number of signs that would be permitted along the arterial street, the approved PUD text allowed two identification signs on each arterial street frontage. One sign currently exists on each arterial frontage.

Applicant Comments:

Mr. Bob Bergman, P. O. Box 2420, Tulsa, representative for Texaco Inc., informed that Texaco had no objection to reducing the height of the sign from 30' to 26'.

Other Comments

Mr. Connery asked Mr. Bergman if he had any objections to the Staff Recommendation and Mr. Bergman informed he had no objections.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On Motion of CONNERY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Rice, VanFossen, Young "absent") to APPROVE the Staff Recommendation for a 26' sign with a display area not greater than 176 square feet.

PUD 351 (Leake-Gish)

Staff Recommendation - Detail Site Plan Review and Detail Landscape Plan

The subject tract is approximately 1-acre in gross area and located on the east side Harvard Avenue approximately 200 feet north of 45th Street South. It is vacant, has underlying zoning of OL and the applicant has requested review and approval of the proposed Detail Site Plan and Detail Landscape Plan.

The proposed office building is two stories (42 feet) tall. The TMAPC and City Commission approval addressed the height question and concern for privacy in adjacent RS-1 zoned neighborhoods to the south and east. The TMAPC conditioned its approval on submission of elevation plans for south side windows above the first floor showing

"PUD 351 (Leake-Gish) (Cont'd)

south and east. The TMAPC conditioned its approval on submission of elevation plans for south side windows above the first floor showing modifications for privacy, and the City Commission further required similar window treatment for windows on the east side above the first floor. Elevations submitted by the applicant show windows on these elevations with the bottom half blanked out by brick facing. The dimension from floor level to the bottom of these windows is indicated by the applicant to be 6 feet. This proposed height addresses the concern and need for privacy treatment to these windows (a person working at a desk would not have a view of the neighboring properties but would have benefit of natural light). The applicant is also indicating on the Plan that an 8-foot screening fence will be installed on the south and east sides of the tract. The 8-foot fence exceeds the screening fence height requirements by 2 feet. The Detail Site Plan indicates that the building, parking area, and ingress and egress are an extremely tight fit on the tract. The two access drives are proposed to be 10 feet wide and should be signed "ENTRANCE ONLY" and "EXIT ONLY" in addition to the parking lot having directional signs for internal circulation if this layout is approved. An alternate layout has been prepared by the TMAPC Staff which provides 36 spaces in front of the building (rather than 30 spaces as proposed by the applicant) and eliminates the problems with directional flows and narrow circulation lanes. The Staff recommends that the alternate parking layout be a condition of approval of the Detail Site Plan. The proposed and recommended parking layout, and access points onto Harvard Avenue, are being reviewed by the Traffic Engineering Department at the drafting of this Staff Recommendation for its input.

The Staff has also reviewed the applicant's Detail Landscape Plan and finds it to be in accordance and consistent with the conditions of approval of the PUD. The alternate recommended parking layout also meets the landscape footage requirements and actually provides slightly increased landscaped areas and increased size to the landscapable areas at various locations within the project. This would allow the treatment to be heavier in said areas for trees and shrubbery, and should result in a more improved appearance for the project. Landscape treatment is proposed for the internal area of the project, plus on the right-of-way. Approximately 3,750 square feet of space is proposed for the internal project areas, plus 2,240 square feet on the street right-of-way.

The Staff has completed review of the applicant's Detail Site Plan, Detail Landscape Plan, underlying zoning, past PUD approvals, and finds these proposals if modified per Staff Recommendation to be:

- (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
- (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the area;
- (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; and
- (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance.

PUD 351 (Leake-Gish) (Cont'd)

A great deal of concern was expressed at the public hearing on the PUD about drainage on and off the site. In conjunction with the PUD review and approval process, a hydrological investigation was prepared by a private engineering firm and submitted for review as Exhibit "A-3". The Staff recommends that the proposed development be further reviewed for drainage considerations at this time in conjunction with the approval process for the Detail Site Plan by the City Engineering Department prior to issuance of a Building Permit for compliance with all applicable City Codes and as an added safeguard to prevent future problems for adjacent properties. Stormwater management must address the requirement for on-site detention as made by the Technical Advisory Committee.

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

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

Land Area (Gross):	1 Acre/43,750 square feet
(Net):	.86 acre/37,500 square feet

	<u>APPROVED/PUD</u>	<u>SUBMITTED</u>
Permitted Uses:	As permitted by right in an OL District.	As permitted by right in an OL District.
Maximum Floor Area:	17,500 sq. ft.	17,500 sq. ft.
Floor Area Ratio:	.4	.4
Maximum Building Height:	42 ft./2 stories	42 ft./2 stories
Maximum Building Setbacks:		
From Centerline of Harvard Avenue	165 ft.	165 ft.
From North Boundary	12 ft.	12 ft. & 6 in.
From East Boundary	85 ft.	85 ft.
From South Boundary	12 ft.	12 ft.
Off-Street Parking:	1 space per 300 square feet.	1 space per 300 square feet.

PUD 351 (Leake-Gish) (Cont'd)

No. of Parking Spaces:		
Total	59 spaces	65 spaces*
Standard Spaces	-0-	59 spaces
Handicapped	-0-	3 spaces
Compact	-0-	3 spaces
Minimum Landscape Open Space:	10% of net area	10% of net area
Other Bulk and Area Requirements:	As required in an OL District.	As required in an OL District.

- * Additional parking provided if the alternate parking layout prepared by the TMAPC Staff is approved.
- (3) Trash storage areas and utility areas be screened from the public view.
 - (4) That signs shall comply with the requirements of the PUD Ordinance and that the project be limited to one (1) monument sign on Harvard not exceeding 12 feet in height, 32 square feet in display surface area, and illumination, if any, shall be by constant light.
 - (5) That all lighting on the building and mounted on poles throughout the parking lot be so constructed as to direct the light downward and away from abutting residential areas.
 - (6) An 8-foot tall screening fence be constructed on the south and east boundaries.
 - (7) That second floor windows on the south and east elevations, measured from the second floor level to the bottom of said windows, be not less than 6 feet unless the Commission feels they should be higher and such condition does not impair the design of the building.
 - (8) That landscaping be installed in accordance with the submitted Detail Landscape Plan.
 - (9) That the parking layout be in accordance with the recommended parking layout as prepared by the TMAPC Staff and pending review by the Traffic Engineering Department of the City, or such other parking and access layout as would meet the approval of the Traffic Engineer and conditions of the PUD.
 - (10) That the City Engineer review the previously submitted Hydrology Plans for compliance with the City Codes for management and handling of runoff as it effects adjacent properties.

PUD 351 (Leake-Gish) (Cont'd)

(11) 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.

Staff Comments:

Mr. Gardner informed the Commission needs to address the detail of the windows. The windows measure about 5 1/2' above floor level but item (7) of the Staff Recommendation proposed they be not less than 6' above the floor; thus there would appear to be a problem.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Adrian Smith, applicant, informed the windows are 5 1/2' above the floor, but he had no problem with the Staff Recommendation for a height of 6' above the floor.

Ms. Higgins informed she thinks 5 1/2' is close enough.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On Motion of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Rice, VanFossen, Young "absent") to APPROVE the Staff Recommendation for PUD #351, Detail Site Plan Review and Detail Landscape Plan and that condition #7 be amended to state that the second floor windows "be not less than 5 1/2'" rather than 6' from floor level on the south and east elevations above the first floor.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Date Approved January 16, 1985

Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

PBPaddock
Secretary

