

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1558
Wednesday, June 5, 1985, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes Connery Draughon Higgins, 2nd Vice- Chairman Kempe, Chairman Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman Woodard	Harris Paddock VanFossen Young	Compton Frank Gardner Holwell	Jackere, Legal Counsel Green, Protective Inspections Linker, Legal Counsel Williams/Haye Stormwater Mgmt.

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, June 4, 1985, at 12:01 p.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 1:36 p.m.

MINUTES:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of May 22, 1985, meeting No. 1556.

REPORTS:

Director's Report:

Mr. Compton informed that a public forum in regard to the proposed closing of Fire Station #39 in north Tulsa, would be held at 6:30 p.m. today in the City Commission Room and invited members of the Planning Commission to attend. He advised that the purpose of the forum is to receive input from area residents which will enable Staff to make a recommendation to the City.

Ms. Wilson asked if the results of the forum would come to the TMAPC or go directly to the City. Mr. Compton informed it would go directly to the City, but it might be determined that an update of the Fire Protection Plan is needed and then it would go through the public hearing process and come before the TMAPC.

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS FOR THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PERTAINING TO THE DRILLING, MINING AND PRODUCTION OF OIL AND GAS WITHIN PLATTED AND RECORDED SUBDIVISIONS LYING IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF TULSA COUNTY

WHEREAS, the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did on the 30th day of August 1978, adopt a set of regulations governing the subdivision of land within the Tulsa Metropolitan Area; and,

WHEREAS, on the 13th day of May 1985, the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission did call a Public Hearing for the 29th day of May 1985, and did give notice thereof, for the purpose of considering the adoption of a resolution amending the Subdivision Regulations pertaining to the drilling, mining and production of oil and gas within platted and recorded subdivisions which are located in the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County; and

WHEREAS, said Public Hearing was held on May 29, 1985; and,

WHEREAS, after public hearing and upon due study and deliberation, it was deemed to be in the public interest and in keeping with the purposes of the Planning Commission as set forth in Title 19, Oklahoma Statutes, Section 863.1 et. sq. to adopt a resolution amending the Subdivision Regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Subdivision Regulations of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area be and the same are hereby amended to read as follows, to wit:

PAGE 11:

Section 3.3.3 Preliminary Plat

3.3.3(h) The location of every oil or gas well, either existing, active or inactive wells, plugged, unplugged or abandoned wells, as shown by the records of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission and by such records as may be on file with the Planning Commission.

The location of any planned future well sites in the unincorporated areas of the County as provided for in Section 4.10.2 of these regulations.

PAGE 20:

SECTION 4. PLANNING AND DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

RESOLUTION NO. 1558:609 (CONT'D)

Section 4.10 Oil and Gas Extraction Sites - Residential
Subdivisions

1. Existing Operative/Inoperative Wells:
 - a. shall be indicated on the face of the plat;
 - b. all abandoned, inactive wells shall be properly plugged;
 - c. residences shall be setback 200 feet or more from any existing well unless said well is plugged, or unless the Board of Adjustment has reduced the setback requirement; and
 - d. access shall be provided and so indicated on the face of the plat for all unplugged wells for the purpose of maintenance and rework.
2. Planned Well Sites - Unincorporated Areas of the County:
 - a. Well sites shall not be permitted within residential subdivisions of less than 10 acres.
 - b. If the developer owns both the surface rights and all mineral rights he may designate future well sites, if there are no existing oil, gas or mineral leases of record.
 - c. If the developer does not own all the mineral rights, or there are recorded oil and gas leases on the subject property, written notice must be sent to all parties who have an oil, gas, or mineral interest or recorded oil or gas lease, as shown by the records of the Tulsa County Clerk. Said notice shall inform of the intent to subdivide said property.
 - d. Interested parties shall have 60 days from receipt of the notice to respond. Said response shall be in writing to both the developer and TMAPC of the intent to drill for oil or gas in the future.
 - e. The developer and owners of leases or owners of mineral interests have an additional 120 days to agree upon the location of the well sites.
 - f. If the parties cannot agree on the location of the well sites, the TMAPC, after Public Hearing, shall select the well sites.

RESOLUTION NO. 1558:609 (CONT'D)

- g. All well sites shall be indicated on the face of the plat, as well as in the Restrictive Covenants.
- h. Standards for location of well sites:
 - (1) Two (2) acres or less in size for each well site.
 - (2) Access shall be provided to the site for purposes of maintenance and service.
 - (3) There shall be no more than one well site within the boundaries of the plat for each twenty (20) acres of land covered by the plat.
 - (4) The County Board of Adjustment must approve the methods of drilling prior to the commencement of drilling operations.
 - (5) Standards for drilling are included in the Tulsa County Zoning Code, Sections 340, 440 and 1224(a).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, upon adoption and approval hereof by the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, this Resolution be certified to the City Commission of the City of Tulsa and the Board of Commissioners of the County of Tulsa for approval and thereafter that it be filed as a public record in the Office of the County Clerk of Tulsa County.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of June, 1985, by a majority of the full membership of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission including its ex officio members, as provided by law.

Staff Comments:

Mr. Gardner informed that the TMAPC approved the Subdivision Regulations at its hearing on May 29, Legal Counsel reviewed the Resolution and it is ready for approval by the Commission.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **ADOPT** the Resolution amending the Subdivision Regulations for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area pertaining to the Drilling, Mining and Production of Oil and Gas within Platted and Recorded Subdivisions Lying in the Unincorporated Areas of Tulsa County.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Preliminary Plat Approval:

Eleven Trade Center (PUD #392) (594) NW/c E. 11th & S. 123rd E. Ave. (CS)

The Staff presented this plat to the TAC with the applicant represented by Joe Donelson.

Traffic Engineering could not attend the meeting, but advised that the access locations were being worked out with the department. Recommendations as written are satisfactory.

This plat has a sketch plat approval, subject to conditions. A copy of the minutes of the TAC meeting of 3/14/85 was provided, with Staff comments as applicable.

Staff and TAC recommended approval of the preliminary plat of Eleven Trade Center, subject to conditions.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Plat of Eleven Trade Center (PUD #392) (594), as recommended by Staff, subject to the following conditions:

1. All conditions of PUD #392 shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat. Include PUD approval date and references to Section 1100-1170 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
2. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property and/or lot lines.
3. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owner of the lot(s).
4. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
5. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer. (Fee-in-lieu acceptable for all drainage to 11th Street; onsite detention required for runoff to north.)

Eleven Trade Center (PUD #392) (594) (cont'd)

6. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by City Commission.
7. Show PUD #392 on face of plat. Show building lines as per PUD (25' on west, 35' on north).
8. Covenants:
 - Section I-1.a - (Should this include "water mains" also?)
 - Section II - Include City Commission date and ordinance number when available.
 - Section II-(8) is subject to Traffic Engineer's approval.
 - Section II-(10) References to "Homeowners" should probably be changed to just "owners" since this is commercial and should not refer to homes or dwelling units.
9. Size of plat should be acceptable to County Clerk (24" x 36" max.) (Not a condition for approval of plat; only for applicant's information.)
10. Limits of Access shall be shown on the plat as approved by City and/or Traffic Engineer. Include applicable language in covenants. (Relocate west access. Middle Access easement required for middle access.) Provide Traffic Engineer with locations of accesses on south side of 11th Street.
11. The underlying plat(s) shall be properly vacated in accordance with current legal practices. (Not a condition for approval of this plat, but this is recommended to avoid clouded title in the future.)
12. The PUD Ordinance shall be published before final plat is released.
13. A "letter of assurance regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6(5) of Subdivision Regulations.)
14. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

The Staff presented the plat to the TAC with the applicant not represented.

Staff advised that collector streets in this section have been established in three of the four quarter sections. 86th Street was stubbed west in the center of the section for extension into the northwest quarter. Since this plat does not show a collector, an alternate location was discussed. Staff suggested two alternates:

- (a) Show 86th Street on this plat with 60' of right-of-way and stub to the east to align with stub from Chimney Hills, or
- (b) Alternate routing through the NW/4 of the property, subject to approval by the City and Traffic Engineering. If an alternate routing is agreeable, the adjacent owner should be made aware of this requirement before he develops his land. (Staff noted that adjacent owners get a written notice of platting. Even if there is no response, if the collector is to be located in that area, that owner will be advised by copy of the minutes of the TMAPC and/or TAC for this information.)

Traffic Engineering was not at the meeting, but the applicant had discussed the plat with that department and there was no objection to the plat street layout as submitted. However, in discussion at the TAC and reviewing the established collectors in this mile section, it was felt that this plat comes closer to the proposed alignment for the collector street. The majority of those present though it in the best interest of the public and for traffic and utility circulation, that we should require a collector street in the general vicinity of 86th Street. Since this will require redesign of the plat, only a SKETCH PLAT will be recommended. Also, if there is to be a divided entry at Sheridan, any landscaped median will require maintenance by homeowners group and be shown on the plat as a "Reserve".

Staff advised the Commission that a revised plat was provided TAC members with a stub to the north for access to future development. The redesign was acceptable and that is the plat before the Commission this date for preliminary approval.

The Staff and TAC recommended approval of the PRELIMINARY PLAT of Huntington Place, subject to conditions.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Plat of Huntington Place (1483), as recommended by Staff, subject to the following conditions:

Huntington Place (1483) (cont'd)

1. Staff has no objection to the 15' building lines as shown, since they will not conflict with adjacent lots. Board of Adjustment approval will be required and final plat shall not be released until such approval is granted.
2. Covenants: Correct miscellaneous typographical errors, plus:
 - Section I, B-4 .. line left out
 - Section I, C .. It should be made clear that the 3' area for "fence easement" is also a utility easement.
 - Section III, 1st paragraph: ..
 - This is not a PUD so the City may not need to be included in amendments to the private restrictions. This paragraph should be modified as needed.
3. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property and/or lot lines.
4. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
5. This property is located within the area served by the Haikey Creek Sewage Treatment Plant and will require a statement concerning sewer availability within the covenants.
6. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
7. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer. Onsite detention for drainage in Fry Ditch II Basin; fees-in-lieu of for Vensel Creek Basin.
8. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the City Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by City Commission.
9. Street names shall be approved by City Engineer. Show on plat as required.

Huntington Place (1483) (cont'd)

10. All curve data shall be shown on final plat where applicable (including corner radii).
11. Limits of Access shall be shown on the plat as approved by City and/or Traffic Engineer.
12. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineering during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)
13. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City/County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
14. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
15. A Corporation Commission letter (or Certificate of Non-Development) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged.)
16. A "letter of assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6(5) of Subdivision Regulations.)
17. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

FINAL APPROVAL AND RELEASE:

West Highlands Center (382) SW/c 61st & S. Union Ave. (CS)

Staff informed that all release letters have been received and recommended final approval and release of plat on West Highlands Center (382).

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the final plat of West Highlands Center (382) and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

CHANGE OF ACCESS ON RECORDED PLAT:

Riverbend (1883) SW/c 81st and South Lewis

(CS)

Staff informed that new shopping center construction does not require the number of platted access points. This application is to reduce and relocate access from seven points to four points, a net reduction of three points. Staff and Traffic Engineer recommended approval of change of access on Riverbend (1883).

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the change of access on **Riverbend (1883)**, as recommended by Staff.

WAIVER OF PLAT:

BOA 13583 (unplatted) (1894) SW/c E. 27th & S. 107th E. Avenue (RS-3)

This is a request to waive plat on a Board of Adjustment application approved for a day care center in Columbus Elementary School. Since existing school facilities will be used and nothing will change, Staff recommends waiver of plat requirement.

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the waiver of plat on **BOA (13583) (unplatted) (1894)**, as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLITS:

Lot Split for Discussion:

L-16237-A Tampa (3104) N. of NW/c of I-244 & Garnett Rd. (CS)

In the opinion of the Staff the lot split listed meets the subdivision and zoning regulations, but since the lot(s) may be irregular in shape, notice has been given to the abutting owner(s) so that property owners in the area may be aware of the application. (Auth: PC Meeting #1505, page 1; 5/9/84) Approval is recommended. Staff advised that the only change from the previous split is that the motel access had been switched from the south side to the north side of the tract.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** lot split **L-16237-A Tampa (3104)**, as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLIT FOR WAIVER:

L-16447-48 Schueller (1993) West of NW/c 41st and S. Lewis (RS-1)

The applicant was represented at the TAC by Terry Roller and Jack Arnold.

This is a request to split Lots 6 and 7, Royal Oak Heights, creating a total of seven lots. The existing house sits across the platted lot line and will remain. The split would possibly be better situated to a plat, but since there is no need for public streets to serve just this development, there was no objection to the concept. It was recommended that the "access handles" be eliminated and a private street provided, including a "mutual access and utility" easement. This will eliminate a battery of water meters at 41st Street under driveway paving. Water and sewer extensions, as well as other utilities, will be required.

The proposed lots far exceed the minimum of 13,500 sq. ft., the smallest being 18,300 sq. ft. and the largest being 28,320 sq. ft. These lots will have access to 41st Street by the private driveway. Applicant was advised of the minimum width of right-of-way required on 41st Street in accordance with the Street Plan. Waiver of this minimum has not been requested.

Since the interior lots do not have a minimum of 30' of frontage on 41st Street, Board of Adjustment approval will be required. Staff and TAC recommended approval subject to conditions.

Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Wilson noted that this case was previously heard by the TMAPC, with 10-12 people present to protest the drainage. Mr. Linker advised that the note from the Engineering Dept. advises that it does not have the jurisdiction to require onsite detention, but the Planning Commission may require it, if it feels it is necessary. Mr. Wilmoth asked what would happen if the Engineering Dept. would not require onsite detention and Mr. Linker advised that Engineering states that onsite detention is advisable, but could not make it a condition for approval, but that the TMAPC could word its condition so as to request that it be reviewed by Engineering at the building permit stage. Mr. Gardner informed that the regulations require that if an area is five acres or more, onsite detention could be required, but it is conditional on the building permit stage of development.

Ms. Higgins suggested that a comment be entered in the record that there are presently ongoing plans in regard to drainage to make certain there is an expansion of existing sewer and any problems in regard to drainage would be worked out in the building permit stage. Mr. Draughon informed he would accept this amendment to the motion. Mr. Connery advised that this application appears to present

L-16447-48 Schueller (1993)

problems in regard to distribution of water in the watershed and objected to the statement that only two lots would be affected.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughton, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** lot split **L-16447-48 Schueller (1993)** as recommended by Staff, subject to the following conditions, including an added condition, (d) "Subject to detention provided it is required by City Engineering at time of issuance of building permit".

- (a) Board of Adjustment approval of lot frontages on a private street.
- (b) Utility extensions and/or easements required for service, including mutual access and utility easement, sewer and water main extension; perimeter easments (11' or 17-1/2').
- (c) Drainage Plan subject to approval of City Engineer.

NOTE: City Engineer made the following comment for the record, but was not a condition of approval. "Onsite detention should be provided; however, current criteria would exempt this development from onsite detention since zoning is not changing. However, it is the feeling of the Engineering Dept. that this development may cause increased runoff on the adjacent properties which may increase this developer's liability."

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-16443 (102) Craddock	L-16456 (2783) Cousins
L-16445 (192) Wall	L-16458 (794) Guaranty
L-16449 (503) Barnes	L-16459 (283) Dodson
L-16451 (404) Zumwalt	L-16460 (1683) Dodson
L-16453 (2093) Mann	L-16461 (1292) Pierce/Hyland
L-16454 (1492) McGraw	L-16462 (2993) Fulton
L-16455 (2393) Landmark	L-16463 (2293) Warren

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughton, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **RATIFY** the approved lots splits listed above.

Application No. PUD #396

Present Zoning: (RE)

Applicant: Ewing

Location: NE corner of 211th and Sheridan

Date of Application: April 10, 1985

Date of Hearing: June 5, 1985 (cont'd from May 29, 1985)

Staff Recommendation: (Related Case CZ-130)

The subject tract is located at the northeast corner of south Sheridan Road and East 211th Street South and has a gross area of 34 acres with 2,640 feet of frontage on 211th Street and 900 feet of frontage on Sheridan Road. The applicant is proposing to construct a cluster-type mobile home park environment with two (2) clusters on both Sheridan and 211th Street. Each sub-cluster will have one point of access on the arterial street and a common parking area of 30 spaces for off-street parking. The development will consist of 40 mobile home lots and one existing single-family detached unit. The mobile home spaces will range in size from 45 feet wide x 145 feet long (6,525 sq. ft.) to 55 feet wide x 165 feet long (8,675 sq. ft.) with approximately 20 acres of common open space plus common parking areas. The site is gently rolling and drains from south to north. Existing vegetation will be preserved during development according to the PUD Text. A private sewer system will be installed utilizing a new wastewater treatment facility located partially on the site. The project will be developed in two phases: Phase I--west clusters on Sheridan; and Phase II--east clusters on 211th Street. Other public utilities are available at the site and water will be supplied by the Okmulgee County Water District Hector Community service area.

The site is located on the Tulsa County/Okmulgee County Line which is also the centerline of 211th Street. Underlying zoning for the tract is RE Residential Estates which would permit the requested 40 home sites providing they can be served by sewer facilities.

The Staff has reviewed the proposed PUD and finds it 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 Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #396, subject to the following conditions:

(1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

(2) Development Standards:

Land Area (Gross): 34.022 acres

Land Area (Net): 30.016 acres

Existing Zoning: RE Residential Estates

PUD #396 (cont'd)

Permitted Uses: One single-family residence and mobile home units and appropriate accessory uses as permitted by right in an RE District.

Standards for Single-Family Residence

No. of Units:	1
Minimum Land Area per Unit:	6,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Lot Size:	4,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Livability Space:	1,000 sq. ft.
Maximum Height:	Existing/1-story
Minimum Front Yard:	Existing/75 feet
Minimum Side Yard:	
One Side Yard	Existing/10 feet
Other Side Yard	Existing/5 feet
Minimum Rear Yard:	Existing/10 feet

Standards for Mobile Home Park

	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
No. of Units:	40 units	40 units
Minimum Land Area Per Unit:	26,250 sq. ft.	26,250 sq. ft.
Minimum Space Width:	45 ft.	45 ft.
Minimum Space Area:	6,500 sq. ft.	6,500 sq. ft.
Maximum Structure Height:	1-story	1-story
Minimum Livability Space Per Unit:	5,300 sq. ft.	5,300 sq. ft.
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From Centerline of Sheridan	85 ft.	85 ft.
From Centerline of 211th	85 ft.	85 ft.
From Parking Area	10 ft.	10 ft.
Side Yard:		
One Side Yard	15 ft.	15 ft.
Other Side Yard	5 ft.	5 ft.
Rear Yard:	15 ft.	15 ft.

PUD #396 (cont'd)

Minimum Parking Spaces

Per Unit:

3 spaces

3 spaces

- (3) That internal streets shall be 24 feet in width and parking areas and streets shall be paved with an all-weather, dust-free surface of asphalt or concrete.
- (4) 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.
- (5) 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 and storms.
- (6) That common park/recreational facilities (which may include trails, playgrounds, community buildings and tot-lots) shall be provided.
- (7) That a six-foot wood screening fence shall be erected and maintained on the west (Sheridan Road) and south (211th) cluster perimeters. Any non-decorative bracing shall be on the interior and the fence along the perimeters shall be set back 10 feet from the property line to allow for a 10-foot landscaping area.
- (8) That the mobile home space shall have a minimum of 100 square feet of paved patio outdoor living area.
- (9) That each mobile home space shall have an enclosed storage accessory building not less than 36 square feet, but no greater than 100 square feet.
- (10) That one sign, not to exceed four feet in height, eight feet in length and 24 square feet in display surface area may be located along the west and south perimeter at the main entrances to the park.
- (11) Subject to recommendations of the TAC, including, but not limited to, the apportioning of open space with the mobile home clusters at the time of platting.
- (12) 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 #396 (cont'd)

- (13) That a Detail Landscape Plan, including location of recreation area(s), location and design of fence, location and design of sign and landscaping along the west and south perimeters shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to the occupancy of any additional units.
- (14) 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.

Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Gardner informed that the conditions recommended by Staff are conditions researched over a period of several months of previous study for a mobile home park as opposed to a trailer park.

Ms. Wilson suggested that she would prefer concrete streets and parking areas rather than asphalt. Mr. Gardner informed that this is not a public street, but that Staff is opposed to gravel because of the dust problems.

Applicant Presentation and Other Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Ewing informed he was representing the owners of the property, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Spradling. He advised that the first phase of development would be the two clusters which face Sheridan. He asked what the principal concern was with the streets and parking areas since they would be private (item 3 of Staff's recommendation). He advised that he could understand Staff's concern about dust, etc. and suggested that there might be some other reasonable material which could be used other than asphalt or concrete and he would like to work with the County Engineer in regard to what he would recommend.

Ms. Wilson asked what type materials Mr. Ewing was considering and he advised there are some chemical applications and oil that could be used to stabilize the dust. Since there would not be high vehicle usage, he felt there would be a satisfactory material which could be used which would be less expensive than asphalt or concrete and would be congruent with that of neighboring facilities.

Mr. Carnes noted that Staff had worked to recommend a single standard as should be required for a first-class facility. Ms. Wilson noted that she was surprised by Mr. Ewing's request since he had previously informed the Commission that this would be a high-quality facility.

Mr. Ewing asked if the City would maintain the surface if it was built as recommended. Ms. Kempe advised that she didn't think the City could

PUD #396 (cont'd)

maintain the surface and Mr. Linker advised that it would be the County's responsibility.

In regard to item 7 of Staff's recommendation, he presented photos of the area and informed that there are few dwellings nearby, with the closest permanent structure located about 230' from the proposed site and the nearest mobile home located about 160' from the nearest proposed structure. He, therefore, requested that fencing not be required.

Ms. Kempe asked why a screening fence was recommended and Mr. Gardner advised that Mr. Ewing was proposing to locate six mobile homes per acre on the property, which would be increasing the intensity. He also advised that if a lot of landscaping, etc. was added to fence the area, it could take the place of the fence. If the landscaping is not present, the fence would be used to screen the area from other uses.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Ewing what he was considering in this regard and he advised that he didn't know, but advised that he would have to return for landscaping approval. Ms. Higgins asked if he would object to leaving the recommendation as currently stated, but if considerable landscaping was installed, the Commission could review it as a minor amendment to the PUD. Mr. Ewing informed that would be alright and advised that he would like to place the fence on the property line if it is required and Mr. Gardner informed that decision would have to wait until the Detail Site Plan/Detail Landscape Plan Review.

Mr. Ewing advised that he would like to insert a provision in the covenants that no outdoor storage would be permitted (Staff recommendation #9) and if a tenant needs outdoor storage, he could specifically request a storage building instead of requiring that each mobile home space have a storage accessory building. He advised that he would like to rephrase this condition to state that no outside storage of materials or vehicles would be permitted, but if an occupant needs additional storage, a building of no less than 36 square feet and no larger than 100 square feet would be located on the site. He also advised that the property owner may mow the area, thus there would be no need for individual mowers, etc. Mr. Gardner informed that the proposed lots are two to three times greater than the usual mobile home lots and anyone who rents the site could provide his own storage building.

Ms. Higgins asked if there was anything in the regulations pertaining to a standard requirement for the storage buildings and Mr. Gardner informed that Staff is considering making it a requirement of mobile home parks as a criteria for a planned mobile home community.

Mr. Carnes advised Mr. Ewing that the proposed conditions would make the development something the neighborhood would be proud of, but suggested that changing the conditions would make it a lesser development.

Interested Party:

Clem Cottum

Address: Box 968, Bixby, OK

6.05.85:1558(17)

PUD #396 (cont'd)

Mr. Cottum cited petitions he had previously presented to the Commission which opposed the increased density, the floodplain area nearby, inadequate roads available to the site and schools and sewage facilities being already over capacity. In regard to the photos presented by Mr. Ewing, Mr. Cottum advised that there are few mobile homes in the area, with only one on the east. He advised he was unaware of any mobile homes to the south and nothing to the west for at least one mile. He disagreed with density and advised that the prospect for a new bridge on Sheridan is three to five years down the road. He noted that this is not a Tulsa County road since it is on the south side of the Okmulge/Tulsa County line; it is a one-lane road to the west and there are only two bridges on the Beeline which are flooding during rainstorms, with the road being impassable to Memorial from 201st and 211th Streets. He asked if the property was going to be fenced and the dogs controlled and Ms. Kempe advised that condition #7 requires that a 6' screening fence be installed and asked Mr. Cottum if he had reviewed the suggested conditions. He advised that he had and would like to see a taller fence.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Gardner informed that the proposed site is not where it floods; the area in between it floods. He noted that of the 34 acres available for development, Mr. Ewing was only proposing to develop 10 acres and he couldn't have any more than 40 units on the site since it is zoned RE and only 40 units would be permitted.

Ms. Higgins asked if the fencing is only to be located on the front sides and was advised that is correct, with the fencing to be located on the section lot line road.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Mr. Ewing informed that he had no intention of returning to request more density and advised that there would be no discharge from the sewer system which would be approved by the County Health Department. It would include 8" sewer lines and manholes like the conventional system and that the County requirements for storm water control would be met.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted 5-2-0 (Carnes, Higgins, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Connery, Draughon, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD #396**, as recommended by Staff, but revising condition (7) to include a condition that if appropriate landscaping is provided, landscaping may be utilized in lieu of fencing.

Legal Description:

All of the South 660' of the East 1500'; and all of the South 300' of the West 1150'; and all of the North 600' of the South 900' of the West 400' all located on the Southwest Quarter of Section 14, T-16-N, R-13-E in Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

Application No. **Z-6049 and PUD #397** Present Zoning: RS-3, RD, RM-1
Applicant: Moody (6LMM Ltd.) Proposed Zoning: RD, RM-1
Location: S. side of E. 61st Street; 1/2 mile E. of Memorial

Date of Application: April 11, 1985
Date of Hearing: June 5, 1985 (cont'd to June 12, 1985)

Chairman Kempe informed that a timely request had been received to continue this case to June 12, 1985.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE consideration** of **Z-6049** and **PUD #397** until Wednesday, June 12, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

CONSIDER APPROVING A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1221.7 OF THE ZONING CODE PERTAINING TO THE USE OF OUTDOOR ADVERTISING SIGNS.

Mr. Gardner informed that the City Commission recently approved an amendment to the Zoning Code pertaining to the use of outdoor advertising signs. In administering the new amendment, it was noted that some items needed to be clarified in regard to intent and some of the original language had been inadvertently omitted. Mr. Gardner noted some of the changes which were proposed. Ray Green, of the City's Protective Inspections Dept., clarified the intent in regard to "cut-out", "extension" and "embellishment" and noted that the sign industry suggested that the word "embellishment" be deleted from items "h" and "i" and noted that the Ad Hoc Committee's intent was to limit the increased size of the sign. As long as an item is considered to be a "cut-out", it is permissible as long as it doesn't exceed 15% of the sign surface; whereas, an "embellishment" could increase the size of the sign by 15%.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the proposed amendment to Section 1221.7 of the Zoning Code, as recommended by Staff, but adding new language in items "h" and "i" and eliminating the word "embellishments".

**CONSIDERATION OF APPROVAL OF THE COOLEY CREEK MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN:
AMENDING THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO REFLECT THE MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN
AND FURTHER TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING ORDINANCES OF THE CITY
OF TULSA, OKLAHOMA.**

Applicant Presentation:

Stan Williams, Acting Director of the Stormwater Management Dept., informed that this was the second Master Drainage Plan (MDP) to be initiated by the City in the late 1970's. When completed in 1981, it was reviewed and approved as a report by the Planning Commission and was adopted by the City Commission in October 1981. It is now being considered for adoption as part of the Comprehensive Plan to make any revisions necessary since the plan was adopted in 1981 and to consider implementation of part of the plan that was not implemented in 1981--the floodway zoning. He advised that he would do a brief overview of the plan and Ruben Haye would cover the adopted plan. He advised that the area in question is about 4,000 acres, approximately the same size as the Red Fork/Cherry Creek watershed. This is a largely undeveloped watershed, as it was in 1979 when the plan was started. This area was about 40% developed in 1980 and has had a bit more development since then. The constraint is how it relates to Mingo Creek; what happens on the mainstem of Mingo Creek is one factor, with the framework of regulations and ordinances and requirements being the other factor which each drainage plan must relate to. Floodplain requirements (water courses that have 40 acres or greater tributary to them) are identified in the Plan. This floodplain is based on the regulatory flood (100-year flood). The way this is calculated is the surface conditions for the flood are based on the full potential urbanization for the watershed which results in regulations for what development should occur within the watershed and insures that the hydraulic capacity is not diminished. He defined floodway as the channel of the water course in those portions of the adjoining floodplains which is required to carry and discharge the regulatory flood. According to the policies and procedures, this floodway is zoned after it is determined by the plan and land uses are regulated; that step was not implemented in 1981. Drainage facility requirements are effected; developments, whether by public or government entities, are subject to the City of Tulsa's drainage requirements, including detention requirements (control of runoff to prevent increase of runoff rates due to urbanization). The owner may contribute to the cost of a regional or subregional detention site in lieu of constructing onsite detention. Erosion Control Ordinances attempt to prevent sedimentation and filling of storm sewers and streets during development.

The plan recognizes that most flood problems are related and in this particular basin, the floodplain and the floodway are almost identical in most cases. It has been recognized that detention facilities could be used for park and recreational facilities and, in one area, there are approximately 18 ways to do regional detention which would provide a number of different combinations to review in regard to costs and benefits. Two components have been identified for curbing the flood problem: use of floodplain regulations to prevent improper uses in floodplain areas and improvements of bridges and culverts.

PUBLIC HEARING — COOLEY CREEK MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN (cont'd)

Ruben Haye informed that when the final MDP was received, he reviewed it and some things appeared which made some alternative developments more feasible. After considerable study, it became apparent that the main problem in this area was the Mingo Valley Expressway and the apartment complexes east of Garnett Road. The MDP proposed five detention sites and proposed that some land be acquired in the heaviest developed areas to reduce the water flow. There is current funding for construction of the northwest detention site which would reduce water flow by 21%, with

construction to be underway within five years. Other proposals will be initiated as part of the plan. Mingo Valley Expressway causes water to back up into the system; the plan calls for water to flow over the expressway into the industrial complex on the west side of the expressway. The urbanized portion of the area is based on zoning maps which might change to residential, commercial or industrial.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Draughon asked if the State Engineers could be requested to enlarge the culverts near the Mingo Valley Expressway since they underestimated the need for a larger water capacity and was informed that he would have to contact senators, representatives, etc. for that information.

Ms. Wilson asked how large the Mingo Creek Basin is and was informed that it's 68 square miles.

Mr. Williams recommended that TMAPC approve the Master Drainage Plan for Cooley Creek. He advised that he would request that the TMAPC continue the floodway zoning question on Cooley Creek until July 31, but requested that interested parties be allowed to make comments on the MDP or the floodway zoning issue.

Interested Parties:

Warren Morris	Address: 2532 E. 46th Pl.
Robert Jones	3140 S. Winston
Marianne Wood	11th & 138th E. Avenue
Curtis Halstead	212221 E. Admiral Pl.
Wesley Worsham	15th & 145th E. Ave.
Ken Cox	4100 BOK Tower
Doug Dixon	N/A
Mark Foltz	607 S. 132 E. Ave.
Ruth Gibbons	13128 E. 4th Pl
Virginia Hamilton	756 E. 138th
June Saireed	748 S. 138th
Guy Williams	Rt. 5, Claremore
Livia Wiles	13506 E. 4th Pl.

Mr. Morris questioned how the plan could be approved when it was only presented to the Commission 30 minutes before. He asked how you get from the Cooley Lake Plan to flood zoning and Mr. Haye informed that floodway zoning is based on the regulatory flood and will cover the floodway of

PUBLIC HEARING — COOLEY CREEK MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN (cont'd)

the regulatory floodplain for Cooley Basin. Mr. Morris advised that the MDP doesn't show the expanse of the floodway area as shown on the map and noted that there appears to be more useable area in the MDP than on the map. Mr. Haye informed that when the issue comes before the Commission for FD zoning, the area would be as shown on the map. Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Morris if his property is located in this area and he advised it is and informed that he had given land to Cooley Lake.

Mr. Jones informed he is an attorney representing the Carl Sampson family interests from Pine to I-44 and from 129th to 145th and asked why there are no retention ponds in Rogers County. Mr. Haye informed that area is outside the Tulsa County line. Mr. Jones advised that Catoosa wants the right-of-way dedicated and wants to put 50' of sewer lines across the property. Mr. Williams informed that this is a case in which the MDP does what it's supposed to do. The proposed sewer line, which would travel through an identified detention site on the MDP was caught in the planning stage. The consulting engineer identified that the sewer line would go through the detention site and the City of Tulsa recommended that it be realigned to go outside the embankment. In order to make it consistent with the Corps' plan, the City must maintain the structural integrity of the embankment. He informed that it creates design problems, but it is a tradeoff between the sanitary sewer line and storm water requirements.

Ms. Wood informed that her property flooded for the first time last May and asked what is being done to protect the people to the south. Mr. Haye informed that the proposed detention site (not yet funded) on the north would reduce water flow to the south, thus there would be less flood potential.

Mr. Halstead informed that he lives on Cooley Creek and had donated five acres of land for the retention pond on Cooley Creek. According to the map, his home is located in the floodway, but when he donated the land, his property was supposed to have been taken out of the floodplain. He asked if he would have to move if the City takes his land, would he be compensated for his property or what would be done. Mr. Haye informed that Mr. Halstead had donated land for construction of a detention site and there were a number of things that took place adjacent to his property which has lowered the floodplain away from his house. When the FD zoning map is returned to the Commission, those corrections will be made and his house will be removed from the floodway. Ms. Kempe informed Mr. Halstead that FD zoning would not change the use and he asked why it was necessary to rezone it if the use wouldn't be changed. Mr. Williams informed that zoning is the governmental regulation of permissible uses of land and although it is a nonconforming use, the current use may continue. If the use is changed, however, it would not be permitted since it would be nonconforming. Mr. Halstead asked if the Zoning Ordinance is available and Mr. Williams informed it is and informed that the other ordinance in question is the Floodplain Ordinance. Mr. Halstead informed that he has had no flooding in or near his house and advised that since the floodplain has been widened in his area, it would locate his property on an island and the cost of building a bridge to get to the area would be doubled.

PUBLIC HEARING — COOLEY CREEK MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN (cont'd)

Mr. Worsham informed that his property is not located in the floodplain, but was flooded last year. He suggested that if 15th Street had proper culverts and the creek was cleaned out around 145th Street, there would not have been water on his land. He advised that there are dead trees and many other miscellaneous items in the creek which are inhibiting the flow of the creek.

Mr. Cox informed he was representing the Williams Corporation in regard to 150 acres of property located at 129th E. Ave. and asked if it was known when the revised map would be completed and was informed that the map would be presented to the TMAPC on July 31.

Mr. Dixon informed that he is general manager of Republic Financial Corporation, advised that the company owns land on either side of the proposed detention facilities and expressed concern about not being notified of the proposed rezoning prior to this meeting. He informed that rezoning the property would virtually eliminate the marketability of the property and expressed concern about damaging the value of the land. Ms. Kempe informed that yellow signs had been placed in the area about 22 days in advance of the hearing to notify the people.

Mr. Foltz informed he built his home last year and it was flooded in May. He noted that development has been occurring and presented photos to illustrate some of the problems. Mrs. Foltz informed that the area did not have flooding in the past, but concrete and other materials have been dumped into the creek, inhibiting the flow. She requested that the creek be cleaned and straightened to correct flooding problems. Mr. Williams informed that the MDP addresses specific problems, but maintenance on unimproved creek areas was not recommended in the Plan. He advised that his department would review and develop a routine maintenance system within the City. Mr. Foltz suggested that it would be practical to clean out the area of the creek to the detention lake. Mr. Williams informed that it's the City's policy not to go on private property to do maintenance on creeks. Mr. Foltz informed that if the MDP didn't include cleaning out the creeks, it would cause flooding in the area to continue. Ms. Higgins asked whose responsibility it is to clean out creeks where debris has resulted from flooding and asked if the City would be permitted to come onto private property to clean out the creek. Mr. Linker informed that the City hasn't had the funds, staff or ability to clean out the creeks throughout the City. Ms. Higgins asked if the City has the right, but doesn't have the funds and Mr. Linker advised that if it's on private property the City doesn't have the right to go in unless it's a public nuisance and if the City doesn't have an easement, there is a problem in getting to the creek. It would have to be judicially declared a public nuisance or have the City Commission pass on it and determine it's a public nuisance. Some owners don't want to go to the trouble and expense and sometimes they don't have the ability to clean up an area themselves. Anyone who causes another to flood by obstructing a drainageway or permitting an obstruction to remain may be sued. There are ordinances in regard to illegally dumping in a floodway area, but the problem is catching someone dumping.

PUBLIC HEARING — COOLEY CREEK MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN (cont'd)

Ms. Gibbons informed that her property flooded last year due to debris in the creek. She informed that the individual property owners have to clean out the creeks and advised that she was told to contact the Code Enforcement Department to make any complaints. She advised that the water is currently running down 132nd Street, not the creek. She asked if her house would be purchased if it is located in a floodway and Mr.

Williams informed that it would not be since retention sites are the protection which is provided. He advised that the City's Code Enforcement Dept. has been in the area and is aware of the complaints in regard to the debris in the creek. Ms. Gibbons advised that she had contacted the City on several occasions in regard to mowing its easement, but it had still not been mowed.

Ms. Hamilton reiterated the problem with debris in the creek and informed that trees have fallen across the creek. She informed that she resents having her home in the area that would be rezoned because it sits on higher ground and asked if the zoning would be reversed. Mr. Williams informed that the zoning could be reversed. Ms. Hamilton informed she was concerned about resale value of her home and Mr. Williams informed that in cases where a home is located higher than its neighbors, it would be reviewed and omitted from the map prior to the hearing on the floodway zoning in July. Ms. Hamilton asked how citizens could get the creeks cleaned out and was advised to contact Code Enforcement to get the property owners to clean out their area, to contact the Stormwater Management Dept. with a complaint in regard to a public or City problem, or in regard to a general question it would be presented to the City Commission and a determination made as to the cost. Mr. Williams informed that there is a need to greatly increase maintenance of the drainageways.

Ms. Saireed informed that her house sits up higher than the creek and the creek backs up on the back of her lot. She noted that there is no funding for the proposed detention areas.

Mr. Williams informed he owns five blocks of property in the area and noted that the creek makes an abrupt turn on what would be 5th Street. He advised that there is debris in the creek and suggested that the creek be straightened and suggested that some of his land could be utilized for straightening the creek.

Ms. Foltz advised that when the storm sewers were installed through the creek in 1977, they caused the creek to narrow. She also advised that water doesn't come from the creek, it comes from upstream.

Ms. Wiles asked what would happen to people's property (undeveloped land) that would be located in the floodway since they would not be able to build on it or sell it. Mr. Williams advised that the uses would be limited to open space or other light uses which would not present an obstruction to water since the land is being used to carry the water. Ms. Wiles asked what the people would do with the lots and Mr. Williams informed that the regulations are to protect the people from further

PUBLIC HEARING — COOLEY CREEK MASTER DRAINAGE PLAN (cont'd)

development. She suggested that the flooding problem is due to the creek being crooked and asked if anything could be done about this. Mr. Williams advised that a request needed to be submitted to Stormwater Management. Ms. Wiles asked if property owners would still have to pay property taxes on the property in this area and was informed that she would have to contact the County Assessor's office in this regard.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Carnes asked why the Master Drainage Plan was just now coming for approval and was advised that it was approved as a report and was sent on for adoption as part of the Comprehensive Plan several years ago.

Ms. Kempe asked if the MDP could be adopted since the floodway zoning case had not been advertised correctly. Mr. Gardner informed that the the advertisement was to adopt this as an element of the Comprehensive Plan, but this would be adopted as an element of the Plan and would not be the same as amending the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Kempe informed that she wished to express the concern of the TMAPC to the City Commission about cleaning and maintaining the creeks throughout the City.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **ADOPT** the **Cooley Creek Master Drainage Plan**, as recommended.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. **Z-6060** Present Zoning: Multiple Zonings
Applicant: Williams (City of Tulsa) Proposed Zoning: FD
Location: Cooley Creek-Mingo Between South 161th E. Ave. & Pine Street to East 21st Street South

Date of Application: May 10, 1985
Date of Hearing: June 5, 1985 (cont'd to July 31, 1985)

Presentation to TMAPC by: Stan Williams/Ruben Haye (Stormwater Mgmt. Dept./ Hydrology Dept.)
Address: 707 S. Houston Phone: 592-7815

Mr. Williams requested that this item be continued to July 31, 1985, along with the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, to allow additional public input and provide additional time for updating the floodway zoning maps.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE consideration** of **Z-6060** until Wednesday, July 31, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #288-3 Eight Acres Subdivision, Lot 13, Block 1 (cont'd to June 12, 1985)

Staff Recommendation -- Minor Amendment to Rear Yard Setback

The subject tract is a single-family residential lot located at the southeast corner of East 26th Place and South Birmingham Place. The applicant is requesting approval of a minor amendment to change the rear building line on one side of the lot from 35 feet to 28.5 feet to accommodate a 6.5 foot encroachment of a corner of the proposed house. The encroachment would occur for a distance of less than 20 feet. According to the PUD requirements, the 35-foot building line is applicable on the two rear sides of the subject tract. All other setbacks are being complied with according to the submitted sketch and construction has not commenced at this time. Notice of this request has been given to abutting owners.

The Staff has reviewed this request and finds that to modify the 35-foot building line to 28.5 feet to accommodate the proposed 6.5 feet encroachment is minor in nature.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the 6.5 foot encroachment of the 35-foot rear building line per the submitted sketches.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to CONTINUE consideration of PUD #288-3, minor amendment to rear yard setback until Wednesday, June 12, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Date Approved June 19, 1985

Cheryl Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

RB Paddock
Secretary