

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1562  
Wednesday, July 3, 1985, 1:30 p.m.  
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	<b>MEMBERS ABSENT</b>	<b>STAFF PRESENT</b>	<b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>
Carnes	Harris	Compton	Linker, Legal
Connery	Young	Frank	Counsel
Draughon		Gardner	
Higgins, 2nd Vice- Chairman		Holwell	
Kempe, Chairman		Wilmoth	
Paddock, Secretary			
VanFossen			
Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, July 2, 1985, at 1:26 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 1:35 p.m.

**Minutes:**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-1 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; VanFossen, "abstaining"; Harris, Kempe, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of June 19, 1985 (No. 1560)**.

**Consideration of Amending Page 18 of TMAPC Minutes of May 1, 1985**

Staff informed that, due to an administrative error, the legal description for another case had inadvertently been used in place of the correct one for **Z-6041**. This legal description corrects that error.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Kempe, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the amendment of Page 18 of the Minutes of May 1, 1985.

**REPORTS:**

**Committee Reports:**

Mr. Paddock informed that the Rules and Regulations Committee would meet on Tuesday, July 9, 1985, in Room 1116 of the City Hall Building to review the proposed amendments to the Tulsa Zoning Code in regard to satellite dishes and the proposed amendments to the Sign Ordinance as it relates to on-premise signs within the City. He advised that it is the purpose of the Committee to address only those items which were addressed in the Public Hearing of June 26 in regard to these proposed amendments.

Director's Report:

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDING THE FIRE  
PROTECTION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF TULSA

Mr. Compton informed that the Fire Protection Plan is being reviewed, but has not reached a point at which it could be presented to the TMAPC; therefore, it was requested that this item be continued until July 17.

Mr. Connery asked if amending the Plan was being contemplated and Mr. Compton informed he was unsure if it would be amended. Mr. Connery advised that when this Plan is considered by the TMAPC, he hoped the people would not have a great many complaints that they were not notified of the hearing in time to attend.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Connery, Carnes, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **continue consideration** of amending the Fire Protection Plan for the City of Tulsa until Wednesday, July 17, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Assembly Center.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Preliminary Approval:

Briarglen Mini-Storage (2194) 3181 S. 129th E. Avenue (CS)

The Staff presented the plat to the TAC with the applicant represented by E.C. Summers.

This tract has been included in numerous applications since 1968, including CDP #45, PUD #148, Z-3121, Z-4512 and Board of Adjustment #13438, which permitted the current proposed mini-storage. It was found that Section 260 of the Zoning Code was not satisfied on Z-4512. Beginning in 1968, the Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment approved CDP #45 on 11/27/68 on approximately 150 acres (including this tract). PUD #148 amended CDP 45. A portion of this tract was included in a "swap" to delete one tract and add one tract to PUD #148. Although the portion is located within the current development from CDP #45, it is not quite clear if it was ever removed from PUD #148 on 10/17/73. The zoning application Z-4512 was also approved in October 1973, but no record of a plat waiver or replat can be found, thus the requirement for the current application. Staff notes that due to the numerous applications, easements, lot splits, etc. on this tract, a plat at this time will help clear up a number of actions that have taken place and/or easements and access that has been filed of record separately.

**Briarglen Mini-Storage (2194) (cont'd)**

This application was originally received 5/20/85 and scheduled for TAC 6/13/85 and Planning Commission on 6/18/85. On 5/29/85, Staff was advised by the applicant to table or pull the plat from the TAC meeting scheduled for 6/13/85, so no further action was taken until 6/7/85, at which time Staff was requested to put the plat back on the agenda. Staff advised the applicant that notices had not been mailed because the plat had been pulled previously. In order to properly notify abutting owners, notices had to be mailed by 6/17/85 for a July 3 meeting. Therefore, the applicant was advised that a current list of abutting owners must be furnished prior to Friday, 6/14/85 in order to notify the abutting owners on the proper date. The TAC reviewed the plat on 6/13/85, but the notice requirement dictated that the earliest Planning Commission hearing would be July 3, 1985.

Stormwater Management advised that onsite detention or fee is required. Immediate downstream storm sewer can carry storm water. Brookhollow detention facility is also downstream (these comments are applicable to #7 and #8 of the conditions for approval).

Staff informed that all release letters had been received, all conditions of the agenda had been met and preliminary and final release of the plat of Briarglen Mini-Storage was requested.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Draughon, "abstaining"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary and Final Plat of Briarglen Mini-Storage (2194)**, and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

**CHANGE OF ACCESS ON RECORDED PLAT:**

**6000 Garnett Park (3294)** E. of NE corner of 61st and S. Garnett (IL)

Staff informed that this request was to add one additional 24' access point to Lot 3, Block 1. Staff and Traffic Engineer recommended approval.

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **change of access on 6000 Garnett Park (3294)**, as recommended by Staff.

**WAIVER OF PLAT:**

**BOA #13564 Mohawk Village (1303)** 9517 E. 42nd Street North (RS-3)

The applicant was represented at the TAC by Martin Hedley.

Staff informed that this is a request to waive plat on part of Lots 4 and 5, Block 1, of the above subdivision. Proposed use is a

**BOA #13564 Mohawk Village (1303)** (cont'd)

day care center which has been approved by the Board of Adjustment. Since the property is already platted and on a non-arterial street, Staff and TAC had no objection to a waiver subject to conditions.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Draughon, "abstaining"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver of Plat of BOA #13564 Mohawk Village (1303)**, subject to the following conditions:

1. Grading and Drainage Plan approval by City Engineer (or Stormwater Management — PFPI, onsite detention).
2. Sewer main extension (subject to approval by Water and Sewer Dept.).
3. Utility extension as needed, including easements thereof (includes perimeter easement as directed by utilities).
4. Possible fire hydrant may be required off the 10" water line on the north side of the property.

**Z-4294 (unplatted) (294)** 17345 E. Admiral Place (IL)

This is a request to waive plat on an unplatted tract less than 2-1/2 acres in size. The proposed use is a car auction. The Staff and TAC recommended approval subject to conditions.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Malone why the TAC was recommending approval of the plat waiver and he informed that when properties are as small as this most drainage requirements are met in the building process. Mr. VanFossen informed that there is considerably less cost involved if a plat is not required on an area such as this.

Mr. Draughon asked if a plat would be required if the car auction was not built and Mr. Gardner informed that condition could be added as a condition of approval. Mr. Draughon requested that this be done and Mr. VanFossen questioned whether there would be a purpose in doing that. Ms. Wilson informed she agreed with Mr. Draughon's recommendation because this is an open space type use and should other buildings be built, it should be brought to the Commission's attention. Mr. Paddock informed that he was in favor of a waiver of plat at this location, but if the use was changed, the waiver of plat could be reconsidered. Ms. Kempe noted that this property is zoned IL and the uses would be subject to zoning and construction of the building without a plat; therefore, she could not see a need for this condition. Mr. VanFossen informed that he would like to see the proposed condition withdrawn. Ms. Higgins asked Mr. Linker if this condition could be included and he informed that it could be done and might be a good condition.

Z-4294 (unplatted) (294) (cont'd)

On **MOTION** of **DRAUGHON**, the Planning Commission voted 5-4-0 (Carnes, Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to amend the conditions on waiver or plat to add an additional condition that the waiver would be specifically for the use requested.

Interested Party:

Ted Dobson

Address: 3747 S. Harvard, Suite 201

Mr. Dobson informed that he was representing the applicant and the intent was to build a building on the property. He advised that application had been made for a building permit, which would meet all requirements and drainage plans had been submitted to Stormwater Management.

Mr. Connery asked if Mr. Dobson had any problem with this condition and he advised he didn't feel it would present a problem.

Ms. Wilson informed that she felt the vote was proper and didn't feel it should be reconsidered. Ms. Higgins recommended that the vote be retaken in view of comments made.

Mr. Dobson informed he didn't feel it would be necessary to have the additional condition because approval must be obtained from Stormwater Management in order to get a building permit. He also informed that if additional buildings were desired, the applicant would be required to return to Stormwater Management for approval on these buildings.

Mr. Gardner informed that a plat stands indefinitely. Drainage is not reviewed every time an applicant applies for a building permit; i.e., parking lots and paving would not require a building permit. He informed that he was not sure how you could control drainage in these instances.

Mr. Linker suggested that items (2) and (3) of the conditions could be amended to require that they be fulfilled anytime structures are built.

Mr. VanFossen expressed concern that the Commission might be adding conditions that are unnecessary and Mr. Linker informed that all drainage problems are not caught in the Drainage Plan stage since it has to be a tract over five acres in the water course or in the floodway. Mr. VanFossen advised that the stormwater drainage requirements might need to be reviewed and Mr. Linker concurred.

Mr. Gardner suggested that the waiver of plat be approved with the proposed condition, but the condition be continued until after the TAC meeting to see if it is needed in order to permit the applicant to obtain his building permit. However, the TMAPC decided to approve the plat waiver without the proposed condition.

Z-4294 (unplatted) (294) (cont'd)

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted 6-2-1 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; Draughon, Wilson, "nay"; Paddock, "abstaining"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the waiver of plat of Z-4294 (unplatted) (294) as recommended by the the TAC and Staff, subject to the following conditions:

1. Dedication of 50' of right-of-way from centerline of Admiral (furnish recording data if dedicated).
2. Access control agreement subject to approval of Traffic Engineering.
3. Grading and Drainage Plans subject to approval of City Engineer (Stormwater Management -- PFPI, onsite detention).
4. Health Dept. approval of septic system (already approved).
5. Extension of utilities as needed, including easements thereof (need perimeter easement.)

Ms. Wilson requested that Staff follow up with TAC as to what was meant by including the proposed use on the subject property. Ms. Higgins informed she would like to have a study done on this.

Ms. Kempe requested that information in regard to platting be obtained from Stormwater Management and Mr. Draughon requested that a review be made of the platting process.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-16464 Moore (1162) S.&W. of SW/c of W. 201st St. & S. Elwood Ave. (AG)

This is a request to split a 4.2 acre tract into two 2.10 acre lots. This proposal will require a variance from the County Board of Adjustment because the bulk and area requirements have not been met. The applicant has been informed about the right-of-way needed for 201st Street and has agreed to a roadway easement in order to bring the roadway to 50 feet. The Staff recommended that this approval be subject to conditions.

The applicant was represented at the TAC by Loretta Cotner.

The Health Dept. advised that approval had been granted and Staff has now also received approval from the Water District. The Staff and TAC recommended approval of L-16464, subject to one condition.

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** L-16464 Moore (1162), subject to the following condition:

L-16464 Moore (1162) (cont'd)

County Board of Adjustment approval of a variance of the bulk and area requirements in the AG district in order to allow a lot split.

L-16471-16476 Hall (3492) N. & E. of NW/c W. 58th & S. Union Ave. (RD)

This is a request to split 11 lots which contain duplexes that are under construction. This split would enable the developers to sell each side of the duplexes as individual units. This split will require a variance from the City Board of Adjustment from the bulk and area requirements for single-family use in RD zoning. A record check of the subject tract indicates that approximately 10 lots in the area have previously been split in this manner and approved by the TMAPC and City Board of Adjustment (LNO #16187-90).

The applicant was not represented at the TAC.

Stem wall and/or "as built" surveys were furnished for TAC review. The Water and Sewer Department recommended that existing easements be increased to the present standards of 11' or 17-1/2".

The Staff and TAC recommended approval of L-16471-76, subject to conditions.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** L-16471-16476 Hall (3492), subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the City Board of Adjustment for the above-mentioned variances;
2. A common wall and maintenance agreement between the duplex owners; and
3. Any utility easements or extensions that may be required in order to service the subject tracts.

L-16470 Parrish (1893) N. of NE/c E. 29th & S. Peoria Ave. (RS-1)

This is a request to split a 1.3 acre rectangular-shaped tract into a .63 acre lot on the eastern portion of a 20-foot handle along the north boundary to the west to Peoria Avenue, and a rectangular-shaped .48 acre lot for the remainder of the tract having over 137 feet of lot width. The applicant was informed of the additional right-of-way needed for Peoria Avenue, and has signed a Deed of Dedication conveying that right-of-way. The proposed lots exceed the minimum lot size for the RS-1 zoning; however, the

L-16470 Parrish (1893) (cont'd)

approval of the City Board of Adjustment will be required because of the requirement of 30 feet of frontage on a dedicated street and the requirement that lots must have an average lot width of 100 feet. (The easternmost lot has only 20 feet of frontage on Peoria Avenue, by virtue of the handle, and the rear of the lot has over 157 feet of lot width.) The Staff recommended approval subject to conditions.

The applicant was not represented at the TAC.

The Water and Sewer Department advised that the applicant should check with that department to determine the availability of sewer service. Utility easements were recommended on the west, south and east perimeters.

The Staff and TAC recommended approval of L-16479, subject to the conditions.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** L-16479 Parrish (1893), subject to the following conditions:

1. City Board of Adjustment approval for the above-mentioned variances;
2. Any utility easements or extensions that may be necessary in order to service the subject tracts (including easements on the west, south and east perimeters).

Lot Splits for Discussion:

L-16485 Phillips (1202) W. of the NW/c 46th St. No. & Peoria Ave. (RS-3)

In the opinion of the Staff, the lot split listed above meets the subdivision and zoning regulations, but since the lot 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). The Staff recommended approval of L-16485.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** L-16485 Phillips (1202), as recommended by Staff.

L-16491 Baker (1083) W. of the NW/c of 79th Pl. & Joplin Ave. (RS-3)

In the opinion of the Staff, the lot split listed above meets the subdivision and zoning regulations, but since the lot may be irregular in shape, notice has been given to the abutting owner(s)

L-16491 Baker (1083) (cont'd)

so that property owners in the area may be aware of the application (Auth: PC Meeting #1505, page 1; 5/9/84). The Staff recommended approval of L-16491.

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** L-16491 Baker (1083), as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-16493 (293) Kelley	L-16487 (2090) Coleman
L-16495 (3194) Mingo Valley Trade Ctr.	L-16488 (592) Duck
L-16486 (2802) Frakes/Wilson	L-16489 (383) Helm

Staff informed that the above lot splits had been reviewed and were in order and ratification was recommended.

Ms. Higgins informed that she would abstain on the vote because she was an interested party in one of the lot splits.

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-2 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Higgins, Wilson, "abstaining"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **RATIFY** the above lot splits, as recommended by Staff.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #325 Elks Lodge NE/c of Harvard Avenue and E. 54th Street

Staff Recommendation — Detail Landscape Plan Review for Area "C"  
(internal area)

---

Area "C" is 3.63 (gross) acres in size and is located at the northeast corner of Harvard Avenue and East 54th Street. It has been approved for a private lodge facility and customary accessory uses. The facility is in the last stages of construction and the applicant now seeks Detail Landscape Plan review.

Detail Landscape Plan approval has been given for perimeter landscaping by the TMAPC on July 18, 1984. The amount of the approved landscaping will effectively screen the building from existing residences to the south; however, there is the unusual requirement that a plan also be approved for internal landscaping (per Planning Commission minutes). External landscaping exceeds the 10% area requirement and internal areas will be basically sodded or seeded areas for grass around the internal parking areas and walks. Due to the unusual nature of the requirement for an internal landscaping plan (recognizing the extensive external landscaping requirement), Staff recommends that the TMAPC review the previous approval requirement for approval of an external and internal plan. If it is the desire of the TMAPC to require internal landscape plan

PUD #325 (cont'd)

approval, Staff recommends the applicant be given one year to submit the required internal landscap plan requirement for TMAPC approval and that the TMAPC indicate, on the record, that this requirement should not cause a further delay in granting the applicant's an Occupancy Permit.

Steve Carr, representative for the applicant, presented a Landscape Plan for the internal area and informed that this request was only for the interior plan, as exterior planting has already begun.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Landscape Plan** submitted for the **interior area**, permit a one-year extension on the installation of interior landscaping and provide notation that this extension should not cause applicant further delay in the granting of an occupancy permit.

PUD #197-2 East of 4009 E. 33rd Street (SE/c 31st Street & S. Pittsburg Ave.)

Staff Recommendation — Minor Amendment of Screening Requirements

PUD #197 is 40 acres in size and is located at the southeast corner of 31st Street and South Pittsburg Avenue. It was approved per conditions in 1978 for a retirement community which utilizes a central multi-story facility as well as duplex and cottage uses. As a condition of the PUD, screening was required to provide visual separation between the retirement community and the abutting single-family dwellings to the west.

The applicant, an abutting property owner, is now requesting a minor amendment to replace the south 24 feet of privacy fence along the west side with chain link. The fence would be of the same height (6 feet) and would not block the view of oncoming traffic along 33rd Street. The abutting owner has stated that he will be responsible for the cost of changing the fence from privacy to chain link.

Upon field investigation, it was found that the fence at that location was in need of repair and a large evergreen tree was growing at the end of the fence. The fence and the large tree do block the line of site from the applicant's property to the east when backing from the driveway (letter from applicant Exhibit "A-1").

Based on the above information and letter of agreement from Methodist Manor (Exhibit "A-2"), the Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the substitution as requested. Methodist Manor has requested that the change be permanent and that they be exempt from ever having to bear the cost of possibly changing this fence from chain link, if approved, back to a privacy fence.

PUD #197-2 (cont'd)

Instruments Submitted: Letter from the Applicant (Exhibit "A-1")  
Letter from Methodist Manor (Exhibit "A-2")

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 9-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD #197-2** minor amendment to waive conditions of a screening requirement.

PUD #355-2 Northwest corner of 91st and Yale

Staff Recommendation -- Minor Amendment to Create Two-Car Garage:

The applicant is requesting approval of a minor amendment to allow construction of a two-car garage for secured parking for a tenant of the office building which is now under construction on the subject tract. The proposed garage building will be one-story and the applicant has proposed the following architectural controls to make the structure compatible with the main building:

1. Installation of a two (2) car garage approximately 25' wide x 20' deep x 9' high maximum. The proposed garage will provide secured parking for a specific tenant and will be completely enclosed, including walls, roof and doors.
2. Walls. Brick veneer and dark bronze metal panels to match the brick and metal used on the office building.
3. Roof. Dark bronze metal panels to match the metal used on the office building.
4. Doors. Dark bronze metal panel-type overhead doors to match the metal used on the office building.

The TMAPC will recall that a similar request, PUD #355-1, was heard by the TMAPC on June 19, 1985 and denied. The proposed location on the original application was on the extreme northern boundary of the PUD and parking lot abutting East 89th Street and the single-family residential area to the north. The new location is proposed to be directly adjacent to the main office building at its northwest corner. Discussions with the applicant indicated that possible future requests for extension of the garage area could be forthcoming; although they would likely be constructed as covered carports open on the sides and without a door. The proposed location is more desirable than that previously proposed due to its interior nature, the garage building is setback approximately 140 feet and 250 feet from the centerline of East 89th Street and South Yale Avenue respectively, no landscaped islands will be used for the building, and the small scale of the structure will be somewhat shrouded by the scale of the adjacent building (which is 3 and 4 stories tall) and due to landscaping in the parking lot and adjacent

**PUD #355-2** (cont'd)

areas. A Detail Landscape Plan is also submitted with PUD #355-2. No elevation drawings have been submitted with the application.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #355-2 subject to the submitted plans and also subject to the Detail Landscape Plan. Notice of the request for minor amendment has been mailed to abutting owners on the north side of East 89th Street.

Arthur Richey of Sunwestern Properties, 1512 S. Boston, Suite 301, informed that he was representing the property owners, showed photos of the residences to the north of the property on 89th Street and requested that the minor amendment be approved to permit installation of the two-car garage.

Mr. Paddock noted that Staff's previous concern had been that this not be an accessory use and Mr. Frank informed that was only one of the concerns. He advised that the applicant didn't want the garage next to his building and the Staff didn't want it next to the residences.

Mr. Connery informed that he didn't support the application because it appeared to be an "after thought" and was concerned that this would set a precedent for garages being added to office PUDs.

Mr. VanFossen informed that he felt this was an appropriate accessory use. Mr. Paddock informed that this might be setting a precedent, but it was not necessarily a bad precedent if it was felt to be an appropriate use under a PUD.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Carnes, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Connery, "abstaining"; Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD #355-2 minor amendment to permit a two-car garage.**

**Staff Recommendation -- Detail Landscape Plan:**

The proposed Detail Landscape Plan is submitted for Phase I of PUD #355 under which a 50,000 square foot building is proposed. The landscape requirement under the PUD is a minimum of 30% of the net area. The proposed Plan includes detail landscape information on plant types, sizes, locations and detailed information on design and layout. Various types of shrubbery, trees, ground cover and sodded areas are proposed for Phase I, and the Plan also describes large trees that will remain in place after site grading is completed on Phases II and III. According to the Text, the Phase II and III areas will be seeded to control wind and water erosion, and fenced on the west boundary. The applicant is asking that the TMAPC consider waiving the screening requirement on the west until buildings are actually constructed on these tracts. The present building for Phase I is more than 380 feet from the closest west boundary where the fence is to be installed and any fencing

PUD #355-2 (cont'd)

installed prior to adjacent construction is likely to be damaged during excavation, grading and parking lot construction. The Staff is supportive of this request. The Plan for Phase I landscaping also includes a "water feature" in the main plaza area adjacent to the building. This is the most comprehensive Detail Landscape Plan submission that has been reviewed by this Staff member.

Therefore, based on the above review, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Landscape Plan and Text as submitted, and further recommends delaying installation of the screening fence on the west boundary until office buildings are constructed on those tracts during Phases II and III.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Harris, Young, "absent") to APPROVE PUD #355-2 Detail Landscape Plan, as recommended by Staff, including delaying installation of the screening fence on the west boundary until office buildings are constructed on those tracts.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Date Approved

July 17, 1985

Cherry Kempe  
Chairman

ATTEST:

APB Paddock  
Secretary

