

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1570  
Wednesday, August 28, 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>    |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Connery<br>Higgins<br>Kempe, Chairman<br>Paddock, Secretary<br>VanFossen<br>Wilson, 1st Vice-<br>Chairman<br>Woodard | Carnes<br>Draughon<br>Harris<br>Young | Frank<br>Gardner<br>Setters | Linker, Legal<br>Counsel |

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, August 27, 1985 at 10:19 a.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 1:40 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**Approval of Minutes of September 14, 1985, Meeting No. 1570:**

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of August 14, 1985, Meeting No. 1568** as submitted.

**REPORTS:**

**Report of Receipts and Deposits:**

Mr. Gardner commented the report reflected that Receipts and Deposits have picked up in terms of number of fees and applications since the last report.

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Report of Receipts and Deposits** as submitted.

**Committee Reports:**

Mr. VanFossen reported that the **Comprehensive Plan Committee** met August 27, 1985 to review the draft of the South Memorial Drive Special Study and will meet again on September 10, 1985 at noon to further consider this report.

Mr. Paddock commented the **Rules and Regulations Committee** had met prior to today's TMAPC meeting to consider the amendment on day care homes and the meeting ended with no specific recommendation for the Commission at this time. A review of the Major Streets and Highway Plan was also made and the Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposed amendments. The procedures for public hearings, specifically Planned Unit Developments, will be considered at a meeting of the Rules and Regulations Committee scheduled for Wednesday, September 11th, as time did not permit review today.

**CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:**

Application No.: **Z-6065** Present Zoning: RM-1  
Applicant: **Everett (Land)** Proposed Zoning: CH  
Location: SE corner of Ute & Joplin

Chairman Kempe read a letter from the Applicant who requested withdrawal of this item from the agenda, and expressed appreciation for TMAPC and Staff assistance. There being no objection from the Commission, it was withdrawn.

Application No.: **Z-6077** Present Zoning: RM-2  
Applicant: **Akdar Shrine Temple** Proposed Zoning: OH  
Location: SW corner of 21st & Boston

Date of Hearing: August 28, 1985  
Requested Continuance Date: September 11, 1985

Presentation to TMAPC by: Roy Johnsen  
Address: 324 Main Mall, Tulsa

**Comments & Discussion:**

Chairman Kempe advised that Staff had received a letter requesting continuance of this case. The letter, although hand delivered to the INCOG offices in a timely manner, was not opened by Mr. Gardner until this date. Mr. Johnsen advised the Commission a continuance was requested to permit further discussions with the nearby property owners.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Wallace Hudson  
Mr. Norman Jones

Address: 6 East 25th Street, Tulsa  
2215 South Boston, Tulsa

The interested parties voiced annoyance at another continuance. Chairman Kempe and Mr. Gardner advised this is a first continuance request and apologized for any inconvenience.

On **MOTION of VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6077** until Wednesday, September 11, 1985 at 1:30p in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No.: **CZ-134** Present Zoning: AG  
Applicant: **D & P Investments** Proposed Zoning: CS  
Location: 1/4 mile West of 116th Street North & Garnett

Date of Hearing: August 28, 1985  
Requested Continuance Date: September 11, 1985

On **MOTION of WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of CZ-134** until Wednesday, September 11, 1985 at 1:30p in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **Z-6073** Present Zoning: RS-3  
Applicant: **Gibbens** Proposed Zoning: RM-2  
Location: East side of Riverside at 66th Place

Date of Application: July 30, 1985  
Date of Hearing: August 28, 1985  
Size of Tract: 6 acres, more or less  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Norman, Suite 909, Kennedy Building

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity - Corridor (Riverside Parkway).

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested RM-2 District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately six acres in size and located on the south side of 66th Place, west of South Newport Avenue. It is partially wooded, gently sloping, contains one single-family residence and accessory buildings zoned RS-3.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property zoned RM-2 and RS-3, on the east by vacant property which is part of an apartment complex zoned RM-2/PUD #341, on the south by mostly vacant property zoned RS-3, and on the west by vacant property zoned RM-2.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** The predominant zoning pattern in the area is RM-2 Medium Intensity multifamily residential.

**Conclusion:** RM-2 zoning abutts the subject tract on three sides and is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. The Staff supports the requested zoning; however, we recommend that the portion located within the proposed Riverside Parkway remain RS-3.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of RM-2 zoning less and except that portion located in the proposed Riverside Parkway which shall remain RS-3 (new legal description to be provided by the applicant.)

Applicant's Comments:

In reply to a question from Mr. Paddock, Mr. Norman stated the increase in the tract area was due to the changing from an expressway designation to a parkway designation. Mr. Norman further stated, for Mr. Paddock, that there was a tract of land on the west side of Riverside Drive (RM-2) which has been platted as a pedestrian easement.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6073** for RM-2, as recommended by Staff.

Application No.: **Z-6074**  
Applicant: **Shipley**  
Location: NW corner of 16th & Denver

Present Zoning: RM-2  
Proposed Zoning: OL

Date of Application: July 30, 1985  
Date of Hearing: August 28, 1985  
Size of Tract: 1 acre, more or less  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Norman, Suite 909, Kennedy Building

### Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 7 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use.

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

### Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately one acre in size and located at the northwest corner of 16th Street and Denver Avenue. It is non-wooded, flat, contains a large single-family dwelling and accessory building and is zoned RM-2.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north and west by single and multifamily dwellings zoned RM-2, on the east across Denver by a single-family dwelling and law office zoned OL, and on the south across 16th Street by a small apartment complex zoned RM-2.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Several zoning requests have been approved, rezoning adjacent property from the 1970 blanket RM-2 zoning designation to office and commercial designations.

**Conclusion:** This area along Denver, like the other area that is located on the perimeter of the Central Business District, is in transition from residential to mostly office use. The Comprehensive Plan takes this change into account by designating the property as "No Specific Land Use". The Staff can support the requested OL zoning, but would note that the required parking for the existing structure could be difficult to meet due to the size of the buildings.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning patterns in the area, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the OL zoning as requested.

### Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner mentioned the applicant informed him that this had been incorrectly advertised OM, not OL, but it did not seem to present a problem. Ms. Wilson asked for details regarding parking and/or any possible parking problems. Mr. Gardner stated it was possible to remove a detached garage for parking and there is an adjacent area that could be used for parking.

### Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Norman gave a description and brief history of the subject area, as well as the intended use of the offices.

**TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present**

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughton, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6074** for OL, as recommended by Staff.

**Legal Description:**

Lots Five (5) and Six (6), Block Four (4), **STONEBRAKER HEIGHTS ADDITION** to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof.

Application No.: **PUD-341-A**

Present Zoning: **RM-2**

Applicant: **U.S. Home**

Proposed Zoning: **Unchanged**

Location: **South & West of 66th Place and South Peoria**

Date of Application: **July 30, 1985**

Date of Hearing: **August 28, 1985**

Size of Tract: **6 acres, more or less**

Presentation to TMAPC by: **Charles Norman, Suite 909, Kennedy Building**

**Staff Recommendation:**

PUD #341 was approved by the TMAPC on September 28, 1983 and the Tulsa City Commission on October 18, 1983. A copy of the amended plat is attached. Multi-family development presently is in place on Lots 1-3 of the Raintree II, Amended Addition. The purpose of PUD 341-A is to delete Lots 4-10 in order to permit subsequent vacation of that part of the plat and development of said area under conventional RM-2 standards. Lots 1-3, which will remain subject to PUD #341, have a gross area of 136,593 square feet and a net area of 108,854 square feet. The gross land area of Lots 1-3 would permit 105 dwelling units under RM-2 standards (33.5 dwelling units per acre); PUD #341 allocates 90 dwelling units to these lots. Therefore, the underlying zoning will support the request for PUD controls to remain on PUD #341/Lots 1-3 and abandonment per PUD #341-A/Lots 4-10. The requested RM-2 zoning, which is to remain for PUD #341-A, is consistent with existing adjacent zoning.

Therefore, the Staff finds that PUD #341-A to be: (a) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (b) in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas; (c) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; and (d) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Codes.

The Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD #341-A with RM-2 zoning to remain in place for that area of Lots 4-10, subject to the following conditions:

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

(2) Development Standards:

|  | <u>PUD #341</u>                                     | <u>Lots 1-3<br/>PUD #341-A</u>                |
|--|---|---|
| Land Area (Gross):                                 | 5.981 acres   | 3.136 acres                                   |
| (Net:)   | 5.634 acres   | 2.499 acres                                   |
| Permitted Use: Multifamily Residential Development |   |   |
| Maximum Number of Units:                           | 204   | 90  |
| Maximum Building Height:                           | 41 ft.  | 41 ft.  |
| Minimum Livability Space                           | 80,100 sq. ft.                                      | 18,000 sq. ft.                                |
| Minimum Off-Street Parking:                        | 342 spaces  | 1.5 spaces/1-bedroom<br>2.0 spaces/2-bedrooms |
| Minimum Building Setbacks:                         |   |   |
| From Peoria Avenue                                 | 35 ft.  | 35 ft.  |
| From 66th Place                                    | 10 ft.  | 10 ft.  |
| From West and South<br>Boundary Lines              | 17.5 ft.  | 17.5 ft.                                      |
| From Tract "A"                                     | 5 ft.   | 5 ft.   |
| From Internal Lot Lines<br>Between Buildings       | 2 ft.   | 2 ft.   |
|  | 8 ft./minor amend-<br>ment approved on<br>10-26-83. | Same  |

(3) Specific Development Standards:

|                           | <u>--Lot 1--</u> |      |
|---------------------------|------------------|------|
| Lot Width:                | 302 ft.          | Same |
| Gross:                    | 1.38619 acres    | Same |
| Net:                      | 1.03955 acres    | Same |
| Paving                    | 0.34966 acre     | Same |
| Buildings:                | 0.27401 acre     | Same |
| Livability Space:         | 0.41588 acre     | Same |
| Number of Units:          | 34               | 34   |
| Number of Parking Spaces: | 58               | 58   |

|                           | <u>PUD #341</u>  | <u>Lots 1-3<br/>PUD #341-A</u> |
|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
|                           | <u>--Lot 2--</u> |                                |
| Lot Width:                | 100 ft. avg.     | Same                           |
| Gross:                    | Same as net      | Same                           |
| Net:                      | 0.92756 acre     | Same                           |
| Paving:                   | 0.35247 acre     | Same                           |
| Buildings:                | 0.2740 acre      | Same                           |
| Livability Space:         | 0.30108 acre     | Same                           |
| Number of Units:          | 34               | 34                             |
| Number of Parking Spaces: | 58               | 58                             |

|                           |                  |      |
|---------------------------|------------------|------|
|                           | <u>--Lot 3--</u> |      |
| Lot Width:                | 95' avg.         | Same |
| Gross:                    | Same as net      | Same |
| Net:                      | 0.53187 acre     | Same |
| Livability Space:         | 0.14550 acre     | Same |
| Number of Units:          | 22               | 22   |
| Number of Parking Spaces: | 36               | 36   |

--Lots 4-10--

Abandoned per PUD #341-A; retains RM-2 zoning

- (4) That all other conditions and covenants of PUD #341 shall continue to be applicable to PUD #341-A, Lots 1-3, which shall remain under the controls and restrictions as originally adopted and amended by the TMAPC until and after the date of approval for PUD #341-A by the Commission.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Vanfossen asked if there were any setbacks that would be changed due to RM-2. Mr. Gardner replied RM-2 permits a 10' setback and the portion remaining has setbacks greater than 10'. Mr. Norman offered further explanation relating to these setbacks.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Norman stated that the purpose of this request is to delete the property from the PUD and vacate the plat for Lots 4-10, and replat to RM-2 standards. Ms. Wilson inquired if the applicant was selling Lots 4-10 to the owners of the property to the west. Mr. Norman replied a third party had a contract to buy Lot 4-10 and the property to the west.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD #341-A**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

All of Lots Four (4), Five (5), Six (6), Seven (7), Eight (8), Nine (9) and Ten (10), Block One (1) RAINTREE II AMENDED, a resubdivision of part of Lot One (1),, Block One (1), RAINTREE II, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof.

Application No.: **Z-6075**

Present Zoning: RS-1

Applicant: **Cutsinger**

Proposed Zoning: RS-2

Location: SE corner of 74th & Birmingham

Date of Application: July 30, 1985

Date of Hearing: August 28, 1985

Size of Tract: 4.5 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Bland Pittman, 10620 East 45th, Tulsa

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - Residential.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested RS-2 District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately 4.5 acres in size and located on the north side of 75th Street, between Birmingham Avenue and Birmingham Court. It is partially wooded, flat, vacant and zoned RS-1.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north and east by single-family dwellings zoned RS-1, on the south by Oral Roberts University zoned RS-1, and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3.

**Zoning and BOA historical Summary:** Rezoning action along 75th Street has allowed a higher intensity development than conventional RS-1 densities. In addition, the area contains both RS-2 and RS-3 zoning districts.

**Conclusion:** The one block strip located between 74th Street and 75th Street, and between Lewis Avenue and Evanston Avenue appear to be in transition to more intense residential development than RS-1. The trend has been established by previous cases and due to the tracts abutting Oral Roberts University, the Staff support this transition. The requested RS-2 would be a logical transition from the RS-3 to the west of the subject tract to the RS-1 on the east.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning patterns, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested RS-2 zoning.

Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked Staff to elaborate on the area being in transition. Mr. Gardner replied the property to the west is all zoned RS-3, the applicant is requesting RS-2, and there was property to the east on the south side that was surrounded by RS-1.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bland Pittman, Tulsa, representing the Applicant, gave a brief description of the property and the intended use. Ms. Wilson discussed with Mr. Pittman, the possibility of extending the cul-de-sac to avoid having homes face a residential collector street. Ms. Wilson then asked if the planned drainage facility was privately owned or dedicated to the City. Mr. Pittman replied the intention was to establish maintenance, of a part of the facility, by the surrounding lot owners. They hope to have the pond facility play a dual role, as a park area for the residents and a water detention area.

Interested Parties:

|                    |                                       |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Mr. Charles Tate   | Address: 7244 South Birmingham, Tulsa |
| Ms. Peggy Char     | 2441 East 75th, Tulsa                 |
| Ms. Kay Clancy     | 7423 South Birmingham, Tulsa          |
| Mr. C.H. Lindsey   | 2517/19 East 74th Place, Tulsa        |
| Ms. Helen Jones    | 2619 Est 73rd, Tulsa                  |
| Mr. Larry Gamel    | 7422 So. Birmingham Ct., Tulsa        |
| Ms. Gloria Huckaby | 562 South Alleghenny, Tulsa           |
| Ms. Susan Carter   | 7410 So. Birmingham Ct., Tulsa        |

Mr. Tate commented the corner where the proposed pond (water detention area) is currently a hazard as it filled with weeds and high growth. Mr. Tate spoke in favor of the proposed project.

Ms. Char's main concern was the water drainage. She was concerned at to the ratio of the land area to the size of the proposed pond. Mr. Pittman stated the intention, if possible, was to actually decrease water run-off. They cannot do anything to increase run-off water amounts in the area. Chairman Kempe informed Ms. Char of the City water detention requirements and assured her the proposed plans would meet these requirements. Mr. VanFossen further added that past builders were not required onsite detention and, in fact, did increase the amount of water. That is not the case for today's builders and should not cause problems of the past. Mr. Pittman, in reply to Ms. Char, further detailed the proposed water detention pond/facility.

Chairman Kempe asked Staff to clarify the current requirements. Mr. Gardner explained the amount of run-off cannot be increased by any construction or building. Mr. Gardner suggested Ms. Char consult Stormwater Management, as they are now in a position to look at these areas and clean out creeks and offer maintenance.

Ms. Clancy asked Mr. Pittman to detail the size of the development, in acres, and sizes of the proposed lots.

Mr. Lindsey voiced concern over the amount of water run-off currently in the area and the chances of this project increasing these amounts. Mr. Lindsey also suggested putting a storm sewer in before the plans were approved for Mr. Pittman's project. Chairman Kempe again stated that detention is required by builders, but a builder is not required to stop present run-off, just TO not increase the amount. Chairman Kempe stated there is a request for a sewer in this addition, but the Commission is not allowed to zone based on proposed sewer plans.

Ms. Higgins informed the interested parties that, if the proposed detention is not large enough, Stormwater Management and City Hydrology will advise the applicant to increase the detention facility. Chairman Kempe supported this comment and added the regulations are now stricter regarding water detention than had been in the past for this area. Mr. VanFossen and Mr. Gardner voiced agreement with these comments and, again, suggested concerned citizens call Stormwater Management.

Ms. Jones stated concerns over present flooding in the area and the possibility of the proposed pond not being large enough to prevent increased flooding. Chairman Kempe stated the Staff finds this case to be appropriate land use and, again, stated that a builder cannot increase water run-off. The City Engineers will make their determinations to verify the detention is large enough.

Mr. Gamel disagreed with the Staff recommendation due to the fact that there is a large area zoned RS-1 surrounding the subject tract and recommended RS-1, not RS-2.

Ms. Huckaby asked if the developers are required to improve the streets (curbs) they abut. Chair and Staff advised that City Engineers will determine these requirements.

Ms. Carter objected to the proposed RS-2 designation and requested RS-1 be considered. In answer to a question by Mr. Woodard, Ms. Carter informed a homeowners association was in the process of being formed. Ms. Higgins established for Ms. Carter the proposed lots would be smaller than her lot and others in the area. Mr. Connery asked Ms. Carter for her evaluation of the drainage situation in the area. Ms. Carter replied that, although her home is not in danger of being flooded, she had sympathy for the others, as she had been flooded while a resident of New Orleans. Ms. Carter pointed out the areas on the map where she had observed excessive water flow. Mr. Woodard asked Ms. Carter if she was aware of the flood control measures recently taken by City and Stormwater Management.

#### Additional Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked Legal to advise the interested parties where they can go for help relating to the redirection of water flow due to landscaping, etc. Mr. Linker stated the City could have jurisdiction, under the Earth Change Ordinance, if it involves a water course or an area that has been mapped as a flood area. Mr. Linker further stated that if it is just surface water flow, it is not covered in the Earth Change Ordinance.

Mr. VanFossen suggested Mr. Pittman present this matter under a PUD with RS-1 zoning. Mr. Paddock stated he had difficulty agreeing with the Staff recommendation. Mr. Connery stated he felt a need for a Master Drainage Plan review before consideration of this request and could not support the requested RS-2 zoning. Ms. Wilson agreed with Mr. Paddock and moved for denial. Mr. VanFossen asked what the time element would be if a continuation was granted to allow for a PUD filing. Mr. Gardner replied it would take a minimum of 26-27 days. Discussion followed among Staff and Legal regarding a PUD versus a zoning case and how each relates to number of lots, density, etc. Chairman Kempe commented that we could not require the applicant to file a PUD and supported Staff recommendation. Mr. VanFossen also supported Staff recommendation.

**TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present**

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 3-4-0 (Connery, Paddock, Wilson, "aye"; Higgins, Kempe, Woodard, VanFossen, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **DENY Z-6075** for RS-2.

The Denial motion failing, the Commission proceeded:

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 4-3-0 "aye"; (Higgins, Kempe, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; Connery, Paddock, Wilson, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6075** for RS-2, as recommended by Staff.

**Legal Description:**

Lot One (1) and Lot Two (2), Block Two (2), SOUTHERN HILLS ESTATES ADDITION to the City, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, less and except a tract located in said Lot One (1); being the south 204' of the west 159' thereof.

Application No.: **Z-5620-SP-5** Present Zoning: Vacant  
Applicant: **State Farm Insurance** Proposed Zoning: C0  
Location: South of the SE corner of 91st & Memorial

Date of Application: July 30, 1985  
Date of Hearing: August 28, 1985  
Size of Tract: 3.0 acres

**Staff Recommendation:**

The subject tract is divided into Development Areas "A" and "B" which have a total area of three acres. Area "A" equals 1.94 acres and Area "B" equals 1.06 acres. Corridor Site Plan approval is requested for Area "A" only for a one story building of 12,376 square feet of office and 1,760 square feet of automobile evaluation area for an auto insurance facility. The proposed plan will supercede Z-5620-SP-4. The north boundary of the tract abuts a common access drive which has been improved to the east boundary of Area "A".

Staff has reviewed the proposed Corridor Site Plan and finds this proposal to be: (a) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (b) in harmony with the existing and expected development possibilities of the site; (c) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; (d) designed in a manner that provides proper accessibility, circulation and functional relationship of uses; and (e) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the Corridor Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Corridor Site Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant's plans and text be made a condition of approval, except as modified herein.
2. Development Standards:

**Development Area "A" - West 376 feet**

Land Area: 84,600 square feet, 1.94 acres

Permitted Uses: Automobile Insurance Claims Adjustment Office with evaluation area

Maximum Floor Area: Office Area 12,376 sq ft  
Evaluation Area (2 bays) 1,760 sq ft

Maximum Building Coverage: 16.7%

Maximum Building Height: 21 feet

Minimum Parking Spaces: Employee - 103 (includes 2 handicapped)  
Guests - 10 (includes 2 handicapped spaces)

Minimum Building Setbacks:

From Centerline of South Memorial 150 ft  
From North boundary 17.5 ft  
From South boundary 29 ft  
From East boundary of Area "A" 50 ft

Sign: One 6' wide X 8' high sign on a 10' tall pole, no taller than 18' above grade.

Screening: 6' tall privacy fence on south boundary

Landscaped Open Space:

Onsite 20,600 sq ft (24%)  
Exterior along Memorial 13,000 sq ft

**Development Area "B" - East 204.8 Feet**

Land Area: 46,080 square feet, 1.06 acres

No Corridor Site Plan approval is requested at this time; therefore, future development of Area "B" will require Commission approval of a Plan and Plat (such additional development standards shall be included in the Restrictive Covenants).

3. Subject to review and approval of conditions from the platting process by the Technical Advisory Committee.
4. That a Corridor Site Plan, Text and Plat for Develop Area "B" shall be approved by the Commission prior to development in said area.
5. That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be approved for each development area by the TMAPC prior to occupancy. Special treatment shall be given to the south boundary which abuts an existing multifamily residential development.

6. That a Detail Sign Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the TMAPC prior to installation.
7. That no damaged vehicles shall be stored on the premises and that no tools for the repair of vehicles be maintained in the Evaluation Area.
8. That all parking lot lighting shall be constructed in such a manner as to direct light downward and away from abutting multifamily residential development.
9. Subject to the proposed common access drive from Memorial being constructed and in place to the each boundary of Development Area "A" prior to the granting of occupancy of the proposed facility.
10. That no building permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the Corridor conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary of said Covenants.

Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked Staff to clarify the differences between this request and Z-5620-SP-4. Mr. Gardner replied the area of the building is larger with additional square footage for office.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughton, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-5620-SP-5**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

A portion of a tract of land lying in the Northwest Quarter of Section 24, Township 18 North, Range 13 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the United States Government Survey thereof, being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: BEGINNING at the NW corner of Section 24; thence due South a distance of 960' to a point; thence North  $89^{\circ}37'44''$  East a distance of 60' to the true point of beginning; thence due north a distance 225' to a point; thence north  $89^{\circ}37'44''$  East a distance of 580.80' to a point; thence due south a distance of 225' to a point; thence south  $89^{\circ}37'44''$  west a distance of 580.80' to the true point of beginning, containing 2.999 acres, being 130,677 square feet, more or less.

Application No.: PUD 403  
Applicant: Mitchell  
Location: NE corner of 57th & Lewis

Present Zoning: OL, RS-2  
Proposed Zoning: Unchanged

Date of Application: July 30, 1985  
Date of Hearing: August 28, 1985  
Size of Tract: 1 acre, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Doug Huber, 808 South Peoria, Tulsa

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is approximately one acre (gross) in size and is located at the northeast corner of 57th Place and South Lewis Avenue. It is abutted to the north by an approved PUD which allowed 5,000 square feet of office uses on .83 gross acres. South of the subject tract is both office and residential uses with residential uses to the east. West of the subject tract, across South Lewis Avenue, is the London Square Shopping Center. The subject tract is zoned a combination of OL and RS-2.

The applicant is proposing a single-story office building consisting of 5,670 square feet, plus the converted dwelling for office use which contains approximately 1,470 square feet. The total square footage of 7,140 is less than the amount permitted by the PUD and underlying zoning.

The text addresses the close proximity of the single family dwelling to the east and states that, in addition to the required 6' screening fence, landscaping in the form of trees will be planted to provide visual separation of uses. A heavy landscape buffer and berming is recommended along the north side of 57th (east of the curb cut) where this area will abut residential development on the south side of the street.

The Staff reviewed the proposal and finds that it is: (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, Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #403, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval, except as modified herein.

2. Development Standards:  
Land Area: 1.0 acre (gross) .542 acre (net)  
Permitted Uses: Uses permitted by right within an OL district,  
excluding a drive-in bank and funeral home.

|                                       |             |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|
| Maximum Floor Area: Existing Building | 1,470 sq ft |
| Proposed Building                     | 5,670 sq ft |
| Maximum Building Height: 1 Story      |             |

Minimum Internal Open Space: 19% of net area (includes perimeter landscape area within the development boundaries, parking island and plaza, but excludes walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation)

Other Bulk & Area Requirements: As required with the OL District

Off-Street Parking: 1 space per 250 sq ft of floor area for medical and dentist offices; 1 space per 300 sq ft of floor area for other office use.

3. Subject to review and conditions of the Technical Advisory Committee.
4. That a Detail Site Plan, building evaluations and type of building materials compatible with surrounding area shall be submitted to and approved by the Commission prior to issuance of Building Permits
5. That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy of any portion of the new office structure. Landscape treatment shall be provided on the east boundary with heavy landscape treatment and berming along the north side of 57th Street east of the curb cut.
6. All signs shall be in general accordance with Section 1130.2(b) of the Zoning Code. No signage shall be permitted along 57th Street. Signage shall be limited to 12' in height and maximum permitted sign area is 32 square feet. Illumination, if any, shall be by constant light.
7. That all trash and utility areas shall be completely screened from public view.
8. That all parking lot lighting shall be directed light downward and away from adjacent residential areas.
9. That a six foot privacy fence be installed prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit along the east boundary of the project.
10. That no building permit shall be issued until the requirement of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied 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 of said Covenants.

Comments & Discussion:

Staff clarified for Mr. VanFossen the land area usage for the OL designation. Ms. Wilson and Mr. Paddock inquired as to the exclusion of funeral homes and drive-in banks. Mr. Gardner stated that, although these uses are permitted in OL, they do present problems in terms of compatibility with residential areas, especially with traffic. They were



Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District #3 - Commercial Complex.

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

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately 1.2 acres in size and located on the east side of Memorial Drive, between 68th Street South and 71st Street South. It is non-wooded, gently sloping, vacant and is zoned CS, OL and AG.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north by restaurant use zoned CS, OL and AG, on the east by Woodland Hills Mall zoned CS, OL and CG, and on the southeast by overflow parking for Woodland Hills Mall zoned OL and on the west and south by both vacant property and commercial uses zoned CS, OL and AG.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** The existing zoning pattern was established before commercial PUD's were allowed. The remaining AG tracts were established to create open space and to prohibit access from Memorial to the Mall and the OL zoning was established to permit parking and control the total commercial floor area of the Mall. A similar zoning case was recently approved by TMAPC for land located north and east of the northeast corner of 71st Street and Memorial Drive.

**Conclusion:** The development of the main mall buildings is now complete and the balance of the potential development sites along 71st and along Memorial Drive are being requested for a zoning change to CS. The existing topography between the subject tract and Memorial Drive requires access be limited to the internal ring road on the south and east.

The Staff recommends APPROVAL of CS zoning on the subject tract, less and except the existing AG tract on the west to remain AG with the applicant to furnish revised legal description excluding the AG area.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Johnsen commented that the limits of no access have been established along Memorial so the access to the subject tract would be direct to the ring road, not to Memorial. Mr. Johnsen also submitted a revised legal description to Staff deleting the west 35', which is the AG area. In answer to a question from Ms. Wilson, Mr. Johnsen advised plans were for a restaurant.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughton, Harris, Woodard, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6076** for CS, as recommended by Staff.

**Legal Description:**

A part of Lot One (1), Block Two (2), WOODLAND HILLS MALL, Blocks 2, 3, 4 and 5, a Subdivision in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; BEGINNING at a point in the West boundary of said Lot 1, 456.17' from the South-Northwest corner thereof; thence due East a distance of 218.51'; thence S 55°23'41" E a distance of 8.92'; thence S 34°36'19" W a distance of 0.00'; thence on a curve to the left having a radius of 175.00' a distance of 105.51'; thence S 0°03'42" W a distance of 154.59'; thence on a curve to the right having a radius of 25.00' a distance of 39.24'; thence due West a distance of 129.97'; thence on a curve to the right having a radius of 50.00' a distance of 46.42'; thence N 0°03'42" E a distance of 263.79' to the point of beginning, LESS AND EXCEPT the West 35' thereof, which is to remain AG.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**PUD #112-3**

8720 East 61st Street, Tulsa

**Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment to permit a Church Sign**

The Detail Site Plan for the church was approved by the TMAPC on July 12, 1978. Research of the files and past approvals indicate that the PUD has been approved without reference to sign standards. The proposed sign is a ground-type monument identification sign/bulletin board. (see attached sketch) Under the present code, a bulletin board is permitted a display area of 12 square feet and an identification sign 32 square feet (Sections 420.2.d.1 and .2 respectively of the Zoning Code). For purposes of this review, the "display area" of the sign will not include the lower decorative brick veneer portion (9'-5" tall x 12'-6" wide overall), but will include the bulletin board area (4' x 8') and the top portion with the name of the church (2' x 12'-6"). The total proposed display area would then be 32 square feet for the bulletin board and 25 square feet or 57 square feet overall. Although this exceeds the present Code, amendments to the Code which have been finally approved by the TMAPC and City of Tulsa, but not yet published, would permit .25 square feet of display area per lineal foot of street frontage not to exceed 150 square feet. A sign of approximately 10 square feet is also presently existing on the building. Staff review of the proposed signage amendment indicates that it is minor in nature; therefore, recommends **APPROVAL** as follows:

- (1) Upon publication of the amendments to the Zoning Code relative to signs.
- (2) subject to removal of the existing sign on the E. 61st Street frontage mounted on freestanding poles, and
- (3) subject to all future signage being submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval prior to installation and total ultimate signage not exceeding 87.5 square feet.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Connery inquired to item #3, thinking the applicant might have used all their signage eligibility. Mr. Frank advised they had a difference between 150 square feet minus existing and proposed signage which means there is 87.5 square feet left.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment to PUD #112-3**, as recommended by Staff.

PUD #196

South of SW corner of 71st Street & Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation - Detail Sign Plan Review

The applicant is requesting Detail Sign Plan approval for a ground identification sign on South Memorial for a proposed Kentucky Fried Chicken Restaurant. Signage controls under the PUD permit three ground signs along the South Memorial frontage, one of which must be a shopping center identification sign. Review of the PUD records indicate that 75 square feet of sign display area remains unused, and the proposed sign is 6' tall x 10' wide or 60 square feet. The sign will be located at the southwest corner of the first parking lot entrance south of 71st Street. The sign will be internally lighted by constant light.

Staff review of the Detail Sign Plan indicates that it is in accordance with PUD #196; therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Plan per the submitted plot plan and sign details. NOTE: File materials indicate that a shopping center identification sign/Target sign has been approved and installed on South Memorial.

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Sign Plan to PUD #196**, as recommended by Staff.

PUD #343

SW corner of East 81st Street & South Memorial

Staff Recommendation - Detail Landscape Plan Review

The subject tract has a net area of .97 acre and is the site of a proposed bank which is now approaching completion of construction. This tract is described as Development Area "A" of the PUD.

Review of the Plan indicates that the proposed landscaped area exceeds the 15% minimum landscaped open space required by the PUD. The Landscape Plan includes a double-row of trees along the S. Memorial frontage, and a single row of trees along E. 81st, plus sodded areas and a large existing tree on E. 81st. Internal landscaped area includes shrubs and trees adjacent to the building and also planted on adjacent parking lot islands. A detailed schedule of shrubbery, trees, and plantings is included in the Plan which specifies locations and sizes of the various planting materials.

Staff review of this Plan indicates that it is consistent with the conditions of approval for PUD 343 and basically consistent with materials now in place for PUD 343. Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan for PUD 343 as submitted.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock inquired if this PUD involved the double row of maple trees and, if so, what caused the change in Staff's thinking. Mr. Gardner replied that he did not have a double row of trees and now he does on Memorial only. Mr. Frank clarified the landscaping on the subject tract for Ms. Wilson and Ms. Kempe. Mr. Paddock stated this sounded like a reasonable compromise.

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-1 (Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; Connery, "abstaining"; Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Landscape Plan to PUD #343**, as recommended by Staff.

PUD #379

North of the NW corner of East 71st & South Memorial

Staff Recommendation - Detail Sign Plan Review

The applicant is requesting approval of a temporary sign (for a period not to exceed six months) to be constructed and installed. Although the PUD conditions do not specifically address temporary signs, this review procedure is considered a reasonable and logical manner under which to control these signs. The underlying zoning of this PUD is CS.

The Staff recommends this Plan be APPROVED and the subject sign be removed prior to March 4, 1986. Further, the Staff recommends that any additional sign which may presently exist on this property be removed within 30 days of the issuance of this permit as a condition of approval of this sign.

Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked if the purpose of the temporary sign is to draw attention to the shopping center area. Mr. Frank confirmed this to be correct.

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Higgins, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, VanFossen, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Draughon, Harris, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Sign Plan to PUD #379**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

Date Approved September 11, 1985

Cherry Kempe  
Chairman

ATTEST:

AB Paddock  
Secretary

