

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1584  
Wednesday, December 11, 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>
Doherty	Carnes	Frank	Linker, Legal
Draughon	Connery	Gardner	Counsel
Kempe, Chairman	VanFossen	Setters	
Paddock, Secretary	Harris		
Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman	Young		
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, December 12, 1985 at 10:22 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 November 20, 1985, Meeting No. 1581:**

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of November 20, 1985, Meeting No. 1581.**

**REPORTS:**

**Committee Reports:**

Ms. Wilson read from the minutes of the December 4, 1985 **Comprehensive Plan Committee** in regard to the Citizen Planning Teams. The minutes indicated the consensus reached by that Committee as to what the role of the TMAPC will be with the Citizen Planning Teams.

Ms. Nancy Taylor of the INCOG Staff advised Thursday, January 9, 1986 has been set for a Get-Together to provide an opportunity for the Chairmen and Co-Chairmen of these Teams to meet with the TMAPC and BOA members. Ms. Taylor informed a short business meeting will take place to discuss roles, responsibilities and workable operating

Reports - Cont'd

procedures. An all day training session has also been set for Saturday, January 18th to provide a working knowledge of the comprehensive planning, zoning, and capital improvements processes.

Chairman Kempe stated it is important that the Planning Commissioners attend both of these meetings.

Director's Report:

Mr. Gardner advised there would be a Transportation Policy Committee meeting Thursday, December 12th at 1:30 in the Library. Mr. Gardner also advised there will not be any further requirements on floodway zoning due to changes in the City's laws and policies.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6087 Present Zoning: AG  
Applicant: Hulett (Cosec International) Proposed Zoning: CS  
Location: SW/c 111th & Yale Avenue  
Size of Tract: 5 acres

Date of Hearing: December 11, 1985 (cont'd from November 13, 1985)  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 26 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use and Residential, as well as Development Sensitive.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested CS District is in accordance with the Plan Map for the Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use portion and is not in accordance with the Plan Map for the Residential portion.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately five acres in size and located at the southwest corner of 111th Street and Yale Avenue. It is flat, vacant and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north, south and east by mostly vacant property. A single-family dwelling, zoned AG, is located to the west. There is a newly platted single-family subdivision located to the northwest.

Z-6087 Hulett (Cosec International) - Cont'd

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Rezoning in the immediate area have limited to low intensity residential categories.

**Conclusion:** Based on the Comprehensive Plan and Development Guidelines, the Staff can support some CS zoning within the typical five acre node with an appropriate buffer for future abutting development. Although the typical buffer for CS development would be RM-0, the large lot development and proximity of existing residential land use in abutting areas suggest that an OL buffer would be more suitable.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of CS zoning on the east 400', measured from the centerline, with a 150' buffer of OL. The balance of the subject tract, the west 110', will remain zoned AG and should develop as residential, which is in keeping with the character of the abutting zoning pattern to the north. Because the application was advertised for CS, the notice is not broad enough to approve residential zoning.

Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Wilson inquired as to how this case could be "No Specific Land Use" and "Residential" at the same time. Mr. Gardner explained the subject area extends beyond the node and the medium intensity node is striped rather than solid, which indicates it can be considered low intensity as well. Mr. Doherty asked why the area is development sensitive. Mr. Gardner stated the primary reason in this particular area is the sandy, erodible soils and, in some areas, it was a combination of vegetation and erodible soils, and the sump areas of this district.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman, representing Mr. H.D. Hulett, stated no objection to the somewhat reduced CS with OL as a transition buffer. Mr. Norman requested approval of this application, as recommended by Staff. Mr. Draughon inquired if the north boundary of the property included 111th Street. Mr. Norman replied the maps go to the centerline of the street. Mr. Draughon further inquired as to how the onsite detention will be accomplished. Mr. Norman commented that a part of the calculation for determining the requirement is the fact that a lot of water drains into the sandy soil of this area. The final solution for detention is on the plat which is presented before a permit can be obtained.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Hal Allen	Address: 4930 East 114th Place
Mr. Ken Ward	5536 East 114th Street South
Mr. Roy Hinkle	5556 East 113th Street South
Mr. Lewis Larry	4954 East 113th Street South
Mr. Harvey Gaspar	5525 East 113th Street South

Z-6087 Hulett (Cosec International) - Cont'd

Chairman Kempe read a letter from residents in the area who were unable to attend due to the weather, but were in protest to this zoning request (attached as an exhibit).

Mr. Hal Allen, who is past chairman of the District 26 Planning Team, stated protest to the application for CS due to the physical facts of this location and the District 26 area, and stated consideration should be given to the fact that 111th Street has no arterial designation past Louisville. He stated his opinion that this intersection is shaped as a "T" intersection and distributed copies of the District 26 Plan to the TMAPC members. Mr. Allen stated that, without a specific plan, the zoning request is premature and the citizens would like to see a plan.

Mr. Draughon inquired as to detention in the vicinity of 98th & Yale. Mr. Allen stated the detention pond in this area did not work that well. Chairman Kempe read from the Floodplain Determination stating this area did not flood 5/27/84 and there were no apparent drainage problems within one-quarter mile of this site. Mr. Paddock asked Mr. Allen if he considered 111th west of Yale a residential collector street and Mr. Allen affirmed he did. Ms. Wilson questioned Mr. Allen as to what type of development should go in with good planning at the corner of 111th and Yale. Mr. Allen replied that, basically, something that fits the topography and fits with what is in the area.

Mr. Ken Ward, representing the Fieldstone Homeowner's Association, stated they are against having this area rezoned for commercial. The Homeowner's are concerned about the increase in traffic and the need to for redesign of a traffic pattern.

Mr. Roy Hinkle stated there was enough shopping within a mile of this area and he felt the area has all the commercial needed. He stated that the road west of 111th & Yale is nothing more than a cow path with trees in the middle of the road. Mr. Hinkle asked for denial of this request as he would like to see the area remain residential.

Mr. Lewis Larry, who has resided in this area for four years, stated he did not want to see commercial at this location and requested denial of the application.

Mr. Harvey Gaspar stated agreement with the previous speakers in opposing the request for commercial.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Norman reviewed the historical zoning practices in recognizing the node concept in planning. Mr. Norman requested that that concept be considered on this application and stated that this Commission has been consistent in allowing a commercial applications at a node. Mr. Norman asked the Commission to clearly understand that the Special District

designation is not the corner including the subject tract, but on the northeast corner, and stated there were no physical facts which would preclude the application request for commercial.

Ms. Wilson commented the District #26 Plan encourages the use of PUD's in Development Sensitive areas. Mr. Gardner advised the subject tract is Development Sensitive, but not a part of the Special District, and there is no requirement under the Plan for a mandatory PUD like there is on the

northeast corner. Mr. Paddock asked Mr. Norman if he was aware of any special detailed analysis done on this corner to determine the appropriate intensity of land use as per Section 4.7 - Development Sensitive Area Policies of the District #26 Plan. Mr. Norman replied this is adequately addressed in the platting and PUD process, and he does not feel this was meant to be a requirement of the zoning process. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Norman further commented that medium intensity use is identified as appropriate for this area and has been granted at every other intersection, and there is no evidence that the subject five acres is different or has any unique problems.

In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Gardner advised 111th Street was a Secondary Arterial west of Yale to Louisville and there was an attempt to get it downgraded. It was downgraded, however, only west of Louisville. Mr. Gardner was not aware of any other actions to get this reviewed again. Mr. Draughon stated he thought the detailed analysis, as mentioned by Mr. Paddock, should be addressed before the platting process. After review of Section 4.7 of the District #26 Plan, Chairman Kempe commented this might be a debatable issue. Mr. Gardner stated that, according to the Plan, the Plan has already designated the appropriate intensities of land use. The intensity is on the Plan, but Section 4.7 does not indicate if, after detailed analysis, the change of intensities is up or down. The Special Districts do not have any intensity assigned to them, but in other parts of the Plan, the only consideration would be low intensity unless you file a PUD. Mr. Linker commented that, from a Legal point of view, there is a problem interpreting what this Section does mean. However, there would be a problem if this case was made an exception in requiring more detail than normally requested. Mr. Linker cautioned the Commission to not place too much emphasis on this.

As requested by Mr. Draughon, Mr. Gardner clarified the Staff recommendation, and commented on the practice of using five acres at the nodes. Mr. Paddock questioned a possible conflict of intensities.

Chairman Kempe stated support of the Staff recommendation. Mr. Draughon remarked he was not comfortable with the soil situation and felt there should be a special study in this area, but he was not really for or against the application. Mr. Paddock commented he was torn between the Staff recommendation and the position of the interested parties, and he feels there is a potential conflict between the physical facts. Ms.

**Z-6087 Hulett (Cosec International) - Cont'd**

Wilson stated she was having difficulty as to what has been designated a Secondary Arterial west of 11th and Yale since the existing physical facts show it as a one-lane road with trees in the middle of the road. Mr. Doherty commented he, too, was having mixed feelings, but as a Planning Commission we are expected to look ahead. Mr. Draughon asked Mr. Doherty if he thought CS zoning might discourage residential growth and Mr. Doherty replied he would rather a developer bear the weight of zoning instead of residents. Mr. Woodard advised having mixed feeling for both sides.

For the sake of a motion, Mr. Doherty moved to go with the Staff recommendation. Ms. Wilson made a second to get it on the floor, but commented she was opposed to the motion.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the Planning Commission voted 2-4-0 (Doherty, Kempe, "aye"; Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to APPROVE Z-6087 Hulett (Cosec International) for CS, as recommended by Staff.

That motion falling, Ms. Wilson made a motion to deny the zoning request.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 4-2-0 (Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Doherty, Kempe, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to DENY Z-6087 Hulett (Cosec International) for CS.

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: PUD #407 Present Zoning: OM  
Applicant: Johnsen (Frates Equities) Proposed Zoning: Unchanged  
Location: NW/c of 68th & Yale  
Size of Tract: 24.7 acres (gross)  
Date of Hearing: December 11, 1985 (cont'd from October 23, 1985)  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Roy Johnsen, 324 Main Mall (585-5641)

**Staff Recommendation:**

The subject tract has a net area of approximately 22.26 acres and underlying OM zoning. The site is currently developed with eleven office buildings ranging from two to fifteen stories in height. The purpose of the PUD is to divide the tract into twelve areas for the purpose of possible future sales and to build two new buildings, one twelve story building of 150,000 square feet and a three story building of 31,000 square feet. Existing floor area is 353,750 square feet, proposed new

**PUD #407 Johnsen (Frates) - Cont'd**

area is 181,000 square feet and total building area proposed is 534,750 square feet. The .5 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for a PUD with OM underlying zoning would allow 537,966 square feet. A structured parking garage is proposed adjacent to the new twelve story building which will be located at the northwest corner of 68th and Yale. The new three story building will be located in the northwest portion of the PUD. The subdivided areas of the tract will be referred to as Parcels A - L. The tract currently has three curb cuts on Toledo Avenue which forms the southwest boundary. One new curb cut is proposed on 68th Street and Yale Avenue.

Based on existing traffic problems in the abutting neighborhood, the Staff is only conditionally supportive of the proposed PUD and does not consider it appropriate to give an intensity bonus, nor additional curb cuts on 68th Street if the proposal would lead to additional traffic problems for the interior residential neighborhood to the west. The Staff is supportive of those elements of the PUD that would require improved landscaped buffers along the south and west boundaries of the PUD, and at the main entrance at Yale to provide storage for northbound left turns, as suggested by the Traffic Engineer at the TAC meeting. The Staff is not supportive of any proposal under the PUD that would create potential additional traffic in the adjacent neighborhood beyond what the property owner would be entitled to under a .5 FAR (net area) in OM zoning, or 484,823 square feet of floor area.

The Staff has reviewed PUD #407 and finds that it is: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas; (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 #407, 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 (Net):	969,646 sf	22.26 acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted by right in an OM District, including restaurant and bar, if located within a mid-rise or high-rise building in accordance with Section 640.3 of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.	
Maximum Building Height:	15 stories	

**PUD #407 Johnsen (Frates) - Cont'd**

Maximum Building Floor Area: 484,823 sf .5 FAR \*  
Minimum Off-Street Parking: 1 space/300 sf \*\*  
Minimum Building Setbacks:  
from Centerline of Yale 110'  
from Centerline of Abutting Nonarterials 55'  
from North Boundary 20'  
Minimum Landscaped Open Space: 35% of net area \*\*\*

\* The applicant is requesting the PUD bonus on 24.7 acres gross at .5 FAR or 538,234 square feet per Text. The Staff is not supportive of the maximum amount requested.

\*\* The applicant has requested one space per each 400 square feet for existing building and proposes one space per each 300 square feet for new buildings. Prior to conveyance of a parcel, the required parking for existing buildings shall be in place. Required parking for new buildings shall be in place prior to occupancy.

\*\*\* The applicant has proposed increased landscaping at various locations within the project. The Staff recommends that a Detail Landscape Plan be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval and installed prior to conveyance of any Parcels created by the PUD and Plat.

**PARCEL DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:**

**PARCEL A**

Net Area: 60,375 sf  
Maximum Floor Area:  
Existing Buildings: 16,911 sf  
New Buildings: None  
Minimum Landscaped Area: 60% of net area  
Maximum Height: 2 stories

**PARCEL B**

Net Area: 250,750 sf  
Maximum Floor Area:  
Existing Buildings: 169,041 sf  
New Buildings: None  
Minimum Landscaped Area: 20% of net area  
Maximum Height: 15 Stories



PUD #407 Johnsen (Frates) - Cont'd

**PARCEL C**

Net Area:	104,275 sf
Maximum Floor Area:	
Existing Buildings:	16,111 sf
New Buildings:	100,000 sf *
Minimum Landscaped Area:	20% of net area
Maximum Height:	12 Stories

\* Applicant requests 150,000 square feet. Floor area from Parcel "L" may be transferred to this tract at the applicant's option; however, Staff recommends that building floor area for Parcel "C" not exceed 131,073 square feet.

**PARCEL D**

Net Area:	50,825 sf
Maximum Floor Area:	
Existing Buildings:	16,111 sf
New Buildings:	None
Minimum Landscaped Area:	45% of net area
Maximum Height:	2 Stories

**PARCEL E**

Net Area:	79,506 sf
Maximum Floor Area:	
Existing Buildings:	16,111 sf
New Buildings:	None
Minimum Landscaped Area:	60% of net area
Maximum Height:	2 Stories

**PARCEL F**

Net Area:	45,775 sf
Maximum Floor Area:	
Existing Buildings:	16,111 sf
New Buildings:	None
Minimum Landscaped Area:	35% of net area
Maximum Height:	2 Stories

**PARCEL G**

Net Area:	82,800 sf
Maximum Floor Area:	
Existing Buildings:	37,264 sf
New Buildings:	None
Minimum Landscaped Area:	20% of net area
Maximum Height:	4 Stories

PUD #407 Johnsen (Frates) - Cont'd

PARCEL H

Net Area: 52,715 sf  
Maximum Floor Area:  
Existing Buildings: 16,111 sf  
New Buildings: None  
Minimum Landscaped Area: 45% of net area  
Maximum Height: 2 Stories

PARCEL I

Net Area: 44,400 sf  
Maximum Floor Area:  
Existing Buildings: 16,111 sf  
New Buildings: None  
Minimum Landscaped Area: 50% of net area  
Maximum Height: 2 Stories

PARCEL J

Net Area: 73,800 sf  
Maximum Floor Area:  
Existing Buildings: 17,757 sf  
New Buildings: None  
Minimum Landscaped Area: 55% of net area  
Maximum Height: 2 Stories

PARCEL K

Net Area: 46,425 sf  
Maximum Floor Area:  
Existing Buildings: 16,111 sf  
New Buildings: None  
Minimum Landscaped Area: 45% of net area  
Maximum Height: 2 Stories

PARCEL L

Net Area: 78,000 sf  
Maximum Floor Area:  
Existing Buildings: None  
New Buildings: 31,073 sf \*  
Minimum Landscaped Area: 15% of net area  
Maximum Height: 3 Stories

\* Applicant's request was 31,000 square feet. This building area could be transferred to Parcel "C" at the applicant's option.

- 3) That ingress and egress shall be subject to approval of the Traffic Engineer. One new curb cut is proposed on Yale which shall be right turn only. The Staff further recommends that Limits of No Access be a condition of PUD approval of the replat. One additional curb cut may be allowed on 68th Street subject to approval of the Traffic

PUD #407 Johnsen (Frates) - Cont'd

Engineer and shall be designed in such a manner as to not cause additional traffic to travel into the abutting residential neighborhood.

- 4) Signs accessory to office use shall comply with the restrictions of the PUD Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

**Ground Signs:** Ground signs shall be limited to two monument signs identifying the project, one located at the Yale entrance to the project, and one located at the Toledo entrance, each not exceeding six feet tall and not exceeding 64 square feet in display surface area, and one monument sign for each building not exceeding four feet in height and 32 square feet in display surface area. (Note: The Staff recommends no new ground signs be permitted on Toledo Avenue.)

**Wall or Canopy Signs:** For each building, if no monument sign has been erected, wall or canopy signs shall be permitted not exceeding one sign for each building, and not exceeding a display surface area of 32 square feet for each sign; provided, however, if a monument sign has been erected, the aggregate display surface area of the monument and wall signs shall not exceed 32 square feet.

A Detail Sign Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval prior to installation.

- 5) A Parking Plan for each Parcel shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to conveyance of any Parcel demonstrating that the required parking will be provided on the site.
- 6) All parking lot and building lighting shall be constructed in such a manner as to direct parking lot and building lighting downward and/or away from abutting residential areas.
- 7) That all trash and utility areas shall be screened from public view.
- 8) A Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval prior to issuance of a Building Permit, for any new buildings. The Detail Landscape Plan materials and products shall be installed prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit on any new buildings.
- 9)) No Building Permit shall be issued on Parcels "C" and "L" until a Detail Site Plan has been submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval.
- 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 PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Johnsen reviewed the PUD for the Commission and advised meeting with the officers of the Warren Foundation, Shell Data Center and Warren Place. They were not agreeable to allowing access across their property to 61st Street. Mr. Johnsen advised hiring DeShazo, Starek & Tang to conduct a study of the traffic counts of the subject area, including Richmond Avenue, and presented a copy of the report to each Commissioner (a copy of that report is attached as an Exhibit to these minutes.) These counts were taken on the subject site, via video taping, of the three collector streets: 68th Street (which becomes Toledo), 66th Street and Richmond. The DeShazo, Starek & Tang report (as stated by Mr. Barb Nuckells of that firm) concludes that:

1. The proposed development will have minimum impact on Yale Avenue and arterial streets serving the other general area.
2. The adjacent collector streets are presently operating less than their design capacities and projected traffic will still be less than design capacities.
3. Traffic on Richmond could be significantly reduced by making certain traffic improvements.
4. The recommended improvements include, most importantly, a new traffic signal on Yale, and secondly, widening of the main entrance on Yale, provision of a driveway on 68th Street for the new parking garage, and reorientation of the internal roadway.

Mr. Nuckells and Mr. Johnsen reviewed with the Commissioners the findings and figures of the report dealing with peak traffic volumes, trip patterns, etc. Mr. Johnsen indicated a potential location for putting a traffic light on Yale into the main entrance to Resource Sciences Center (RSC). Mr. Johnsen advised the applicant is prepared to accept, as a condition of approval, that no building permit would be issued for floor area exceeding 130,000 square feet until a traffic signal was in place at the front entry of RSC or at Shell's private drive with RSC having access. Mr. Johnsen also advised the applicant has considered moving the proposed building on Parcel "L" further south to have the trafficway end at the building, which should discourage traffic to the west side. Mr. Johnsen further stated the neighborhood residents had been very gracious in meeting with the applicant and it appeared their main concern was the speed of motorists on Richmond more than the volume. Mr. Johnsen asked the Commission to keep in mind that the RSC project is not the main cause of the traffic problems, although they do contribute to the traffic situation.

PUD #407 Johnsen (Frates) - Cont'd

Interested Parties:

Mr. Ted Autrey	Address: 6310 South Richmond Avenue
Mr. Richard Polishuk	3309 East 66th Street
Mr. Robert Sneed	6224 South Richmond Avenue
Ms. Judy Autrey	6310 South Richmond Avenue
Mr. Jim Ulrich	6425 South Richmond Avenue
Ms. Emma Ruth Steed	6224 South Richmond Avenue

Mr. Ted Autrey stated concern over the future development in this area in regard to the traffic problems on Richmond. As a resident in this area for five years, Mr. Autrey stated he felt the numbers in the report appeared low. Mr. Autrey suggested closing off the west entrance and/or Shell entrance.

Mr. Richard Polishuk, who lives near Harvard on 66th Street, commented 66th is a highly travelled collector Street and he was concerned about the addition of traffic onto this street. Mr. Polishuk offered a possible solution might be to get access to the Shell Drive entrance so as to not open up more traffic onto 68th/66th.

Mr. Robert Sneed suggested obtaining analogues comparing similar situations in Tulsa, and not just a professional opinion.

Ms. Judy Autrey stated opposition to an increase in traffic onto Richmond and asked the Commission to keep in mind that the RSC center is only 70% occupied as of now. Ms. Wilson remarked that the submitted traffic report states that the figures are adjusted to reflect 100% occupancy.

Mr. Jim Ulrich, while appreciating the efforts made by the applicant, stated he did not think these efforts would keep the traffic problems from compounding.

Ms. Emma Ruth Sneed commented she did not feel the whole picture properly reflected the future traffic of the 61st - 71st and Yale area, and asked the Commission to consider the number of children in the area.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Johnsen reiterated the counts did assume 100% occupancy of existing and proposed construction; and the counts on Richmond were taken when the barrels were not up. Mr. Johnsen, again, stated the PUD be conditional to the applicant providing the additional traffic signal on Yale prior to building beyond the 130,000 square feet of floor area, which is permissible under OM zoning.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock asked Staff if they had a problem with the additional condition of approval. Mr. Gardner stated there was no question that that kind of condition is enforceable. Mr. Gardner advised the applicant can, by right, put in 130,000 square feet, and for the bonus of 50,000

**PUD #407 Johnsen (Frates) - Cont'd**

square feet the applicant is willing to make the additional condition of approval. In reply to Mr. Paddock on the same question, Mr. Linker advised that, from a legal point of view, there was no problem in imposing a condition, especially when the applicant is volunteering. Mr. Gardner reminded the Commissioners the applicant is willing to put in the traffic light at their expense.

Chairman Kempe asked for clarification on the applicant volunteering to move the proposed building further south to help block the west drive, provide a new exit on 68th Street and widen the main entrance; with the additional 50,000 square feet being based on the approval of the Traffic Engineer. Mr. Gardner explained the applicant is willing to make all of these as conditions of approval if they get the 50,000 square feet. If they do not get the 50,000 square feet, they can have the 130,000 square feet and not be restricted by a PUD. Ms. Wilson advised she will be abstaining as her husband is an employee of Frates.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **5-0-1** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Wilson, "abstaining"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD #407, Johnsen (Frates)**, as recommended by Staff and subject to the following additional conditions:

- a) Reorientation of the proposed building on Parcel "L";
- b) Change of the private drive access on 68th;
- c) Widening of access on 66th Street;
- d) The bonus of 50,000 square feet is contingent upon obtaining clearance from Traffic Engineer to place an additional traffic signal, which would be constructed by the applicant and in place prior to the bonus floor area under the PUD being granted.

**Legal Description:**

Lot One, Block One, WILLOW CREEK ADDITION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the Recorded Plat thereof.

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: Z-6090  
Applicant: City of Tulsa (HBM-71)  
Location: NE/c 71st & Yale Avenue  
Size of Tract: 10 acres, approximate

Present Zoning: CS, OMH, OM  
Proposed Zoning: CS, OM

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 #2 (Hospital - Medical and Related Activities, Office, Commercial Shopping, Residential and Cultural Activities) and Development Sensitive.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 10 acres in size and located at the northeast corner of 71st Street and Yale Avenue. It is nonwooded, gently sloping, under construction for a restaurant on part of the site and is zoned CS, OMH and OM, and PUD #260-A.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north and east by vacant property zoned OM and PUD, on the south by a shopping center zoned OM on which the District Court allowed commercial uses, and on the west by a multi-story office park zoned OM.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The subject tract has been approved for commercial/office use by PUD #260-A.

Conclusion: Although the subject tract has been approved for PUD #260-A development, the underlying rezoning application is a housekeeping measure initiated by TMAPC, to reduce the underlying CS and OMH zoning, which will accommodate the recently approved development, but is more consistent with City Commission approval of the original CS zoning and the latest PUD amendment. The owner has been advised of the application and is in agreement. This proposed zoning pattern will be more in character with the commercial pattern established at the southeast corner of this intersection by the District Court. The Staff, therefore, recommends approval of a 3.6 acre parcel located at the southeast corner of the subject tract for CS zoning (the west 405' of the south 387.2'), and the balance OM.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner advised when the PUD for the northeast corner was processed, it was discovered the ordinance was, inadvertently, published for a full ten acres of CS. The applicant later came back for a specific proposal for OMH, but the PUD was amended and the OMH is now no longer needed. Mr. Gardner continued by stating the City approved approximately 3.6

**Z-6090 City of Tulsa (HBM-71) - Cont'd**

acres of commercial and this application is merely reducing the amount of commercial and getting rid of the OMH and placing it in the original approved zoning district. There were no protestants or interested parties in attendance.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6090 City of Tulsa (HBM-71)**, as recommended by Staff.

**Legal Description:**

**CS:** The west 405' of the south 387.2' of a tract described as: All that part of the SW/4 SW/4, Section 3, Township 18 North, Range 13 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the official US Government Survey thereof, more particularly described as follows, to-wit: BEGINNING at the Southwest corner of Lot 1, Block 2, Burning Hills, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the official recorded plat (also the North right-of-way line of East 71st Street South); thence along the North right-of-way line of East 71st Street South as follows: N 89° 49' 38" W parallel to and 60.00 feet from the South boundary of said SW/4 SW/4 a distance of 289.85 feet; thence N 00° 00' 17" E a distance of 8.00 feet; thence N 89° 49' 38" W parallel to and 68.00 feet from the South boundary of said SW/4 SW/4 a distance of 286.20 feet calculated (Mortgage 286.22 feet); thence N 54° 20' 53" W a distance of 29.29 feet; thence due North along the East right-of-way line of South Yale Avenue parallel to and 60.00 feet from the West boundary of said SW/4 SW/4 a distance of 576.02 feet; thence S 89° 49' 36" E a distance of 599.91 feet to a point on the West boundary of Lot 1, Block 2, Burning Hills, an addition in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the official recorded plat; thence S 00° 00' 17" W along the West boundary of Lot 1, Block 2, Burning Hills a distance of 601.01 feet to the Point of Beginning; containing 357,854 square feet or 8.21520 acres, more or less.

**OM:** All of the above described tract, except the west 405' of the south 387.2'.

\* \* \* \* \*



Application No.: Z-6091 Present Zoning: RS-3  
Applicant: Snow (Moore) Proposed Zoning: CS  
Location: North of the NE/c of 61st & 33rd West Avenue  
Size of Tract: .5 acres, more or less  
Date of Hearing: December 11, 1985  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Gerald Snow, 820 North Lynn Lane

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 8 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity - No Specific Land Use.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .5 acres in size and located north of the northeast corner of 61st Street South and 33rd West Avenue. It is partially wooded, gently sloping, contains two single-family dwellings and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by similar single family dwellings zoned RS-3, on the east and west by vacant property property zoned RS-3 and CS, and on the south by a car wash zoned CS.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: A precedent for both commercial zoning and medium intensity commercial uses has been established in the area.

Conclusion: The subject tract lies within the Type I Node (467' x 467') created by the intersection of two secondary arterial streets. In addition, the requested CS zoning is consistent with established zoning patterns in the area abutting similar CS zoning to the south and west.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to APPROVE Z-6091 Snow (Moore), as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

The South 25' of Lot 14 and all of Lot 15, AND the South 50' of Lot 13, and the North 50' of Lot 14, Block 1, SUMMIT PARK ADDITION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6092 & PUD #410  
Applicant: Jones (Cambridge)  
Location: South and East of 36th & South Yale  
Size of Tract: 4.1 acres, more or less

Present Zoning: RD  
Proposed Zoning: RM-1

Date of Hearing: December 11, 1985

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

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

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested RM-1 zoning **may be found** in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation - Z-6092

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately 4.1 acres in size and located south and east of the southeast corner of 36th Street and Yale Avenue. It is non-wooded, sloping, vacant and is zoned RD.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north by a church zoned RS-2, on the east and south by single-family dwellings zoned RS-2 and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3. A 70' wide buffer strip of land zoned RD would remain along the south and east boundaries of the subject tract being considered for RM-1.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** The City Commission recently approved RD Duplex zoning on the subject tract. The City Board of Adjustment approved a use variance upon the showing of hardship to allow a branch office of a savings and loan company on the northwest corner of 36th Street and Yale Avenue.

**Conclusion:** The TMAPC and Staff recommended denial of the initial request for OL zoning on the subject tract. The City Commission referred the OL application back to the TMAPC on January 14, 1985 to allow the applicant to file a PUD with underlying RM-1 zoning for office uses. The TMAPC recommended approval of RM-1, subject to PUD #402, and the City Commission denied RM-1 and PUD #402 on September 3, 1985. The Staff did not support the RM-1 request previously and, therefore, did not support PUD #402. Although RM-1 is a "may be found" in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, the existing zoning pattern and adjacent land use does not support RM-1 zoning. The RD zoned buffer strip which would remain on the south and east will reduce the intensity, but does not change the fact that there is no RM-1 zoning or higher intensity zoning

Z-6092 & PUD #410 Jones (Cambridge) - Cont'd

abutting the subject tract. The adjacent land is used exclusively for single-family residential purposes with a church on the north side and zoned RS-2 and RS-3 on three sides. The residential character of this area dictates that the future uses of the subject property be residential, such as RM-T Townhouse, which had previously been supported by both the TMAPC and Staff under Z-5855, with a buffer of RD along the south and east boundaries or RD duplex development on the entirety as approved by the City Commission.

Therefore, Staff recommends DENIAL of RM-1. The related PUD #410 follows.

Staff Recommendation - PUD #410

The subject tract has a gross area of 6.26 acres and is located adjacent to the southeast corner of East 36th Street and South Yale Avenue, with a frontage of approximately 376' on South Yale and 105' on East 36th Street. South Yale is classified as a Primary Arterial and East 36th as a Residential Collector at this location. The tract has been advertised for RM-1 for the purpose of accommodating a 70,000 square foot office complex. The land located at the intersection of South Yale and East 36th Street is the site of an existing church. The applicant is proposing access to both Yale Avenue and 36th Street. The location of the access point on Yale Avenue appears too close to the crest of the hill and, therefore, should be approved as to location by the Traffic Engineer. The Staff suggests that consideration be given to the northbound right-turn deceleration lane being added to Yale to allow safer turning movements and potential storage out of the through lanes.

The Traffic Engineer has been supportive of a requirement for ingress and egress to the site from East 36th due to sight distance problems at the main entrance from Yale. The PUD Text indicates that the church and office park will share a common access point on East 36th and, thus, eliminate one curb cut on 36th Street. The building setback along the east and south boundaries which abut existing single-family residential uses is 70' from the property line. The Text further indicates that buildings will be restricted to one story in height for the east 150', and in accordance with this proposal, no building shall exceed 752' mean sea level in elevation. This restriction would indicate that the maximum building height would be about two stories or 28' based on the topography of the land. Off-street parking will be arranged along the periphery of the development on all sides and a 5' landscape buffer is proposed with a 6' tall privacy fence on the south and east boundaries. If a 5' cut in grade is required along these boundaries, a retaining wall be constructed to preserve the landscape requirement. Total interior landscaping of the net site is 39%. No exterior lighting will be located within 30' of the south and east boundaries. Light poles will not exceed 8' and direct light downward and away from adjacent residences. Drainage will be to the north and west and managed by an onsite detention pond adjacent to

**Z-6092 & PUD #410 Jones (Cambridge) - Cont'd**

the northwest corner of the tract. The PUD Text indicates that the drainage plan concept has been approved by the City's Stormwater Management Department and will require detention. The PUD file also includes a soils analysis.

The Staff is not supportive of the underlying zoning requested per Z-6092 for RM-1 and is, therefore, not supportive of the proposed PUD and recommends DENIAL. However, if the Commission is supportive of the requested zoning, the Staff suggests the following development standards:

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):	277,387 sf	6.36 acres
(Net):	251,693 sf	5.78 acres
Proposed RM-1 Zoned Area:	180,016 sf	4.1326 acres

	Submitted	Recommended
Permitted Uses:	Principal and accessory permitted in Use Unit 10, Off-Street Parking Areas, and Use Unit 11, Office and Studios.	Use Unit 11, Office & Studios, excluding funeral homes & drive-in bank facilities.
Maximum Building Floor Area:	.39/RM-1 Area	
Maximum Building Height:		
Within East 150'	1 story	
Within Remainder	2 story*	
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	As required by the Zoning Ordinance	
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
from Centerline of East 36th	350'	
from West Property Line	70'	
from East Property Line	70'	
from North Interior Property Line	70'	
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space:	39% (net)	

\* No roof line shall exceed 752 feet mean sea level.

3) **Signs:**

Submitted: Two ground identification signs (one on South Yale and one on East 36th) which shall not exceed 6' in height or 32 square feet of display surface area. Signage for property shall be of a monument type with constant upward directed ground lighting.

Suggested: Same, except allow only one sign on South Yale and permit no signage on East 36th Street, except directional signs for traffic.

Z-6092 & PUD #410 Jones (Cambridge) - Cont'd

- 4) Access to East 36th Street shall be shared by this PUD and the existing church to the north allowing one less curb cut on East 36th. Traffic conditions of approval shall be subject to approval of the Traffic Engineer. Further, consideration is recommended for addition of a north bound right turn deceleration lane on Yale for safer and more protected turning movements into this project, if feasible.
- 5) That parking lot lighting be restricted to a maximum of 8' in height, and be directed downward away from the adjacent residential areas, and not be permitted within the east and south 30' of the subject tract.
- 6) That a 5' landscape buffer be required along the south and east boundaries, plus a 6' tall screening fence; further that if a grade cut is required along these boundaries, it will not exceed 5' and the landscape buffer be preserved by construction of a retaining wall of comparable height to the cut.
- 7) That all trash, utility and equipment areas shall be screened from public view. and from ground level view of persons in adjacent residential areas, which shall include a screening requirement for roof mounted mechanical equipment.
- 8) Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee, including the approval of all access points by the Traffic Engineer.
- 9) That a Detail Site Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- 10) That a Detail Landscape Plan and Sign Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit.
- 11) 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 PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

Comments & Discussion:

There was some discussion initiated by Ms. Wilson as to why this case was brought back to the TMAPC after a previous denial for RM-1 by the City Commission. Mr. Wilson stated the Item G.7 of the Rules and Policies of the TMAPC state that "The Commission shall not rehear a denied zoning application for a period of six months unless said application is amended to a zoning classification consistent with the Comprehensive Plan." Mr. Gardner commented the word "Commission" was unclear as to whether it was referring to the City Commission or the Planning Commission. Ms. Wilson contended that the word "denied" implied the City Commission since the

Z-6092 & PUD #410 Jones (Cambridge) - Cont'd

TMAPC is a recommending body to the City on zoning matters and the TMAPC does not have final authority. Mr. Paddock commented that maybe the TMAPC Rules and Procedures should be reviewed for rephrasing.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman commented this case was last heard July 17, 1985, and stated the project has been reduced in floor area and the correct FAR should be 25.2%, not 39% as stated in the Staff recommendation. Mr. Norman advised this PUD was drawn up only after agreement was reached with all 14 abutting homeowners. An agreement has also been made with the church on the corner of 36th and Yale to allow them access across the panhandle portion of the subject tract for parking.

Interested Parties:

Ms. Barbara Glass	Address: 3612 South Braden Place
Ms. Janet Bradley	3355 South Braden
Ms. Susan Little	3360 South Allegheny
Mr. John Bradley	3355 South Braden
Mr. Herb Fritz	1433 East 46th Street

Ms. Glass, whose home abuts the subject property, spoke in support of the project and asked the Commission to also support this PUD.

Those speaking in protest to this application were Ms. Bradley, Ms. Little, Mr. Bradley and Mr. Fritz. Ms. Bradley submitted a petition with signatures of homeowners in the Highland Park area protesting the zoning request. Ms. Bradley stated, while having no problems with the site plan, she did not agree with the rezoning. Ms. Little stated concerns over the potential traffic increase in the neighborhood. Mr. Bradley, using aerial maps, indicated how deep this project goes into the residential areas. Mr. Fritz, as District #6 Citizen Planning Team Chairman, stated the land use is not in compliance with the District Plan.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Norman referred to an office area at Yale and Allegheny (PUD #340) which met with approval of the residents, as this situation compares to the same situation of this zoning/PUD application. Mr. Norman stated he felt the subject tract has been isolated from the neighborhood to the south due to the platting process along Yale. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Norman commented this treatment to his tract was far better if comparing intrusions and impact on the neighborhood.

**Z-6092 & PUD #410 Jones (Cambridge) - Cont'd**

Mr. Paddock stated Staff was recommending RM-T and asked Mr. Norman's reaction to this recommendation. Mr. Norman stated he, obviously, disagreed, and the degree of use is less than that of PUD #340. Mr. Norman advised the Comprehensive Plan relationship was exactly the same and he was confused as the neighbors supported projects of a similar type adjacent to them but they are objecting to them 600' - 700' away.

**Additional Comments & Discussion:**

Mr. Doherty made a motion to go with the Staff recommendation and deny the zoning request. After discussion of the motion, Mr. Doherty amended the motion to deny the request for RM-1, but allow rezoning to RM-T.

NOTE: Staff states for the record that the subject recommendation is for denial of RM-1. Staff did not support RM-T on a previous application and made mention of that fact in this case.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Kempe, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to DENY Z-6092 Jones (Cambridge) for RM-1, as recommended by Staff, but APPROVE the rezoning to RM-T.

On MOTION of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 5-1-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Kempe, "nay"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to DENY PUD #410 Jones (Cambridge), as recommended by Staff.

**SUBDIVISIONS:**

**FINAL APPROVAL & RELEASE:**

**State Farm Service Center (Revised)**

South of SE/c 91st & Memorial

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to APPROVE the Final and Release of Plat for State Farm Service Center, as recommended by Staff.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD #337-1

Lot 5, Block 1, Steeplechase Addition

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment to Side Yard Setback

The purpose of the minor amendment is to clear the title on an existing single-family residence. The request is to reduce the south (rear) setback line from 25' to 19'. Vacant property exists to the south (abutting) and notice has been given to these owners. Staff finds the request to be minor in nature; therefore, recommends APPROVAL of the minor amendment.

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to APPROVE the Minor Amendment to Side Yard Setback for PUD #337-1, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

PUD #320-2

South and East of 81st Street & Delaware

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment of the Fencing Plan and Approval of the Detail Fence Plan

The subject tract is approximately 16.05 acres in size and located south of the southeast corner of 81st Street and South Delaware Avenue. It is wooded and contains a private club, swimming pool, tennis courts and picnic tables. It has been approved for a 119 unit single-family attached condominium complex.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's fence plan and compared it to the Outline Development Plan and have identified an area of minor concern. The eastern boundary of the fence plan is proposed to be masonry and wood, and not completely masonry as presented in the Development Plan. However, the fence will provide visual separation as originally indicated. The remainder of the fence plan calls for a standard six foot high wood screening fence along the north and south boundaries, and a four foot high decorative fence with earthen berms and extensive landscape along the western boundary.

The Staff has determined that the request is minor in nature and, therefore, recommends APPROVAL of the fence plan, subject to APPROVAL of the minor amendment and the submitted fence plans.

**NOTE:** Notice of the minor amendment has been given to abutting property owners.



Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Hinkle, 1515 East 71st, #307, represented Cooper Brothers, Inc., the builder of the condominiums. Mr. Hinkle advised an agreement had been worked out the the abutting neighbors as to the height of the fence on the east side. The pillars separating the fence will be 7'8"; the decorative wall which sets underneath the wooden fence which will be 1'6" in height; and the fence will be 5' high. Mr. Hinkle advised the agreement included rebars in the masonry columns, as well as in the wall for proper reinforcement; and brick on both sides of the fence. In reply to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Hinkle stated the fence material would probably redwood. Mr. Draughon asked the difference between this submittal and the original plan. Mr. Hinkle informed the first plan just satisfied the need for a screening fence and this submittal is more in keeping with the neighborhood.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Howard Kearns, 8214 South College, whose property abuts the fence, stated he agrees with the changes that have been made to the fence design.

On **MOTION** of **DRAUGHON**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Connery, Harris, VanFossen, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment of the Fencing Plan and the Detail Fence Plan for PUD #320-2**, as recommended by Staff and amended as follows: the east fence will have 7'8" pillars, a decorative wall of 1'6" underneath and the fence structure will be 5' in height.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 6:17 p.m.

Date Approved

January 8, 1986

Cherry Kempe  
Chairman

ATTEST:

PBPaddock

Secretary



TO BE READ AT THE TMAPC MEETING - December 11, 1985

RE: Z-6087 (Hulet)

Because of the hazardous road conditions south of 61st Street, we are unable to be present at this public hearing to protest application Z-6087 which would allow commercial zoning at the southwest corner of 111th & Yale. We live south and west of that intersection and are familiar with the drainage and traffic problems, as well as land uses in this part of District #26. We feel that any commercial zoning would be inappropriate and, in fact, damaging to the neighborhood.

Samuel & Linda Shaddock

M/M Don Roach

Allen & Martha Roberts

Betty & Clarence Simmons

Ruth Broach Dunner

Anthony Cole Dunner

Forrest & Carol Garretson

Harvey Mingle

Duane & Awilda Godsey

Betty Knight Broach

Steven R. Dunner

Barbara & Bill Lipe

