

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1613  
Wednesday, **July 23, 1986**, 1:30 p.m.  
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>	<b>MEMBERS ABSENT</b>	<b>STAFF PRESENT</b>	<b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>
Carnes	Crawford	Jones	Linker, Legal
Doherty, 2nd Vice-Chairman	Kempe	Gardner	Counsel
Draughon		Setters	Williams, DSM
Paddock, Secretary		Matthews	Connelly, DCD
Parmele, Chairman			
Selph			
VanFossen			
Wilson, 1st Vice-Chairman			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, July 22, 1986 at 9:45 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**Approval of Minutes of July 9, 1986, Meeting #1611:**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-1** (Carnes, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Wilson, "abstaining"; Doherty, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of July 9, 1986, Meeting #1611**.

**REPORTS:**

**Committee Report:**

Mr. VanFossen advised of the Comprehensive Plan Committee meeting this date to review the final draft of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Policies and Procedures. Mr. Pat Connelly of the Department of City Development (DCD) briefed the Commission on the presentation made to the Comprehensive Plan Committee and reviewed the suggested changes to the final draft.

**TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present**

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **ADOPT** the **Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Policies and Procedures, as modified, and as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan Committee.**

**Director's Report:**

- a) Mr. Gardner presented the request from Staff to call a public hearing to be held August 27, 1986 to consider amendments to Title 42, City of Tulsa Zoning Code, as relates to Section 1690.1 Procedure (referring to the Secretary of the Board of Adjustment), and Section 1215.2 Included Uses (referring to maximum permitted floor area for dry cleaning/laundry facilities).

**TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **SET** a Public Hearing for August 27, 1986 to Consider amendments to Title 42, City of Tulsa Zoning Code, as relates to Section 1690.1 Procedure (referring to the Secretary of the Board of Adjustment), and Section 1215.2 Included Uses (referring to maximum permitted floor area for dry cleaning/laundry facilities).

- b) Consider holding a meeting of the TMAPC on July 30, 1986, the fifth Wednesday in July.

Mr. Gardner explained this item was placed on the agenda to discuss the possibilities of hearing and receiving information from the report on the two proposed routes for the Creek Freeway. The information will be going to the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Transportation Study Policy Committee (TMATS) on the following day, July 31st. Should TMAPC decide they do wish to see this information before it goes to TMATS, this fifth Wednesday (July 30th) would be the only day TMAPC would be able to do so. If this proved to be the case, TMAPC could only receive information, but they would not be able to vote or take action, as there is not enough time to properly advertise it as a public hearing. Mr. Gardner added that, should the TMAPC decide to wait and meet between the TMATS meeting (July 31st) and the INCOG Board meeting (August 14th), then Staff would need a directive from the TMAPC, this day, to call for and advertise a public hearing in order to meet the 15 days notice requirement (this would set the public hearing date at August 13th). Mr. Gardner added that, if the TMAPC decided to wait until after both meetings, the need to meet advertising requirements would not be a problem.

REPORTS - Cont'd

Chairman Parmele commented that the decision to be made is where TMAPC wants to insert themselves in the process of reviewing the Creek Freeway issue. The alternatives being whether to meet prior to the INCOG Board, or wait until afterwards. Ms. Wilson asked if the information would be available, publicly, by July 30th. Mr. Gardner stated the earliest possible time it might be available would be to mail out in this week's packets, but it is not ready at this point. Chairman Parmele commented that he was not sure it would do the TMAPC much good to have a special meeting to receive a report for something that was to be discussed the following day at the TMATS Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. VanFossen stated that he, personally, preferred having the information mailed in their packets so the Commissioners can be aware of the report, but not necessarily have a special hearing meeting on July 30th. Mr. Carnes commented there were several affirmative nods among the Commission members at this suggestion. Mr. Paddock remarked it appeared to be another situation of "public meeting" versus "public hearing", and he could see advantages/disadvantages to both. Mr. Gardner, in reply to Mr. Paddock, advised the Staff could present the information on the following Wednesday (August 6th) in a public forum mode, but the TMAPC could not take any action, only review and use the forum for questions and answers for their own clarification. Mr. Gardner reiterated that, if the TMAPC decided to have a public hearing on August 13th, Staff would have to be advised this date in order to meet advertising requirements. Mr. Paddock then inquired when the information would be ready for TMAPC, media, etc. Mr. Gardner stated that if it could be ready by this Friday (July 25th) then it would be made available to all interested parties.

Ms. Wilson stated she saw pro and con to both alternatives, but an advantage to having a public meeting (July 30th) would be to have an opportunity to review the two plans and, with the meeting not being a public hearing, it should offer a clearer perspective. Mr. VanFossen, offering the other side, stated he would not want to see the TMAPC get into a situation where the questions asked (by TMAPC) become leading questions causing the minds of the TMAPC members to become preset before the public hearing.

Chairman Parmele commented that, should the TMAPC decide to have any public input before the Planning Commission, when should they have that input. In other words, at the time of the public hearing to amend the Major Street and Highway Plan, the TMAPC will have a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommendation, a TMATS recommendation, and as it now stands, a resolution from the INCOG Board of Directors adopting the Long-Range Transportation Plan amendments. The decision for the TMAPC is to now decide where they want to place themselves in the process. Ms. Wilson reminded that the TMAPC previously decided (through Committee action) to place themselves at the end of the process.

REPORTS - Cont'd

Mr. Draughon stated he would prefer getting the information from the other sources (TAC, TMATS, etc.) so the TMAPC has the whole picture, and can review it before a public hearing. Commissioner Selph commented that, speaking strictly for himself, he would like to have the TMAPC public hearing before the INCOG Board meets since, as an elected official and a member of the INCOG Board, he would like to have public input prior to voting on August 14th.

Mr. Doherty remarked that the distinction between the public meeting and the public hearing has been made quite well, and agreed with Commissioner Selph that, perhaps, the public hearing is needed for input and TMAPC recommendation prior to any decision by the INCOG Board. Mr. Doherty commented that the item on the agenda was to consider a public meeting on July 30th, which he did not think was necessary. (There was a general consensus of agreement among the TMAPC members to this comment.)

Mr. Carnes made a motion to not have a meeting on July 30, 1986, but to set and advertise a public hearing for August 13, 1986 to amend the Major Street and Highway Plan. General discussion followed on the motion for a public hearing, with emphasis by Mr. Gardner and Mr. Linker that the INCOG Board is involved with amendments to the Long-Range Transportation Plan, while the TMAPC's responsibility is with the Major Street and Highway Plan. Therefore, any public hearing called by the TMAPC would be to deal with amendments to the Major Street and Highway Plan.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **8-1-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; VanFossen, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **DENY** Wednesday, July 30, 1986 as a TMAPC meeting date, and to **APPROVE** setting a public hearing for Wednesday, August 13, 1986 to review amendments to the Major Street and Highway Plan, as relates to the Creek Freeway and related items.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6119 & PUD 380-A Present Zoning: AG, RS-1  
Applicant: Walker (Nassif & 71st St Ltd) Proposed Zoning: RS-2  
Location: East of the SE/c of 101st & Yale  
Size of Tract: 40 acres  
Date of Hearing: July 23, 1986 (Continuance requested to August 6, 1986)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-6119

The District 26 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District Number 2 - Limited to Low Intensity Residential (RS-1), or increased intensity allowed under a PUD.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested RS-2 zoning **may be found** in accordance with the Plan Map, with a companion PUD.

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately 40 acres in size and is located east of the southeast corner of South Yale and East 101st Street. It is partially wooded, vacant and characterized as a "sump area" with poor drainage away from the site, according to the City Hydrologist.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The area north across East 101st and east of the subject tract is vacant and zoned AG, the area to the south is vacant and zoned RS-1, and the area to the west is vacant and zoned RS-2 and a church site zoned AG.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** The most recent RS-2 zoning, a part of the subject tract, in this area was granted in combination with a PUD which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

**Conclusion:** The central portion of the subject tract includes PUD 380-A, which requests abandonment of PUD 380 and retention of the underlying RS-2 zoning. Z-6119 requests rezoning from RS-1 to RS-2 on the west part, rezoning from AG to RS-2 on the east, and also includes all of the area previously approved for RS-2 under Z-6012/PUD 380.

The Comprehensive Plan Special District designates this area a natural drainage "sump area". The Plan states that zoning shall be RS-1 unless accompanied by a PUD so that drainage problems can be resolved by site design and development. Although a PUD application to accomplish this requirement was not originally submitted with Z-6119, discussions with the applicant indicate a request for continuance of this application would be made on July 23, 1986 and the necessary PUD filed for TMAPC and City Commission review and approval in support of RS-2. Given past zoning actions, including District Court actions, surrounding zoning patterns and existing drainage problems, Staff would be supportive of RS-2 zoning only in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, which requires submission of a PUD.

Therefore, Staff recommends DENIAL of RS-2 as requested. Staff could be supportive of RS-2 with the submission of a companion PUD for review and approval by the TMAPC and City Commission.

Staff Recommendation: PUD 380-A

The subject tract has an area of approximately 14 acres and is located east of the southeast corner of South Yale and East 101st Street. The applicants are requesting that PUD 380 be abandoned and that the underlying RS-2 zoning be retained. The Comprehensive Plan designates this area as a Special District, which is characterized as a natural drainage "sump area", according to the City Hydrologist. The Plan states that zoning shall be RS-1 unless accompanied by a PUD so that drainage problems can be resolved by site design and development. The required PUD would also assure that common areas, including onsite drainage and detention areas, would be maintained by a Homeowners Association, which can be a condition of PUD approval. Discussions with the applicant have indicated a request for continuance of PUD 380-A and Z-6119 would be presented on July 23, 1986, and an RS-2/PUD application would be filed for TMAPC and City Commission review and approval at a future date.

Therefore, based on the Comprehensive Plan, Staff recommends DENIAL of the request to abandon PUD 380-A and retain the RS-2 underlying zoning. Staff could be supportive of abandoning PUD 380-A with retention of the underlying RS-2 zoning only if a companion PUD was submitted for review and approval by the TMAPC and City Commission.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doherty, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6119 and PUD 380-A Walker until Wednesday, August 6, 1986, 1986 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.**

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: PUD 418 Present Zoning: CS, OL  
Applicant: Jones (Williams) Proposed Zoning: Unchanged  
Location: West of the SW/c of East 91st Street South & South Delaware  
Size of Tract: 23.14 acres  
Date of Hearing: July 23, 1986 (Continuance requested for August 6, 1986)

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract has a total area of 23.14 acres located west of the southwest corner of East 91st Street and South Delaware. The tract has 660' of frontage on East 91st Street and 1,416' of frontage along the Arkansas River. The proposed alignment of the Riverside Parkway on the adopted Major Street and Highway Plan (an element of the Comprehensive Plan) generally includes the approximate west 150' of the subject tract. Staff is **not supportive** of the proposed PUD as it is not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons:

- 1) No provision is made in the PUD Outline Development Plan or Text for the Riverside Parkway.
- 2) No medium intensity node is designated on the Comprehensive Plan at this location.
- 3) The proposed PUD spreads medium intensity commercial development over the entire tract to a depth of approximately one-fourth mile, even though the majority of the tract is zoned light office and does not equate to commercial floor area.

PUD 418 is divided into Development Areas A, B and C, each of which proposes all principal uses permitted as a matter of right and accessory uses permitted in the CS zoning district. The planned parkway right-of-way would be included in Development Areas A and B. According to the Text, the tract includes 5.507 acres of CS zoning and 17.633 acres of OL zoning. This zoning pattern would generate 119,942 square feet of medium intensity uses (CS and otherwise), and 230,428 square feet (.3 FAR) of low intensity uses (such as light office). The Text proposes 477,174 square feet of medium intensity uses spread over the entire tract which would require 19.61 acres of CS zoning. No conceptual plan of building layouts, parking areas, drives and open space areas is provided in the PUD Text; therefore, it is not possible to assess the impact of the proposed PUD upon the officially adopted Major Street and Highway Plan or proposed land use relationships to the abutting areas.

Staff considers the manner in which this Plan is presented to be a circumvention of the PUD process and strongly supports a redesign of the Plan to provide for the dedication of the required 150' of parkway right-of-way. If this redesign was also supported by the Commission, an intersection (which presently does not exist) would be created at the Parkway and East 91st Street; such an intersection could reasonably be treated under the Development Guidelines as a Type II Node (10 acres of medium intensity). It should be recognized that in accordance with the present plans for the Riverside Parkway, south bound traffic could not exit the parkway onto East 91st east bound, and west bound traffic from East 91st Street could only enter the parkway and go north.

**PUD 418 Jones (Williams) - Cont'd**

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of PUD 418 as submitted and recommends a redesign to provide for the Riverside Parkway and proper allocation of intensity of uses, as the PUD Plan and Text in its present form is:

- 1) Inconsistent with the Major Street and Highway Plan, an element of the Comprehensive Plan.
- 2) Not in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas.
- 3) Not considered a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site.
- 4) Not consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

**NOTE:** A copy of this Staff recommendation and related case materials is being forwarded to the Riverparks Authority for review and comment. It is possible the results of that review would be submitted to the TMAPC under separate cover or at the meeting. According to the PUD Text, .555 acres of the gross site is included within the "Arkansas River Meander Line".

**TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present**

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Draughton, Paddock, Parmele, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doherty, Kempe, Selph, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 418 Jones (Williams)** until Wednesday, **August 6, 1986**, 1986 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

**ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:**

Application No.: **Z-6118**  
Applicant: **Moore**  
Location: **91st East Avenue at Skelly Drive**  
Size of Tract: **.5+ acres**

Present Zoning: **RD**  
Proposed Zoning: **OL**

Date of Hearing: **July 23, 1986**  
Presentation to TMAPC by: **Mr. Jim Moore, 2 Diamond Head, Sand Springs**

**Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:**

The District 17 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - No Specific Use.



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

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately .5 acres in size and located at the southeast corner of 91st East Avenue and Skelly Drive. It is nonwooded, flat, contains 2 residential duplex units and is zoned RD.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north by Skelly Drive I-44 zoned RS-2, on the east by duplex dwelling units zoned RD and on the south and west by single-family dwelling units zoned RS-3.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Recent actions have allowed office uses in the surrounding area in both conventionally zoned areas and areas with a PUD supplemental district, but not on the immediately abutting tracts.

**Conclusion:** According to the Comprehensive Plan, the requested OL zoning is a "may be found," which means additional consideration must be given to the physical facts and zoning patterns in the immediate area. The subject tract and abutting tracts to the south and east have been developed into a stable residential duplex and single-family neighborhood. The design of these lots is residential and would not be readily adaptable to conversion of the existing units to office due to requirements for parking areas in what is now front yards. If the tracts were redeveloped and existing structures were removed, the residential character of the area would change. Further, the service road along the Skelly Drive dead ends just east of this tract and only serves other residential properties in this general area. OL zoning has been granted west of the subject tract; however, said zoning is confined to the intersection of a collector street/overpass and the Skelly Drive.

Therefore, based on the physical facts and existing zoning patterns, Staff is not supportive of the requested zoning and recommends OL zoning be **DENIED**.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Jim Moore reviewed the zoning surrounding the subject tract and submitted photos of the area. Mr. Moore stated he intended to use one side of the duplex for office and an associate would be using the other side. He stated there was presently enough parking for eight vehicles, and he has had no objection from any other property owners in the area. (There were no interested parties or protestants in attendance.)

Comments & Discussion:

In regard to OL zoning just west of Skelly Drive, Ms. Wilson inquired as to any distinctive features that would make the area different from the subject tract. Mr. Gardner reviewed the zoning surrounding Skelly and stated the Staff recommendation for denial was, primarily, to protect the three homes to the south of the subject property.

Mr. VanFossen stated he had very mixed emotions on this application, as he felt it was not a good location for a residence, but he has also recognized the access may not be totally appropriate for office. Mr. Paddock stated his understanding was that the tracts in question were zoned RD for duplex, as opposed to single-family residential. Therefore, he felt, for the particular location and for the reasons stated in the Staff recommendation, that it was appropriate the tract retain the present zoning and not be zoned OL.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **DENY Z-6118 Moore for OL zoning**, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: Z-6120 Present Zoning: RS-3  
Applicant: **Curtsinger (Menta)** Proposed Zoning: CS  
Location: North of the NW/c of Apache and Lewis  
Size of Tract: 3.06 acres

Date of Hearing: July 23, 1986  
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Curtsinger, 4515 So Yale, #101 (622-8787)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 2 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - No Specific Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the requested CS District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is 3.06 acres in size and located north of the northwest corner of Lewis Avenue and Apache Street. It is non-wooded, flat, vacant and is zoned RS-3.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north by a single-family dwelling unit zoned RS-3, on the east by a produce market zoned CS and RS-3, on the south by vacant property zoned CS and on the west by an elementary school zoned RS-3.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Although there has not been any recent rezoning action, several years ago medium intensity CS zoning was approved in the area.

**Conclusion:** The intersection of Lewis Avenue and Apache Street would qualify as a Type I Node due to both streets being designated as 100 foot Secondary Arterials on the Major Street Plan. Evidence of this commercial trend has been established on the east side of Lewis Avenue with commercial zoning as far north as 660 feet from the centerline of Apache Street. The Type I Node, 5 acres, could be established by rezoning a portion of the subject tract CS, which would result in a 660' by 330' (5 acres) CS area. Staff can support a node configuration other than the standard "square" pattern if the existing zoning pattern in the area deviates from the Development Guidelines.

Based on the existing land use and zoning patterns in the area, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of CS zoning for the subject tract, **LESS** and **EXCEPT** the north 150 feet. This will allow the commercial zoning to line up with the commercial on the east side of Lewis Avenue which is the centerline of East 27th Street North and **DENIAL** of the balance.

Staff also recommends an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reflect the change in zoning. The revised legal description will be: To rezone to CS a tract of land described as the North 460' of the East 340' of the South 810' of the SE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 19, T-20-N, R-13-E, according to the United States Government Survey. Less the land included in the public streets of Apache Street on the south and Lewis Avenue on the east of the above described land owned by the Tulsa County, Oklahoma, **LESS** and **EXCEPT** the North 150' thereof which shall remain RS-3.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock inquired as to the property on the east side of Lewis, across from the proposed tract, and stated his map indicated a gap of the tract zoned CS and the tract zoned CH. Mr. Gardner confirmed this "gap" was zoned RS-3. Mr. Paddock continued by stating that, if the Commission followed the Staff recommendation, he felt the "gap" would be open for rezoning. Mr. Wilson confirmed there were no buildings on the subject tract.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Curtsinger presented the request for CS and, while he would accept the Staff recommendation, he stressed the need for CS on the entire tract. Mr. Curtsinger stated the applicant intended to build an L-shaped shopping center and CS was needed to meet the necessary parking for the center.

Z-6120 Curtsinger - Cont'd

Mr. VanFossen stated he did not understand why it was critical to have CS on the entire tract. Mr. Curtsinger pointed out that in order to get the best return on the investment dollar, they would like to maximize the use of the land. Mr. Paddock asked the applicant his feeling if the north 150' were zoned OL, offering a combination OL/CS zoning, which would provide some parking. Mr. Curtsinger stated this an OL/CS combination should certainly be taken into consideration, and that it might meet their objective as well. Ms. Wilson inquired how long the owner has owned this property. Mr. Curtsinger, representing the owner, stated the owners took title on January 17, 1986.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Carnes made a motion for OL on the north 150' of the tract, with CS on the balance, as suggested by Mr. Paddock. Mr. Paddock inquired if the TMAPC could legally propose this combination, based on the way it was advertised, and was informed they could do so.

Mr. Doherty inquired as to the difference in densities and its affect on development, in an OL versus CS situation on the north 150'. Mr. Gardner stated the primary intensity of development of OL would have to be used for light office or parking. If zoned commercial, the applicant could construct whatever freestanding building he wished. Mr. Draughon asked if the TMAPC should consider the zoning effect on the school in the area. Mr. Gardner stated the subject tracts, which back up to the school, get their access off of streets that would not conflict with the school access. Mr. Gardner also confirmed for Mr. Draughon that OL zoning would accommodate parking.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** Z-6120 Curtsinger (**Menta**), for OL zoning on the north 150' and CS zoning on the balance.

Legal Description:

**CS:** On a tract of land described as the North 460' of the East 340' of the South 810' of the SE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 19, T-20-N, R-13-E, according to the United States Government Survey; less the land included in the public streets of Apache Street on the south and Lewis Avenue on the east of the above described land owned by the Tulsa County, Oklahoma, LESS and EXCEPT the North 150' thereof which shall be zoned OL.

**OL:** The north 150' of the above described tract of land, the balance of which is to be CS.

\* \* \* \* \*

Application No.: CZ-150

Applicant: Bussman

Location: NE/c of 56th Street North and Peoria Avenue

Size of Tract: 5 acres

Present Zoning: AG

Proposed Zoning: IL/CS

Date of Hearing: July 23, 1986

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. R.F. Bussman, 5635 North Peoria

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 24 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Peoria Special District (Committed to Commercial Development).

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

Staff Recommendation:

**Site Analysis:** The subject tract is approximately 5 acres in size and located at the northeast corner of Peoria Avenue and 56th Street North. It is nonwooded, vacant, contains a dwelling unit and barn and is zoned AG.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north and east by scattered single-family units zoned AG, on the south by a vacant gasoline service station and vacant land zoned CS and RS-3 and on the west by a gasoline service station and a funeral home zoned IL.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** All zoning for this area was established prior to 1970.

**Conclusion:** The subject tract qualifies as a "Type One" node with five acres of medium intensity use, due to its location at the intersection of two Secondary Arterial streets. Commercial zoning has already been established on two of the other corners at this intersection. Staff can not support the requested IL zoning due to the permitted uses, permitted outdoor storage and because of the Comprehensive Plan (Industrial limited to west side of Peoria, between railroad and Peoria Avenue).

Staff recommends **DENIAL** of IL zoning and **APPROVAL** of CS zoning as requested in the alternative by the applicant.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bussman commented that he was not opposed to CS and, while not having an IL use in mind at the moment, he would prefer the IL over CS zoning to allow future industrial use at this location. Mr. VanFossen asked the

**CZ-150 Bussman - Cont'd**

applicant if he understood that CS zoning did not necessarily permit industrial or manufacturing type facilities, and would require coming back for review, such as with a PUD. Mr. Bussman stated he understood.

**TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE CZ-150 Bussman for CS**, as recommended by Staff.

**Legal Description:**

The south 467' of the west 467' of the SW/4 of the SW/4, also known as Lot 7, less 1.43 acres for road right-of-way, Section 6, T-20-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

**SUBDIVISIONS:**

**FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:**

**9100 Memorial (PUD 405)(2383)** SW/c 91st & South Memorial Drive (CS, CO)

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE the Final Plat of 9100 Memorial** and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**PUD 385-2:** NW/c of East 71st Street South and South Utica

**Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan**

PUD 385 was approved by the TMAPC and City Commission for a decorator center which is now in the final stage of construction completion. The subject tract has underlying zoning of CS and OM. The TMAPC approved the Detail Site Plan on June 19, 1985 which showed the project sign to be located on the north side of the entrance/exit drive from Utica. Although the sign was not specifically approved at that location per the Detail Site Plan, it was noted that the sign would be 8' wide and have a maximum 24' height.

The sign will now be relocated south of the Utica entrance and be 27' from the centerline of Utica, and 64' from the centerline of 71st Street. The sign will be a monument type ground sign 6'-6" wide x 11'-0" tall. This sign meets the requirements of PUD 385 and PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 385-2 and the proposed Detail Sign Plan.

Comments & Discussion:

In response to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Gardner reviewed the sign location and stated the sign can now be viewed from both sides. Mr. Gardner clarified, for Mr. Paddock, that most PUD's require both a Detail Site Plan, a Detail Sign Plan and a Detail Landscape Plan. Sometimes the applicant tries to combine these in one phase and Staff submits these all in one document. Mr. Gardner further explained that, in this particular case, the architect probably showed a location for a sign on the plot plan, but approval of a plot plan does not mean approval of landscaping, signage, etc. Mr. Paddock commented that, in other words, when the TMAPC reviews a Detail Sign Plan, they are not looking at just the nature of the sign, but also reviewing the location of the sign.

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, absent) to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan for PUD 385-2**, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

**PUD 323-A:** South of Coyote Trail Between 241st and 257th West Avenues

Staff Recommendation: **Detail Site Plan and Detail Sign Plan**

**Detail Site Plan:** The subject tract has an area of 22.4 acres and has been approved for development of 20 mobile home units total; three units are presently existing on the site. The present Development Standards (as amended) were established in accordance with PUD 323-A which was approved by the Tulsa County Board of Commissioners on August 26, 1985. The underlying zoning for this tract is AG and RE.

The proposed plan incorporates 20' building setbacks from Coyote Trail for mobile home units as approved by the TMAPC per a minor amendment. The plan also designates common park and recreation area (which may include trails, playgrounds, community buildings and tot lots) in the central area of the mobile home park referred to as Reserve Area "A". The Preliminary Plat of Heatherwood Mobile Home Park for the subject tract has been placed on the TMAPC agenda and is presently being reviewed for utility design by the Oklahoma State Health Department.

Staff review of the proposed Detail Site Plan indicates 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 the Detail Site Plan subject to the following conditions:

1) That the proposed Detail Site Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

2) **Development Standards:**

Land Area 22.398 acres

Permitted Uses: Mobile Home dwelling and accessory uses on 20 spaces, plus open space set aside as required below. Open space is reserved for garden area, recreation, possible future fire station uses and maintenance, and storage building for mobile home park use only.

Maximum No. of Units: 20 total (17 new and 3 existing)

Minimum Livability Area  
per Mobile Home Unit: 12,000 sf

Minimum Off-Street Parking: 2 paved spaces/unit

Maximum Building Height: 1-story

Minimum Building Setbacks:

From Centerline of Coyote Trail 70 ft  
From Private Drives 20 ft \*  
From Rear Yard 10 ft

Separation Between Units: 25 ft  
One Side Yard 5 ft  
Other Side Yard 20 ft

Minimum Open Space: 6% of Gross

Land Area: "See Permitted  
Uses", above 1.4 acres

\* A 10 foot setback is allowed for the 30 foot private loop street only in the north part of the development.

3) Subject to review and conditions of the Technical Advisory Committee.

4) That internal streets shall be a minimum of 24 feet in width and paved with an all weather dust-free surface.



- 5) That all mobile home units shall be completely skirted with materials that are architecturally compatible with the unit being skirted and installed in a manner that the unit appears to be placed on-grade.
- 6) That the tie-down facilities shall be incorporated into concrete anchors so that guy lines can be installed under each mobile home at sufficient intervals to prevent upheaval of the unit during strong winds and storms.
- 7) That common park/recreation facilities (which may include trails, play grounds, community buildings and tot lots) shall be provided. Six percent (6%) of the gross area (1.4 acres) shall be designated for a fire station or related purposes.
- 8) That the mobile home space shall have a minimum of 100 square feet of paved outdoor living area (patio). In the alternative, a combination of 100 square feet of paved patio area and porch area, or 100 square feet of porch area is considered to be an acceptable substitute meeting this requirement.
- 9) That each mobile home space shall have an enclosed storage accessory building of not less than 36 square feet, but no greater than 100 square feet.
- 10) That one sign, not to exceed four feet in height, eight feet in length and 24 square feet in display surface area may be located along the north perimeter between the entrances to the park.
- 11) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied, including the incorporation within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the County of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants. The plat should be submitted to the County Building Inspector's Office for review of flooding potential.

**Detail Sign Plan:** Condition number 10 of PUD 323-A and of the recommended Detail Site Plan approval states: "That one sign, not to exceed four feet in height, eight feet in length and 24 square feet in display surface area may be located along the north perimeter between the entrances to the park."

The proposed sign is a wooden, hanging sign with large timber post supports. Although the Detail Sign Plan does not specify the exact location of the sign, approval could be recommended subject to meeting condition number 10 of PUD 323-A, with the location being subject to the approval of the County Building Inspector. The proposed display surface of the sign is 4' x 6' or 24 square feet and compliance with the maximum 4' height requirement would require discounting the heights of the posts which support the timber suspending the sign. Sign post height is proposed as 8'. It would appear that the PUD contemplated a ground mounted sign face and the applicant is proposing a slight modification of the sign type which will, according to the sign plan, be tastefully done. Staff would suggest the sign post height be reduced to 6' to more closely be in compliance with PUD 323-A.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the exact location be subject to approval of the County Building Inspector.
- 2) That sign posts supporting this sign shall be reduced from 8' to 6' maximum.
- 3) All other Codes and related regulations of Tulsa County for signs be complied with.

Comments & Discussion:

In regard to condition #6 (tie-down facilities), Ms. Wilson inquired if thought had been given to having this type of requirement in the Zoning Code. Mr. Gardner advised that most of the conditions for this particular PUD came from data used in the latest draft for manufactured housing, which has involved several months of study for amendments to the Code. Mr. Doherty commented that the reference to tie-down facilities was excellent, but he was curious why there were no standards referenced in regard to depth of anchoring, tinsel strength, etc. Mr. Gardner advised that, at present, Staff does not have that kind of information, and he was not sure the City had the information. Mr. Linker stated the City has tie-down requirements separate and apart from the Zoning Code. However, he was not sure what requirements the County has adopted, but he thought the Building Officials Code of America (BOCA) provisions were usually referenced in these cases. Mr. Gardner confirmed the County uses the BOCA Code. Mr. Doherty and Commissioner Selph both expressed thoughts that if the BOCA provisions were used by the County, then the necessary requirements have been made.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Harry Adkins, 4141 West Eight Street, advised he had discussed the Staff recommendation with a Staff member, was aware of the conditions of approval, and was in agreement. In reply to Commissioner Selph, Mr. Adkins reviewed the sewage and water systems planned for the area.

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Site Plan and Detail Sign Plan for PUD 323-A**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:54 p.m.

Date Approved

8-17-86

Ray J. [Signature]

Chairman

ATTEST:

AB Paddock

Secretary

