TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1651
Wednesday, **May 27, 1987**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Doherty, 2nd Vice-Chairman	Carnes	Frank	Linker, Legal Counsel
Draughon	Crawford	Gardner	
Kempe		Setters	
Paddock, 1st Vice-Chairman			
Parmele, Chairman			
Rice			
VanFossen, Secretary			
Wilson			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, May 26, 1987 at 10:30 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 1:34 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of Minutes of May 13, 1987, Meeting #1649:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-2** (Doherty, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Draughon, Kempe, "abstaining"; Carnes, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of May 13, 1987**, Meeting No. 1649.

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Paddock advised of a TMAPC Joint Committee meeting and the unanimous recommendation that the TMAPC set a public hearing June 24th for the purpose of considering amendments as relates to the Metropolitan Development Guidelines, as well as consideration of amendments to the District 18 Comprehensive Plan.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Crawford, "absent") to **SET** a **Public Hearing** for **June 24, 1987** to consider amendments to the Comprehensive Master Plan for Development of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, as relates to:

- Development Districts Goals and Objectives, Development Districts Concept, Development Districts Components (referred to as the Metropolitan Development Guidelines);
- Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts; and
- District Plan Map and Text for District 18

pertaining to establishment of Special Consideration Areas for Low and Medium Intensity Development, policies for implementing Corridor Zoning, redefining Special Districts, and related matters.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **Z-6150** Present Zoning: RS-3
Applicant: **Holmboe** Proposed Zoning: OL
Location: NW/c of 17th and Victor
Size of Tract: .16 acres, approximate

Date of Hearing: May 27, 1987
Continued from: May 13, 1987 **(Withdrawal requested by applicant)**

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Withdrawal of Z-6150 Holmboe**, as requested by the applicant.

* * * * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6151** Present Zoning: OL
Applicant: **Peoria Office Park** Proposed Zoning: OM
Location: NE/c of East 56th Street & Peoria Avenue
Size of Tract: .78 acres, approximate

Date of Hearing: May 27, 1987
Continuance Requested to: July 8, 1987

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6151 Peoria Office Park** until Wednesday, **July 8, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6157** Present Zoning: IL
Applicant: **Norman (Siegfried)** Proposed Zoning: CG
Location: South of the SE/c of East Pine & North 108th East Avenue
Size of Tract: 1.7 acres, approximate

Date of Hearing: May 27, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Charles Norman, 909 Kennedy Building (583-7571)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 16 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District -- Industrial.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 1.7 acres in size and is located at the southeast corner of East Pine Street and North 108th East Avenue. The tract is nonwooded, flat, vacant and is zoned IL.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north across East Pine by vacant property zoned CG; on the east by industrial uses, zoned IL; on the south by a parking lot, zoned IL; on the west by a U.S. Highway 169 and North 108th East Avenue zoned RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Medium intensity zoning, including IL and CG, has been approved in the immediate area.

Conclusion: Although the Comprehensive Plan has designated the area for industrial development, CG zoning is located north and east of the subject tract. The Zoning Code permits similar uses in both the CG and IL districts. Use Unit 25 (Light Manufacturing) is a use by special exception in the CG district. Based on the existing zoning patterns in the area, Staff can support the zoning change.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of CG zoning for Z-6157 as requested.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Chairman Parmele, the applicant stated agreement to the Staff recommendation.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD,** the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6157 Norman (Siegfried) for CG,** as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

A tract of land containing 1.7379 acres, more or less, located in the NW/4 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 31, T-20-N, R-14-E of the IBM, according to the US Government Survey thereof; situated in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, being more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows, to-wit: BEGINNING at a point being the northwest corner of NORDAM EAST II, a subdivision duly recorded at the Tulsa County Clerk's office, said NORDAM EAST II being located in the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 31, T-20-N, R-14-E, IBM, according to the US Government Survey thereof; thence S 00°06'40" W along the westerly boundary of said NORDAM EAST II for a distance of 300.39' to a point; thence N 89°52'58" W for a distance of 319.78' to a point being on the easterly right-of-way of North 108th East Avenue; thence N 24°21'10" E along the said easterly right-of-way of North 108th East Avenue for a distance to a point being on the southerly right-of-way of East Pine Street; thence S 90°00'00" E along the said southerly right-of-way of East Pine Street and being parallel to and 80.00' south of the north boundary of the said NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 31 for a distance of 184.68' to the POB, and containing 1.7379 acres, more or less. Basis of Bearing for said tract is the north boundary of the said NE/4 of the NE/4 being arbitrarily established as S 90°00'00" E.

* * * * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6158** Present Zoning: RM-2
Applicant: **Williams** Proposed Zoning: OM
Location: SE/c of South Denver & 16th Street
Size of Tract: .1 acre, approximate

Date of Hearing: May 27, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Roger Williams, 1605 South Denver (583-1124)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 7 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property High Intensity - Residential/Office, Stonebraker Heights Office - Residential Area.

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

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .1 acre in size and is located at the southeast corner of South Denver Avenue and 16th Street South. It is partially wooded, flat, contains a single-family, and is zoned RM-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis The tract is abutted on the north across 16th Street by a converted single-family dwelling for office use zoned OL; on the east by a single-family dwelling, zoned RM-2; on the south by a converted single-family dwelling for office use, zoned OM; on the west across Denver by a small apartment building, zoned RM-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Several requests for both OM and OL office zoning have been approved in the area.

Conclusion: Review of the case map and zoning background indicate this to be an area that is in transition from residential to office. Based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning patterns, Staff can support the OM zoning.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of OM zoning for Z-6158 as requested.

Comments & Discussion:

In response to questions relating to the proposed parking on such a small tract, Mr. Williams clarified that he owned the existing law office adjacent to the subject tract, and he purchased this tract as they were needing more space.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN,** the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6158 Williams for OM,** as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

CORRECTED PER TMAPC 7/15/87

All of the west 78.2' of Lot 6, Block 6, STONEBRAKER HEIGHTS ADDITION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

* * * * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6159** Present Zoning: RS-1, RS-2
Applicant: **Walker** Proposed Zoning: RS-3
Location: North of the NE/c of East 91st Street & South Delaware Avenue
Size of Tract: 9 acres, approximate

Date of Hearing: May 27, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Don Walker, 9410-E East 51st Street (622-4050)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested RS-3 District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately nine acres in size and is located north of the northeast corner of East 91st Street and South Delaware Avenue. It is nonwooded, flat, vacant, and is zoned RS-1 and RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by a developing single-family subdivision zoned RS-2; on the east by a developing single-family subdivision, zoned RS-3; on the south by a condominium development, zoned RM-T; on the west across Delaware by vacant property zoned IL.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The northeast corner of the intersection has developed in the traditional nodal pattern for commercial with a wrap around buffer of multi-family zoning.

Conclusion: The Staff sees the RS-3 zoning as consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning patterns in the area. The RS-3 zoning also provides a logical decrease in zoning intensities as you move away from the corner from CS to RM-2, RM-0, RM-T, RS-3 and finally RS-2.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of RS-3 zoning for Z-6159 as requested.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Don Walker, a partner and architect on this project, reviewed the history of this tract which has been vacant for several years. He stated the applicant's proposal involved extensive landscaping, perimeter fencing, entrance markers, irrigation systems, etc. for this area and the subdivision to the east. Mr. Walker agreed with Staff's recommendation based on the zoning patterns surrounding this tract. He stated he had met with the homeowners of the Cedarcrest I and II subdivisions. Mr. Walker advised that Cedarcrest I supported their intent to close off the 89th Street extension with a cul-de-sac to better control some existing traffic problems. Mr. Walker pointed out that the rezoning applied only to four lots as the balance of the subdivision was currently RS-3. In an effort to guarantee the homeowners that the applicant would only use the subdivision as intended and presented, Mr. Walker suggested having the City withhold the publication of the zoning ordinance for RS-3 until such time that the plat has been prepared documenting the developer's intenstions and abandonment of the street section is accomplished, and until such time that approval from the appropriate City agencies has been obtained.

Ms. Kempe inquired as to what the Police and Fire Departments might feel as to this type of street arrangement, i.e. closing off 89th Street, which is the only access to the subdivision for Delaware, etc. Mr. Walker stated that they had already reviewed this with the City Street Department as to the cul-de-sac and street concept in general, and had received a preliminary "blessing", but they were advised that the applicant would also need approval of the Police and Fire Department. Mr. Gardner confirmed that the applicant was following Staff's advice, and he felt that, in order for the concept to work, the isolation of this subdivision from the two abutting subdivisions was needed.

Chairman Parmele asked Legal, if approved, could publication be withheld pending the plat approval. Mr. Linker stated that he thought the TMAPC could be mandated to proceed with the ordinance if the zoning were approved by the City Commission. However, he suggested a better approach might be to "flag" the subdivision plat, since the applicant was offering this as a "guarantee" of their proposal.

In reply to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walker clarified the placement of subdivision markers, which would be filed with the plat, as a first step o implemeting commitment to he neighborhood. Ms. Wilson inquired as to support from the neighboring homeowners. Mr. Walker stated that Cedarcrest I residents had

Indicated support of their proposals, while Cedarcrest II (to the north) were not as supportive as they did not have as much to gain. Mr. Walker confirmed for Ms. Wilson that a homeowners association would have the maintenance obligation for the perimeter fencing.

Interested Parties:	Address:	
Ms. Harriet Westerman	8924 South Gary	74137
Mr. Mark Morrow	8717 South Evanston	"
Ms. Anita Paryl	2373 East 89th Street	"
Mr. Fred Van Eman	8751 South College Place	"
Mr. James Price	9031 South Delaware	"
Mr. John Philcox	3010 East 88th Street	"
Ms. Barbara Kudlac	8731 South College Place	"
Mr. Joe Westervelt	320 South Boston, #1025	74103
Ms. Ann Weatherly	(did not give address on record)	

Ms. Harriet Westerman, president of the Cedarcrest I, stated support of Mr. Walker and the proposed development as she felt this would not only improve the neighborhood, but would enhance traffic and safety in the area. After a nine year absence of any development on the tracts, Ms. Westerman commented that she felt the developer was offering a quality development.

Mr. Mark Morrow, president of Cedarcrest II Homeowner's Association, stated opposition to the zoning change. Mr. Morrow submitted photos of homes in the areas and commented he felt the subject tract was never intended to be zoned RS-3 due to the building standards of the subdivision. He objected to the developer's proposal to close the street, and he submitted a petition with 73 signatures requesting denial of the zoning change.

Ms. Anita Paryl, the homeowner adjacent to the subject tract in Cedarcrest I, stated opposition to the zoning change as she felt this would devalue their property, and she felt that just having a fence would not be a viable solution.

Mr. Fred Van Eman, a resident in Cedarcrest II, commented that the proposed development would not be consistent with neighborhood. He stated he felt that, if approved, this would hurt the credibility of the City as the homeowners purchased their properties based on the existing RS-2 zoning.

Mr. James Price, Secretary of the Delaware Crossing Condominium Association, also stated opposition to the proposed zoning change.

Mr. John Philcox of Cedarcrest II voiced concerns as to property devaluation, and requested denial of the zoning change to RS-3 and suggested RS-2 zoning as a compromise.

Ms. Barbara Kudlac, a homeowner in Cedarcrest II, joined those in opposition to the zoning change to RS-3, as she was supportive of RS-2 zoning.

Mr. Joe Westervelt, a representative of the owner in this venture with Mr. Walker, commented he did not anticipate speaking but, as he had been through all processes of the development over the last year, he confirmed the efforts extended to the homeowners to establish them as an entity in attempting to find acceptable solutions for this subdivision. Mr. Westervelt stated strong support of the solutions presented by Mr. Walker for this tract which has been vacant for several years. Chairman Parmele asked Mr. Westervelt if he would be opposed to a compromise zoning of RS-2. Mr. Westervelt stated that Mr. Walker was more prepared to answer the technical issues. However, from what he knew of the planning and economics of the development, the compromise zoning would not be as beneficial for the area, as is the plan presented by Mr. Walker.

Ms. Ann Weatherly, a resident in Cedarcrest I, felt that the current number of empty lots, which were littered with debris, devalued the surrounding neighborhood, and the proposed development would enhance the area. Therefore, she requested approval of the zoning change.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

In regard to the ratio of lots allowed between RS-2 and RS-3 zoning, Mr. Walker stated that there would be a difference of four or five units per acre. However, due to the existing street layout, the ratio would actually be three to two units per acre. He explained there would be 24 lots under RS-2 zoning, and 36 lots under RS-3, and added that there was no physical way to accomplish a larger number due to the placement of the property lines. In response to statements made by the Delaware Crossing Condominium representative, Mr. Walker stated that he felt this project would in no way have a negative impact on the multi-family projects in the area.

Mr. Paddock inquired as to the price range of homes if built under RS-3 zoning. Mr. Walker advised the lots would be in the range of $17,500 to $20,000, with the homes being estimated to be in the low $80,000 range. Ms. Wilson inquired as to the proposed minimum square footage. Mr. Walker stated they have not addressed this phase of the project, which would involve work with the restrictive covenants, but they were targeting the minimum square footage to be in proportion to the anticipated price range of the lots.

Review Session:

Ms. Kempe commented that this was a situation where there were some very fortunate people who lived in a subdivision with RS-3 zoning and development to RS-1 standards. However, she could see no real reason for denying this application for the RS-3 zoning, and she moved for approval of the request. Mr. VanFossen pointed out that the Commission has ended

up discussing the development as to how it was going to be used, and this was totally different and getting away from the zoning request. Mr. VanFossen suggested adding an amendment to Ms. Kempe's motion that the interested parties/protestants in attendance be notified at the time any plat was presented. Ms. Kempe agreed to amending the motion.

Mr. Paddock inquired if the RS-3 property to the east was built to RS-1 or RS-2 standards. Mr. Gardner stated he thought they exceeded RS-1 standards, and Mr. VanFossen commented he was very familiar with this area and he agreed it exceeded RS-1 standards. Mr. Paddock remarked that, rather than looking at the zoning pattern, he felt the Commission should consider the physical facts and actual use. Therefore, he felt that RS-2 would be much more appropriate, and he agreed that property owners had a right to rely on the zoning placed on land abutting their subdivisions. Ms. Wilson agreed with Mr. Paddock that an RS-2 zoning would be more appropriate, and consideration should be given as to how the properties in the area were presently developed.

Chairman Parmele concurred that the physical facts should be considered, and he pointed out the IL zoning across from the subject tract, which could be developed into an industrial park. Chairman Parmele pointed out that the developed properties to the north and across from Cedarcrest II were high density apartment complexes, with condominiums to the south. Therefore, in looking at the surrounding zoning as to what was there or could be there, he felt that RS-3 was appropriate.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE,** the Planning Commission voted **7-2-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; Paddock, Wilson, "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6159 Walker for RS-3,** as recommended by Staff. Further, the interested Parties (as listed in these minutes) shall be notified of any upcoming subdivision hearings on this property.

Legal Description:

Lots 1 - 6 of Block 1, and Lots 12 - 17 of Block 2, CEDARCREST ADDITION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

* * * * * * *

Application No.: **PUD 420-A** Present Zoning: RS-2
Applicant: **Wenrick** Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: East of the SE/c of East 101st Street & South Yale
Size of Tract: 40 acres, approximately

Date of Hearing: May 27, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Tom Wenrick, 2930 East 51st Street (749-7781)

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is approximately 40 acres in size and located east of the southeast corner of East 101st Street and South Yale. It is partially wooded, vacant, and classified as a "Development Sensitive Area" according to the District 26 Comprehensive Plan map. This area is included in the area of south and southeast Tulsa which is experiencing problems with development on septic systems. An ongoing study of remedies to solve this problem is underway by the TMAPC, City-County Health Department and related agencies. However, this particular development will be connected to the public sewer system according to the developer.

The physical topography of the site causes it to be a "sump" drainage area from which water does not drain but must eventually evaporate. Problems with water standing along East 101st Street in this general area from even small rains should be addressed, or at a minimum, not aggravated by the proposed development.

The underlying zoning of this tract is RS-2 which is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan if accompanied by a PUD. No change is contemplated in the RS-2 zoning. PUD 420-A requests that the number of dwelling units approved in PUD 420 be increased from 91 to 120. The internal streets will be public and of a curvi-linear design. The one main entrance from East 101st Street will include landscaped buffers and a landscaped median. Retention of storm water is planned to be accomplished off the site and maintained by the homeowner's association. The association will also be required to maintain all open, landscaped areas within the property. Although the PUD Text indicates decorative fencing along East 101st Street would be optional, Staff recommends a 6' screening fence be required along the entire north boundary for residential lots which back into the arterial street. The overall density of the tract is less than three units per acre and the average lot size is 77' wide x 125' deep.

Staff review of PUD 420-A, Major Amendment to replace PUD 420, finds the request to be: (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 420-A subject to the following conditions:

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

2) **Development Standards:**

Land Area (Gross):	40.19 acres
(Net):	38.67 acres
Existing Zoning	RS-2 with PUD 420
Proposed Zoning:	RS-2 with PUD 420-A
Permitted Uses:	Use Unit 6 single-family detached dwelling units and customary accessory uses.
Maximum No. Dwelling Units (DU):	120
Minimum Lot Width:	77' average *
Minimum Lot Area:	9,000 sf/RS-2; 9,625 sf average
Minimum Land Area per DU:	10,875 sf/RS-2; 14,037 sf average on net site
Maximum Structure Height:	35'
Minimum Livability Space per DU:	5,000 sf average
Minimum Lot Depth:	125' average/development
Minimum Front Yard:	25'
Minimum Rear Yard:	25'
Minimum Side Yard Abutting a Nonarterial Public Street:	15'
Minimum Side Yard: **	
One Side	10'
Other side	5'
Open Space/Detention Area:	Maintenance of these private facilities shall be by a Homeowner's Association created for that purpose.

* The 77' average lot width for the entire development may be varied according to the approved plat on cul-de-sacs and pie-shaped lots and be less than the minimum as measured at the building line.

** Side yards on cul-de-sacs and pie-shaped lots are permitted to be a minimum of 5' on both sides according to the approved plat.

3) Subject to the review and conditions of the Technical Advisory Committee. Special attention shall be given to requirements for management of storm water adjacent to and on the site. The sanitary sewer system shall be connected to the public sewer system.

4) That the development be in general compliance with the RS-2 Zoning Code provisions unless modified by the PUD Text and approved by the Commission.

5) That a Homeowner's Association be created to provide for the maintenance of retention/detention areas, and other common facilities.

6) That a 6' screening fence shall be installed along the north boundary of the site where residential lots back into East 101st Street. Decorative type fencing along this boundary is optional, however, shall require Detail Fence Plan approval by the TMAPC prior to installation.

7) That the requirement for submission and approval of a Detail Site Plan is considered to be satisfied by the filing and approval of a Final Plat by the TMAPC and acceptance by the City of Tulsa. If the detail for construction of entry ways and similar facilities is not covered on the plat, these details shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

8) That a Detail Landscape Plan and Sign Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC for public and common areas only. Installation of landscape materials is required prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit for any residential units in the development. The landscaped entry shall include a landscaped median and 10' landscaped buffer strip along both sides of the entry way, and a 15' landscaped/bermed area as shown in the PUD Text.

9) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code has 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 City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

NOTE: Early transmittal of this case to the City Commission is requested by the applicant.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Chairman Parmele, the applicant stated agreement to the listed conditions of the Staff recommendation. Mr. Gardner reviewed and clarified the DSM comments in response to Mr. Draughon. Mr. Paddock commented that when DSM marks that a Watershed Development permit would be required, they were not indicating whether Class A, Class B, or Exemption applied. Mr. Draughon requested Staff to contact DSM on this matter.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD 420-A Wenrick**, as recommended by Staff and to APPROVE early transmittal of the minutes regarding same.

Legal Description:

The NE/4 of the NW/4 of Section 27, T-18-N, R-13-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the official US Government Survey thereof.

SUBDIVISIONS:

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:

Country Acres (2572) East 167th Street & South Peoria (AG)

Crow Creek Office Park (PUD 422)(2492) East 33rd & South Peoria (OMH/OM/RS-3)

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY,** the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Final Plat of Country Acres and Crow Creek Office Park** and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 281-8: **Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan**
South and East of 61st & Mingo, Blocks 4 & 6 of Gleneagles Addition, and Blocks 4, 5 and 6 of Kingsridge Estates Addition

(NOTE: The applicant has requested a one week continuance to June 3, 1987.)

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE,** the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Carnes, Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 281-8** until Wednesday, **June 3, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * * * *

PUD 253-B-1: SW/c of East 51st Street and South Marion Avenu

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

PUD 253-B-1 is 2.17 (gross) acres in size and is located at the southwest corner of East 51st Street and South Marion Avenue. The PUD has been approved for both office and commercial uses and was also approved for two ground signs with a maximum of 60 square feet per sign, a maximum height of six feet above the abutting streets, to be located at the principal entries on East 51st Street. The applicant is now requesting a minor amendment to relocate an existing shopping center identification sign (12 feet wide x 20 feet tall) from its present location on South Harvard

Avenue to the northeast corner of the PUD which is less than 150' from a residential area. An existing sign 4' tall x 11.5' wide will remain along the western boundary of the PUD. Underlying zoning is CS and OL. Notice of the application has been given to abutting property owners.

Based on Staff review of the submitted plot plan and information, Staff finds the request will require approval of a variance from the Board of Adjustment and TMAPC. Although the request exceeds the approved square footage for one sign by 400% and for the approved height by over 300%, the original sign standards were very restrictive and the total display surface area is in accordance with the Zoning Code and PUD sign restrictions.

If the TMAPC is supportive of PUD 253-B-1 Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan, approval should be subject to the following conditions:

1) Approval of a variance from the Board of Adjustment for a sign less than 150' from a residential area.

2) Subject to the submitted plot plan, unless modified herein, for the existing and proposed ground sign.

3) That the relocated sign not occupy any required parking places as determined by the Building Inspector.

4) All lighting (internal or external) shall be by constant light.

Comments & Discussion:

In response to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Frank clarified the location of the existing sign. Mr. Sam Steele (6747 East 32nd Place) representing the owners of Country Club Plaza Shopping Center, explained for Ms. Wilson that the existing sign (to the west) could not be relocated as this sign identified those tenants on the back side of the shopping center. Mr. Steele acknowledged the applicant was agreeable to the listed conditions.

Mr. VanFossen stated he would be abstaining from the vote as he was initially involved in this project. He commented that the project was originally zoned office at the location near Marion and was later changed to allow retail, however, he did not feel it was appropriate to put a 20' high sign at this location. Mr. Steele advised that he had personally visited with those in the neighbors abutting the center, and he received no objections as the sign would not be obstructing traffic views when entering 51st Street.

In reply to Ms. Wilson regarding a possible reduction to 15' to avoid a BOA variance, Mr. Gardner clarified that the sign height had nothing to do with the BOA hearing as this was due to the proximity to the residential neighborhood (less than 150'). Mr. Gardner added that a 20' height was permitted in an office district, with 30' being the customary retail height.

PUD 253-B-1 Minor Amendment - Cont'd

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **RICE**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-1** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; VanFossen, "abstaining"; (Carnes, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan for PUD 253-A-1**, subject to the conditions as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Date Approved 6-10-87

Chairman

ATTEST:

Secretary