

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1661
Wednesday, August 12, 1987, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carnes
Doherty, 2nd Vice-
Chairman
Kempe
Paddock, 1st Vice-
Chairman
Parmele, Chairman
Rice
Woodard

MEMBERS ABSENT

Crawford
Draughon
VanFossen
Wilson

STAFF PRESENT

Frank
Gardner
Setters

OTHERS PRESENT

Jackere, Legal
Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, August 11, 1987 at 10:07 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 29, 1987, Meeting #1659:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of July 29, 1987, Meeting #1659**.

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Paddock announced the Rules & Regulations Committee would be meeting August 19, 1987 to discuss suggested amendments to the Zoning Code, as relates to portable/promotional signs, etc. Mr. Jackere gave an "unofficial" briefing on the recent court hearing regarding the portable sign issue.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6151
Applicant: Peoria Office Park
Location: NE/c of East 56th Street & South Peoria
Size of Tract: .78 acres, more or less
Date of Hearing: August 12, 1987
Continuance Requested to: September 9, 1987

Present Zoning: OL
Proposed Zoning: OM

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **CONTINUE** Consideration of **Z-6151 Peoria Office Park** until Wednesday, **September 9, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6169
Applicant: Young (Lamons)
Location: 1623 - 1639 West 41st Street
Size of Tract: 180' x 163'

Present Zoning: RS-3
Proposed Zoning: CS

Date of Hearing: August 12, 1987

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Terry Young, PO Box 3351

(583-4611)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 9 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 CS District **is not** in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .67 acres in size and is located at the northwest corner of West 41st Street South and U.S. Highway 75 (Okmulgee Beeline). It is nonwooded, flat, contains two single-family dwellings and one vacant lot, and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by a single-family dwelling on a large lot recently approved for rezoning from RS-3 to CS; on the east by the Okmulgee Beeline, zoned RS-3; on the south across West 41st Street by single-family dwellings on large lots, zoned RS-3; and on the west by a convenience store, zoned CS.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The TMAPC and City Commission recently approved rezoning the abutting property to the north of the subject tract to CS. Commercial zoning was placed on the northeast and southeast corners of the intersection by Study Map in 1956.

Conclusion: Although the requested CS zoning is not in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, it is recognized that CS zoning is present on two sides and an expressway is a physical fact on the third. Staff would anticipate typical commercial nodal development occurring on the east side of South Union Avenue based on TMAPC and City Commission action on a previous application north of the subject tract.

Therefore, Staff commends **APPROVAL** of the requested CS zoning for Z-6169 based on previous TMAPC and City Commission approval of Z-6161.

Note: Staff would recommend an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reflect future planned commercialization at this location (northeast and southeast corners) based on the nodal concept of the Development Guidelines.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Chairman Parmele, Mr. Young confirmed his agreement to the conditions of the Staff recommendation.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6169 Young (Lamons) for CS**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

The east 60' of Lot 15, Block 6, INTERURBAN ADDITION, and the west 60' of the east 180', and the west 60' of the east 120' of Lot 15, Block 6, INTERURBAN ADDITION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

* * * * *

Application No.: Z-6170 & PUD 430 Present Zoning: P
Applicant: Norman (Pecan Tree Partnership) Proposed Zoning: OL
Location: N/side of East 35th Street & east of South Peoria
Size of Tract: .32 acres, more or less
Date of Hearing: August 12, 1987
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 OL District is **not** in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-6170

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .32 acres in size and located east of the northeast corner of East 35th Street South and South Peoria Avenue. It is nonwooded, flat, contains a parking lot and a residential building, and is zoned P (Parking).

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north and east by single-family residences zoned RS-3, on the south across East 35th Street South by a parking lot and with an office building zoned OL and on the west by a single-family dwelling converted to a dentist's office zoned RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: OL zoning was approved on a lot 50 feet to the west. OL zoning was placed on the tract located south of the subject tract across East 35th Street when there was no "P" (Parking) designation. The BOA granted a Use Variance for a dentist's office in an RS-3 District on the lot to the west.

Conclusion: Staff cannot support the requested OL zoning on the subject tract based on the Comprehensive Plan Map and the fact that the subject tract abuts residential land use on the east. The request represents a further encroachment of nonresidential use into the residential area. The Staff recommended "P" per Z-5874 based on the Brookside Area Special Study, which designated the subject tract for parking to aid in the lack of sufficient off-street parking in the area. Although CH zoning now requires parking, when the use is changed to another Use Unit, the parking problem along Peoria Avenue and the minor interior streets still exists. The reduction of available parking spaces in the area as a result of redevelopment of the subject tract would only add to the problem.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of OL zoning.

Staff Recommendation: PUD 430

The subject tract has an area of approximately .32 acres and is located east of the northeast corner of South Peoria and East 35th Street. The present zoning of this tract is P (Parking) and Staff is not supportive of rezoning to OL as requested per Z-6170, and therefore, expresses nonsupport of PUD 430.

The proposed office development consists of two office buildings connected by a breezeway and landscaped court. A parking area for four cars is included in the front yard and a driveway is located along the west boundary connecting to a rear parking lot. The two buildings have a total floor area of 3,600 square feet, which would require twelve parking places if limited to general office uses.

Staff would note that the entire front yard is devoted to a four space parking lot which severely limits open space. If the rezoning and PUD is approved, Staff would note that the parking lot in the front yard should be limited to two spaces with access to the spaces from the west drive and the landscaped green space increased accordingly to reduce the impact of this development on the residential area to the east, to improve the transition of office to residential uses and provide a better demarcation between the office uses and the abutting single-family residential area.

An existing large pecan tree will be preserved on the site and a 6' screening fence (finished on both sides) would be installed along the north boundary and along the east boundary to a point which corresponds to the front of the east building. Exterior lighting standards will be limited to a maximum height of 6' along the north and east boundary. The PUD Text indicates that approval for phased development via lot splitting is being requested.

Staff is not supportive of the requested underlying OL zoning per Z-6170, and therefore, recommends **DENIAL** of PUD 430. If the TMAPC is supportive of OL zoning on a part of the subject tract, as was indicated on a previous case (Z-6109, 4-2-0 on 4/23/86), OL zoning on the west 55' of the subject tract would accommodate the requested floor area, and Staff would suggest the following Development Standards:

1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan be redesigned to limit parking in the front yard to a maximum of two spaces and that the Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

2) **Development Standards:**

Land Area (Gross):	16,500 sf
(Net):	14,000 sf

Permitted Uses: Uses permitted by right in an OL District excluding funeral homes, medical and dental offices, clinics and laboratories.

Z-6170 & PUD 430 Norman (Pecan Tree Partnership) - Cont'd

Maximum Building Height:	One story not to exceed 26'
Maximum Number of Buildings:	Two
Maximum Building Floor Area:	
West Building	1,920 sf
East Building	1,680 sf
Total	3,600 sf
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	As required by the Zoning Code
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from Centerline of East 35th	55'
from West boundary	18'
from East Boundary	7'
from North Boundary	40'
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	8% *

- * Landscaped open space shall include internal and external landscaped open areas, parking lot islands and buffers, but shall exclude pedestrian walkways and parking areas designed solely for circulation. The Staff recommendation for redesign of the front parking area, limiting it to a maximum of two spaces, is required to accomplish 8%, which is considered minimal.
- 3) That all trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view.
 - 4) That all parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas, and limited to a maximum height of 6' as per the PUD Text along the north and east boundaries.
 - 5) All signs shall be subject to Detail Sign Plan review and approval by the TMAPC prior to installation and in accordance with Section 1130.2(b) of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code, and limited to a maximum of one ground identification sign not to exceed 5' tall and not to exceed a maximum display surface area of 20 square feet.
 - 6) That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval and installed prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The landscaping materials required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continued condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit. Plantings of a screening nature shall be added along the east boundary in front of the proposed building to provide a "living screen fence" 4' tall.
 - 7) Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
 - 8) That a Detail Site Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit, and shall include elevations of the proposed development demonstrating compliance with the Country English architecture featuring stone and cedar shingle siding as proposed 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 the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner acknowledged that the parking problems in the Brookside area have improved since the time the Brookside Study was done. Mr. Paddock confirmed the abutting residential properties were to the north and east of the subject tract, and requested clarification of the parking spaces proposed for the front of the lot.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman, representing Mr. Tim Hays, reviewed the history of this site as to its use as a parking lot. He stressed that the lot was not being used by those in the area for parking as most people preferred parking at the meters along Peoria. Mr. Norman submitted photos of the adjacent office uses, stating that the proposed buildings would also maintain a residential appearance. Mr. Norman reviewed the PUD criteria as to the screening fence, lighting, etc. In regard to the landscaping, Mr. Norman commented that, based on his definition, the landscaped open space included the courtyard between the two buildings, the sidewalk areas, the landscaped areas, and everything except the driveway and parking areas. He pointed out that the two buildings were only connected by the breezeways, which would allow for two separate ownerships, subject to a mutual access covenant for the driveway.

In regard to the zoning request, Mr. Norman advised they would need the west 55' of property to be zoned in the OL district to permit 3,600 square feet of building area. Mr. Norman requested the Commission keep in mind that there currently was no landscaping on the front parking area, and he has discussed with the Staff the amount of landscaping needed to provide an attractive development and maintain the transition concept. He stated that, if they gave up two of the front parking spaces, it would require the applicant to change the design in the rear of the property. Mr. Norman presented an alternative design to Site Plan originally submitted, and stated that the redesign would increase the landscaped area in the front yard by 400 square feet.

In regard to the signage, Mr. Norman stated the applicant was requesting two identification signs (one for each building), while the Staff was recommending only one sign. Otherwise, Mr. Norman stated the Staff recommendation was acceptable. He added that he had mailed copies of the proposed design to the 35 owners on the property list, and had personally talked with a few of the owners who expressed this would be a great improvement over the vacant parking lot and would, in fact, provide a more proper transition for the neighborhood.

Z-6170 & PUD 430 Norman (Pecan Tree Partnership) - Cont'd

In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Norman advised there was 100' of frontage, which was consistent with the other two buildings to the west. Ms. Kempe inquired if Mr. Norman had talked with any of the homeowners along 34th Street, and Mr. Norman advised that, in his conversation with the residents, one lady expressed she much preferred viewing a screening fence than the dilapidated building currently on the lot.

Mr. Doherty inquired as to sign placement based on the revised plan. Mr. Norman commented that, as the applicant had to submit a Detail Site Plan, he would be willing to relocate the signs to the satisfaction of the Commission. Mr. Doherty asked for clarification from the Staff as to the need for redesigning the front parking spaces. Mr. Gardner stated the redesign offered an increase in the open space area of more than 400 square feet. Mr. Doherty inquired as to the importance of having two separate signs. Mr. Norman replied that, depending on the location in the new green area, it may not be a major point. However, he was not sure that a four foot height would accommodate identifying the four tenants. Mr. Gardner clarified that the Staff recommendation was for 20 square feet of display surface, which was greater than the two 8' signs requested. Mr. Norman commented that the applicant could work within this recommendation. Mr. Carnes pointed out the applicant was subject to Detail Sign Plan approval, and Mr. Norman reiterated he felt the signage could be worked out to meet Staff's recommendation.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Robert R. Wann (177 East 29th Place), owner of the property to the west, commented on the continued deterioration of the subject tract, and the ineffectiveness of efforts to convert this to a parking lot. He remarked the lot was used by teens on weekends as a meeting place, and was usually left quite littered. Mr. Wann pointed out that no one had previously shown interest in this property until this presentation, and as he felt this would add to the aesthetics of the neighborhood, he requested approval of the submitted zoning and PUD.

Mr. J.D. Thompson (1407 East 35th Street) commented that he has tried to keep this lot residential, as he did not want to see commercial encroach further into the neighborhood. Mr. Thompson agreed with Mr. Carnes' comments that, under the PUD, the building would be residential in nature, and would assist in keeping the teens out of the area. In response to Ms. Kempe, Mr. Thompson stated the real estate and dental offices had not created any problems to the residents.

Review Session:

Mr. Doherty moved for approval of OL zoning on the west 55', approval of the PUD with the applicant's redesigned Outline Development Plan showing four parking places in front (two with access from 35th Street; two from the west driveway), and all other conditions as suggested by Staff.

Z-6170 & PUD 430 Norman (Pecan Tree Partnership) - Cont'd

Mr. Paddock, recognizing the PUD concept is, historically, intended to cover much larger tracts, stated that in view of the fact that nothing else had succeeded on this tract, he would be voting in favor of the motion.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6170 and PUD 430 Norman (Pecan Tree Partnerships)** for OL zoning on the west 55', subject to the applicant's redesigned Outline Development Plan showing four parking places in front (two with access from 35th Street; two from the west driveway), and all other conditions as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

Lot 11, Block 2, OLIVERS ADDITION, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

* * * * *

Application No.: **CZ-160** Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: **Just (Warstell, Allen, Traband)** Proposed Zoning: CG
Location: NE/c, SE/c and SW/c of East 146th Street North & US Highway 75
Size of Tract: 60 acres, more or less
Date of Hearing: August 12, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Glen Just, Box 296, Collinsville (371-2553)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 13 and 14 Plans, parts of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designate the subject property Medium Intensity - Commercial - Office and Medium Intensity - Agriculture and Rural Residential.

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 for the Medium Intensity - Commercial/Office and is not in accordance with the Plan Map for the Medium Intensity - Agriculture and Rural Residential portion.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tracts are approximately 60 acres in size and located at the northeast, southeast, and southwest corners of East 146th Street North and US Highway 75. They are partially wooded, gently sloping, vacant, and zoned AG.

CZ-160 Just (Warstell, Allen, Traband) - Cont'd

Surrounding Area Analysis: The northwest corner of East 146th Street North is an automobile dealership, zoned CG and OL. The northeast, southeast, and southwest corners of this intersection are generally abutted by vacant property zoned AG except as previously noted.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The TMAPC and County Commission approved 15 acres of CG zoning with an OL buffer on the northwest corner of U.S. Highway 75 and East 146th Street North.

Conclusion: The Development Guidelines do not specifically address the intersection of a primary arterial street with a limited access facility such as the subject application. However, the traffic capacity of a limited access facility such as Highway 75 is equal to or greater than a primary arterial street. Accordingly, the subject intersection was given Type III Node status by the approval of 15 acres of CG zoning on the northwest corner of the intersection. To exceed 15 acres of commercial zoning at any one corner of this intersection would exceed the Development Guidelines.

Therefore, the Staff is supportive of 15 acres (net) of CG zoning at each corner per the decision on the northwest corner and 100 feet of OL buffering to the north on the northeast corner and 100 feet of OL buffering to the south on the southwest and southeast corners of the intersection and, denial of the balance of the property exceeding these amounts.

NOTE: It would be the responsibility of the applicant to provide Staff revised legal descriptions if alternative zoning patterns are granted.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Chairman Parmele, the applicant confirmed agreement to the Staff recommendation for the CG/OL zoning. The applicant was advised of his responsibility to provide a revised legal description prior to hearing of this application by the County Commission, if the CG/OL is approved by the TMAPC.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE CZ-160 Just (Warstell, Allen, Traband) for CG/OL zoning**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

As noted in the "Comments & Discussion" above, the applicant was instructed to provide a revised legal description for the CG/OL zoning prior to hearing of this application by the County Commission.

* * * * *

Application No.: PUD 384-A Present Zoning: CS & AG
Applicant: Wilson Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: East of the SE/c of West 71st Street & South Elwood Avenue
Size of Tract: 9.75 acres, approximate
Date of Hearing: August 12, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Jerry Wilson, 6116 South Memorial (252-5623)

Staff Recommendation: Major Amendment

The subject tract has an area of 9.75 acres and is located east of the southeast corner of West 71st Street South and South Elwood Avenue. The tract is abutted on the east by the City of Tulsa sewage sludge drying beds facility. No change is proposed in the CS underlying zoning which has been approved on the north 550' with AG zoning on the balance of the tract. The applicant is requesting a major amendment to PUD 384 which will effectively abandon previous approvals and permit Use Units 11, 14, 15 and 17 if approved. Proposed uses within the requested Use Units are as follows: a mini-storage facility and office/showroom uses on the east 175' which abuts the sewage sludge drying facility, and a retail lawn and garden center on the balance of the property to the west which has approximately 310' of frontage on West 71st Street.

The Outline Development Plan illustrates the general location of the proposed uses. The maximum building floor area is 98,050 square feet total allocated as follows: 37,100 square feet to retail lawn and garden center uses, and 60,950 square feet to mini-storage and office/showroom uses. PUD 384 was originally approved for 133,600 square feet of floor area and also included Use Unit 12, Entertainment and Eating Establishments. The relatively low intensity of the retail lawn and garden center uses should provide a compatible transition to the existing residential uses to the west with proper screening and a recommended requirement that automobile parking not be permitted to abut this boundary and in the alternative be located on the east side of the west drive. It is also recommended that screening be required along those retail lawn and garden center PUD boundaries which abut residential uses, and in particular along the common boundaries of Area 9 which is proposed for "material storage". The screening requirements should remain somewhat flexible at the conceptual stage and be established in conjunction with submission of future Detail Site Plans and Detail Landscape Plans.

The subject tract is designated as Special Consideration Area No. 1 - Medium Intensity in the District 8 Plan which requires submission of a PUD for medium intensity development to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This tract has also been proposed for identification as a Medium Intensity Linear Development Area based on amendments to the Development Guidelines which will be presented to the TMAPC at an 8/5/87 public hearing.

PUD 384-A Wilson - Cont'd

Staff review of PUD 384-A finds it to be: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the 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 384-A as 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): 424,710 sf 9.75 acres

Permitted Uses: **Use Unit 11**

Use Unit 14 - Outside display of merchandise is permitted for seasonal merchandise only and is otherwise restricted in accordance with the Zoning Code, Section 1214.3 Use Conditions.

Use Unit 15; EXCLUDING air conditioning and heating, bottled gas, fence, fuel oil, general merchandising establishment (NEC), heating equipment, ice plant, lumber yard, model homes (for display only), plumbing shop, portable storage building/sales, air conditioning, plumbing, frozen food locker, kennel, linen supply, and packing and crating of household and other similar goods.

Use Unit 17 - Permitting ONLY mini-storage on the east 175' of the subject tract.

Maximum Building Height: One story not to exceed 20' except 27' permitted for manager's quarters (Building A)

Maximum Building Floor Area: 98,050 sf

Minimum Off-Street Parking: As required by the applicable Use Units

Minimum Building Setbacks:

from North Boundary (West 71st	65'
from West boundary (mini-storage)	0'
from West Boundary (garden center)	60'
from South Boundary (mini-storage)	15'
from South Boundary (garden center)	15'
from East Boundary (mini-storage)	0' *
from East Boundary (garden center)	25'

* Subject to approval by the appropriate City Department.

Minimum Landscaped Open Space: 15% **

** Required landscaped open space shall include perimeter landscaping along 71st Street. Landscaped open space shall include internal and external landscaped open areas, parking lot islands and buffers, but shall exclude pedestrian walkways and parking areas designed solely for circulation. Each major functional area (garden center and mini-storage/office showroom) shall include not less than 5% landscaped open areas. A 15' continuous landscape buffer shall be provided along the west and south boundaries.

- 3) That all trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view. A 6' screening fence shall be required along the west and south boundaries subject to review at the time a Detail Site Plan is submitted; at a minimum, the area abutting Building 8/Storage Area 9 shall be enclosed by a 6' screening fence due to outside material storage.
- 4) That all parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas.
- 5) All signs shall be subject to Detail Sign Plan review and approval by the TMAPC prior to installation in accordance with Section 1130.2(b) of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code and the following additional conditions:

Ground Signs: Ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign identifying the building or buildings not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 64 square feet.

Wall or Canopy Signs: Wall or canopy signs shall be limited to one sign for each principal building and shall not exceed a display surface area of one square foot per lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed. No wall signs are permitted on the east or west elevations of the mini-storage buildings, or the retail garden center buildings.

Entry and Expressway Signage: In addition to other signage, a monument sign identifying the project, not exceeding 6' in height nor exceeding a display surface area of 120 square feet, may be located at each of the principal entrances to the project.

No portable signs are permitted.

- 6) That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval and installed prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The landscaping materials required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continued condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit. Buffering and landscaped area is subject to additional requirements as stated in the Development Standards.
- 7) Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.

- 8) That a Detail Site Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit, including elevations showing architectural treatment of exterior building facades which shall be of masonry type construction. The concept plan shall be redesigned to require cars to be parked along the east side of the west drive of the garden center and away from the 15' landscape buffer and screening
- 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.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Jerry Wilson reviewed the proposed site plan as to the intended use for a mini-storage and garden center, and briefed the Commission as to the development history of this site. Mr. Wilson stated his difference of opinion with Staff as to shifting the parking from the west to the east, on the retail garden center drive, and explained that the screening fence would totally block any view of the parking from the residential area adjacent to this site, and he would be losing some needed space if the parking was moved. He also stated confusion as to Staff's recommendation regarding signage. Mr. Gardner advised that the sign standards in the recommendation were from the original PUD, as Staff had received no new signage requests from the applicant. Mr. Gardner suggested the applicant submit some basic sign standards for Staff's review. Mr. Wilson advised of his intentions to lower the elevation of the service road leading into this site, and said he would be working with the proper city agencies to do this, in order to improve this service road to meet city standards.

Interested Parties:

Mr. John Cuevas (Rt. 3 Box 745, Broken Arrow) reviewed the minutes of the previous TMAPC hearings on this application (October 1984, May 1985), pointing out the comments that a mini-storage would be excluded. Mr. Cuevas advised the protestants still had the same concerns as to ingress/egress, retention ponds, etc.

In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Cuevas clarified that he was representing property owners in the area. Mr. Carnes commented for Mr. Cuevas that, over the past three years when PUD's were submitted, the TMAPC has encouraged the developer and residents to work out their differences, as the PUD offered controls and protection for both parties. He stated he felt this was another case where a better understanding could be worked out. In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Cuevas stated the main objections involved the mini-storage because of drainage, traffic coming and going, and dust associated with a mini-storage, but they had no concerns about the garden center if well maintained.

Mr. Ken Robertson, represented his father Louie Robertson (Rt. 5 Box 342, Tulsa), who lives immediately west of the subject tract. Mr. Robertson stated that, based on his conversation with an appraiser, mini-storages were very detrimental to property values. He commented that he felt this area, which has remained virtually untouched, should be planned and developed with caution so as not to further downgrade West Tulsa.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Wilson pointed out that the location of the mini-storage provided a good buffer between the sludge ponds and the residential neighborhoods. Further, the residents would see very little, if any, of the development due to the screening proposed. Mr. Wilson pointed out that, historically, mini-storages only generated two cars per hour, which was very low compared to other commercial developments. He also pointed out that, as the entire lot was to be paved, he could not see how the residents would be concerned with a dust problem.

In response to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Wilson confirmed that the Detail Site Plan provided for solid walls along the east and west boundaries, which would totally enclose the mini-storage site.

Review Session:

Mr. Gardner verified, in reply to Mr. Doherty, that traffic generation from a mini-storage was extremely low and had no comparison to the traffic generated by a retail operation. He further confirmed the Code required the area to be paved (i.e., no gravel lot permitted). In regard to the differences of opinion on signage, Mr. Gardner suggested leaving this subject to Detail Sign Plan review at a later date.

Mr. Doherty moved for approval of the PUD, subject to Staff conditions, with the exception of conditions #5 and #8. Mr. Doherty suggested deleting the paragraphs dealing with ground signs and entry/expressway signs (condition #5). Also, in regard to condition #5, he suggested amending the last sentence of the paragraph on wall/canopy signs to read: "No wall signs are permitted on the east elevation of the mini-storage building, nor on the west elevation prior to completion of the garden center." Further, Mr. Doherty suggested deleting the last sentence of condition #8 dealing with the concept plan for parking.

For the residents in attendance, Ms. Kempe mentioned that, as a resident in District 8, she felt the Chairman for this District would be in attendance if this project presented any great concerns. Further, she would welcome the proposed nursery operation and mini-storage if she lived in the area near the sludge ponds.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-1 (Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Carnes, "abstaining"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to APPROVE the Major Amendment to PUD 384-A Wilson, as recommended by Staff, with the following exceptions:

Condition #5: Delete the paragraphs dealing with Ground Signs and Entry or Expressway Signage. Amend the paragraph dealing with Wall or Canopy Signs (last sentence) to read, "No wall signs are permitted on the east elevation of the mini-storage building, nor on the west elevation prior to completion of the garden center."

Condition #8: Delete the last sentence of the paragraph which states, "The concept plan shall be redesigned to require cars to be parked along the east side of the west drive of the garden center and away from the 15' landscape buffer and screening."

Legal Description:

BEGINNING at a point that is 901.74' east of the west line and 140.0' south of the north line of Section 12, T-18-N, R-12-E; thence due east, parallel to and 140.0' south of the north line of Section 12, for a distance of 490.4' to a point that is 67.89' east of the east line of the NW/4 of the NW/4; thence S 01°17'58" E, parallel to the east line of the NW/4 of the NW/4 for a distance of 709.96'; thence due west for a distance of 727.89' to a point that is 660.0' from the east line of the NW/4 of the NW/4 for a distance of 709.96'; ~~thence due west for a distance of 727.89' to a point that is 660.0' from the east line of the NW/4 of the NW/4;~~ thence N 01°17'58" W, parallel to the east line of the NW/4 of the NW/4 for a distance of 330.0'; thence due east for a distance of 237.82' to a point that is 901.74' east of the west line; thence N 01°21'25" W, parallel to the west line for a distance of 379.96' and the POB, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the US Government Survey thereof.

* * * * *

Application No.: PUD 431 Present Zoning: CS, RM-1, RS-3
Applicant: Johnsen (Torchia) Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: SW/c of South Sheridan & East 101st Street
Size of Tract: 23.4 acres, more or less
Date of Hearing: August 12, 1987
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Roy Johnsen, 324 Main Mall (585-5641)

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract has a gross area of 23.4 acres and is located at the southwest corner of South Sheridan and East 101st Street South. The abutting streets are secondary arterials and the underlying zoning of the tract is CS/5.0 acres, RM-1/5.2 acres, and RS-3/13.2 acres. No change is proposed in the underlying zoning.

PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia) - Cont'd

The proposed PUD is divided into the following development areas: Parcel A, B and C - restaurant and office; Parcel D - shopping; Parcel E - office; Parcel F - single-family dwelling units (DU's); and Parcel G - common open space. The restaurant parcels are located at the arterial street intersection with the shopping parcel wrapping around the intersection on the west and south sides of the restaurant areas. The office parcel is located west of the shopping area on East 101st Street and the common open space, which also functions as a detention area, forms a buffer between the office and shopping areas and the single-family residential parcels along the west boundary. The office area has 180' of frontage on East 101st Street and a detention area will buffer the residential uses in the most westerly development parcel from the office and commercial uses. The westerly portion of the subject tract is identified as a "sump area", being Special District 2 in the District 26 Plan. According to the Plan, the development design should give special consideration to providing for on-site drainage and detention of storm water such that historic run-off rates are not exceeded. PUD's are required in Special District 2 for medium intensity developments. A 20' landscape buffer is proposed along the East 101st and Sheridan frontages. Staff is most supportive of PUD 431 if further limitations are placed on sign display surface areas and locations; and as otherwise noted in the development standards.

Therefore, with revisions to sign standards and as noted in the Development Standards, Staff finds PUD 431 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.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD 431 subject to the following conditions, which have been modified to reflect the applicant's revised submittal at the TMAPC meeting:

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

2) **Development Summary:**

Land Area (Net): 20.19 Acres
 (Gross): 23.40 Acres

<u>Parcel</u>	<u>Use</u>	<u>Gross Area</u>	<u>Floor Area</u>
A	Restaurant	1.56 acres	7,200 sf
B	Restaurant	1.06 acres	7,200 sf
C	Restaurant	1.15 acres	7,200 sf
D	Shopping	7.50 acres	87,200 sf
E	Office	1.25 acres	14,550 sf
F	Single-family	7.37 acres	31 DU's
G	Common Open Space	3.50 acres	--
TOTALS:		23.39 acres	123,350 sf 31 DU's

LANDSCAPED OPEN SPACES ON NONRESIDENTIAL PARCELS

(Excludes Parcel G) = 9% of Net Area.

Landscaped open space shall include internal and external landscaped open areas, parking lot islands and buffers, but shall exclude pedestrian walkways and parking areas designed solely for circulation.

Summary of Permitted Uses: Use Unit 11, excluding funeral homes; Use Unit 12, excluding bars, nightclubs, taverns and dance halls; however accessory bar to a restaurant is permitted in Parcel A, B, or C; Use Unit 13; and Use Unit 14

3) Development Standards:

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL A

Land Area (Net):	1.02 acres
Permitted Uses:	Freestanding restaurant, or office or financial institution. Drive-up services shall be confined to the south and west elevations only. Only one of the restaurant parcels is permitted a drive-thru service window.
Maximum Floor Area:	7,200 sf
Minimum Floor Area: *	3,000 sf
Maximum Building Height:	35'
Maximum Stories:	1-1/2 Stories
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from centerline of 101st	100'
from centerline of Sheridan	100'
from development area line	10'
Minimum Off-Street Parking: **	
Restaurant	1 space/100 sf - floor area, and 1 space/75 sf - accessory bar area
Office/Financial Institution	1 space/300 sf - floor area

* The minimum floor area for restaurant use may be reduced within one of the three restaurant parcels to a minimum floor area requirement of 1,500 square feet. Only one of the restaurant parcels is permitted a drive-thru service window.

** Required parking need not be located within the development parcel if effective cross-parking easements are established, and within the commercial parcels, there exists in the aggregate the required parking for each of the various permitted uses.

PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia) - Cont'd

Minimum Interior Landscaped
Open Space: 18% of net area, excluding
landscaped right-of-way

Other Bulk & Area Requirements: As required in a CS District

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL B

Land Area (Net): .86 acres

Permitted Uses: Freestanding restaurant, or office or financial
institution. Drive-up services shall be confined
to the north and west elevations only. Only one
of the restaurant parcels is permitted a
drive-thru service window.

Maximum Floor Area: 7,200 sf
Minimum Floor Area: * 3,000 sf

Maximum Building Height: 35'

Maximum Stories: 1-1/2 Stories

Minimum Building Setbacks:
from centerline of Sheridan 100'
from development area line 10'

Minimum Off-Street Parking: **

Restaurant 1 space/100 sf - floor area, and 1
space/75 sf - accessory bar area,
if any

Office/Financial Institution 1 space/300 sf - floor area

Minimum Interior Landscaped
Open Space: 13% of net area, excluding
landscaped right-of-way.

Other Bulk & Area Requirements: As required in a CS District

* The minimum floor area for restaurant use may be reduced within one
of the three restaurant parcels to a minimum floor area requirement
of 1,500 square feet. Only one of the restaurant parcels is
permitted a drive-thru service window.

** Required parking need not be located within the development parcel if
effective cross-parking easements are established, and within the
commercial parcels, there exists in the aggregate the required
parking for each of the various permitted uses.

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL C

Land Area (Net): .915 Acres

Permitted Uses: Freestanding restaurant, or office or financial
institution. Drive-up services shall be confined
to the east and south elevations only. Only one
of the restaurant parcels is permitted a
drive-thru service window.

PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia) - Cont'd

Maximum Floor Area:	7,200 sf
Minimum Floor Area: *	3,000 sf
Maximum Building Height:	35'
Maximum Stories:	1-1/2 Stories
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from centerline of 101st	100'
from development area line	10'
Minimum Off-Street Parking: **	
Restaurant	1 space/100 sf - floor area, and 1 space/75 sf - accessory bar area, if any.
Office/Financial Institution	1 space/300 sf - floor area
Minimum Interior Landscaped Open Space:	11% of net area, excluding landscaped right-of-way
Other Bulk & Area Requirements:	As required in a CS District

* The minimum floor area for restaurant use may be reduced within one of the three restaurant parcels to a minimum floor area requirement of 1,500 square feet. Only one of the restaurant parcels is permitted a drive-thru service window.

** Required parking need not be located within the development parcel if effective cross-parking easements are established, and within the commercial parcels, there exists in the aggregate the required parking for each of the various permitted uses.

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL D

Land Area (Net):	6.92 Acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted in a CS District; provided however, no liquor store, dance hall, bar, night club, tavern or other establishment serving alcoholic beverages shall be located within 190 feet of the south boundary of the development parcel.
Maximum Floor Area:	87,200 sf
Maximum Building Height:	28'
Maximum Stories:	1 Story
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from centerline of 101st	175'
from centerline of Sheridan	130'
from south development area line	40'
from west development area line	40'

PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia) - Cont'd

Minimum Off-Street Parking: 1 space/225 sf - floor area, or as required.
Minimum Interior Landscaped Open Space: 8% of net area, excluding landscaped right-of-way
Other Bulk & Area Requirements: As required in a CS District

NOTE: The architectural treatment of the south and west elevations of buildings constructed on Parcel D shall be compatible in material, design, and architectural treatment with frontal building facades. Building elevations shall be submitted with the Detail Site Plan for TMAPC review and approval.

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL E

All exterior building facades for office building(s) constructed on Parcel E shall be residential in design and character. Detail Site Plan shall include elevations for TMAPC review and approval.

Land Area (Net): 1.05 Acres
Permitted Uses: Offices or financial institution
Maximum Floor Area: 14,550 sf
Maximum Stories 2 Stories
Maximum Building Height: 28'
Minimum Building Setbacks:
from centerline of 101st 175'
from south development area line 10'
from west development area line 15'
Minimum Off-Street Parking: 1 space/300 sf - floor area, or as required.
Minimum Interior Landscaped Open Space: 20% of net
Other Bulk & Area Requirements: As required in a OL District

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL F

Land Area (Net): 6.96 Acres
Maximum Number of DU's: 31
Permitted Uses: Single-family detached residential uses and normal accessory uses.
Minimum Floor Area of DU's: 1,750 sf
Minimum Lot Size: 6,000 sf
Minimum Livability Space per Lot: 3,400 sf

PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia) - Cont'd

Minimum Lot Width:	50'
Minimum Setback from Nonarterial Street:	
Front yard	25'
Side yard	20'
Rear Yard:	
Development perimeter	17-1/2'
Interior	15'
Side yards:	5'
Maximum Height:	35'
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	2 spaces/dwelling unit

NOTE: A 6' screening fence shall be installed along the west boundary of Parcel F.

DEVELOPMENT PARCEL G

Development Parcel G is proposed as common open space containing storm water detention facilities and functions as a buffer between Parcels D - Shopping, Parcel E - Office and Parcel F - Single-Family Residential.

Net Area: 3.4 + Acres

Permitted Uses: Common open space, recreation and stormwater detention facilities

- 4) **Sign Standards:** Signs accessory to the principal uses within the development shall be permitted, but shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

° **Development Parcels A, B & C - Restaurant or Office**

Ground Signs: Within each parcel ground signs shall be limited to one sign along the arterial frontage identifying the establishment therein. The ground sign shall not exceed 16 feet in height, nor exceed a display surface area of 180 square feet.

Wall or Canopy Signs: The aggregate display surface area of the wall or canopy signs shall be limited to one square foot per each lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed. Wall or canopy signs shall not exceed the height of the building. No flashing or intermittently lighted signs are permitted and no wall or canopy signs are permitted on the west elevations of buildings constructed on Parcels A and C.

° **Development Parcel D - Shopping**

Ground Signs: Ground signs shall be limited to one sign along 101st Street and one sign along Sheridan identifying the center and/or tenants therein. A permitted ground sign shall not exceed 16 feet in height, nor exceed a display surface area of 180 square feet. No ground sign shall be permitted closer than 150 feet from the west or south boundary of Parcel D.

Wall or Canopy Signs: The aggregate display surface area of the wall or canopy signs shall be limited to one square foot per each lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed. Wall or canopy signs shall not exceed the height of the building. No flashing or intermittently lighted signs are permitted and no wall or canopy signs are permitted on the west or south elevations of buildings constructed on Parcel D.

° Development Parcel E - Office

Ground Signs: Ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign along 101st Street not exceeding 8 feet in height nor 32 square feet in display surface area.

° Development Parcel F - Single-Family

Ground Signs: Ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign along 101st Street not exceeding 8 feet in height, nor 32 square feet in display surface area.

- 5) That all trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view.
- 6) That all parking lot lighting shall be shielded and directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas.
- 7) All signs shall be subject to Detail Sign Plan review and approval by the TMAPC prior to installation and in accordance with Section 1130.2(b) of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code and as further restricted by the "Sign Standards" herein.
- 8) That a Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval and installed prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The landscaping materials required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continued condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit. A landscaped area of not less than 20 feet in width (exclusive of right-of-way) shall be provided along the East 101st and Sheridan frontages excepting points of access; provided however, that along the west 150 feet of Parcel D - Shopping (along Sheridan), the landscaped area shall be unbroken by any point of access. Within Parcel D - Shopping, a landscaped area of not less than 10 feet in width shall be provided along the southerly boundary, and a 6 foot screening fence shall be constructed and maintained along the common boundary between Parcel D and Parcel G and Parcel E and G.
- 9) Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
- 10) That a Detail Site Plan and building elevations shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia) - Cont'd

- 11) 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 the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.
- 12) An association of owners shall be created to maintain common open space, drives and parking areas for residential and nonresidential spaces as necessary.

Comments & Discussion:

In response to Mr. Paddock regarding traffic counts, Mr. Gardner advised these were done every two years and, as yet, 1985 reports are the most current, with 1987 reports coming out at year end. Mr. Paddock inquired as to why there were no comments under "utilities" on the case report, and was informed that there was no city sewer service in parts of this area.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Johnsen advised this particular application was located in an area that was sewerable. He reviewed the previous development proposal (July 1986) that was approved by the TMAPC, but denied by the City Commission in a 3-2-0 vote. Mr. Johnsen stated that, at that City Commission hearing, the Mayor had suggested the applicant and the residents try to resolve their differences, and he felt this presentation accomplished this. Mr. Johnsen advised the applicant had deleted multifamily area on the west and redesigned this area with single-family; the PUD text now included language regarding lighting; and restaurant heights were now limited to 1-1/2 stories. He further advised that drainage had been designed so that it should help with water problems in this entire area. Mr. Johnsen reviewed the floor area minimums. He pointed out that, in order to address the concerns as to "fast food" type restaurants, the the applicant proposed that two of the restaurants would not be permitted to have a drive-thru window, and this could also be controlled by limiting square footage and signage.

Mr. Johnsen reviewed the modifications made to clear confusion as to north/west and south/east of Development Areas B and C (reflected correctly in this text). He reviewed the amount of landscaping proposed for the development areas.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Don Forlenza (10015 South Maplewood), a resident of the Bayberry Addition, advised of meetings with the developer and owner, stating that most of the resident's concerns had been met. Mr. Forlenza stated that a remaining concern involved the water problems on the north side of East 101st at Maplewood, which would have to be resolved by the City, as the applicant's design offered a solution to the water problems on the south side of 101st. He advised that, in his discussions with the city agencies, he was told this would be reviewed as development occurred in

PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia) - Cont'd

this area. Mr. Forlenza confirmed with Staff that the text would be modified so as to restrict a drive-thru facility to only one of the development areas.

Review Session:

Mr. Carnes moved for approval of the PUD, as amended. Chairman Parmele inquired if the TMAPC could make a suggestion to the City Commission that they work through the Engineering Department with the developer to resolve the water problems on the north side of East 101st at Maplewood. Mr. Gardner confirmed that, while it could not be a condition of approval, the Commission could strongly recommend the City take action to resolve the water problems at this intersection. Mr. Doherty complimented the developer and residents for their efforts to work together to solve their difference regarding the water concerns. Chairman Parmele echoed compliments to the developer for his efforts to work out solutions with the neighborhood.

Mr. Paddock commented that he felt it should be specifically stated in the text that only one restaurant would be permitted a drive-thru window, and not implied by restricting footage, signage, etc. Mr. Jackere clarified that Staff's restriction on the windows and the size of the building was a practical matter which would eliminate "fast foods" on two of the buildings. Further discussion clarified that this was a part of the motion for approval, and had been put into text.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD 431 Johnsen (Torchia)**, as amended and recommended by Staff in these minutes.

Legal Description:

The N/2 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 27, and the N/2 of the S/2 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of said Section 27, less and except the south 330' of the east 865' thereof, Section 27, T-18-N, R-13-E.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 405: West of the SW/c of South Memorial & East 91st Street

Staff Recommendation: Revised Detail Sign Plan

The subject tract is located west of the southwest corner of South Memorial and East 91st Street South and is included in Development Area 1-A. This development area has been approved for the sale of new and used automobiles and several dealerships have been constructed. The TMAPC approved the Initial Detail Sign Plan for signs along East 91st Street on July 8, 1987. The applicant is requesting that the location of the signs be revised to allow the signs to be placed on the public right-of-way more than 50' from the centerline of East 91st (to comply with the Major Street Plan) but less than 60' from said centerline to avoid utility easements on the subject tracts.

Staff is conditionally supportive of the request and recommends APPROVAL as follows:

- (1) Subject to the submitted plans and locational drawings.
- (2) That prior approval from the City of Tulsa be given for placement of said signs on the public right-of-way in accordance with a removal contract.
- (3) In the alternative to placement of signs on the public right-of-way, signs may be placed on public or private utility easements on the subject tract only with prior approval of the effected utility companies.

Comments & Discussion:

In response to Mr. Carnes and Mr. Doherty, Staff clarified placement of the signs and fence in regard to public right-of-way.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted **6-1-0** (Carnes, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; Doherty, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Revised Detail Sign Plan for PUD 405**, as recommended by Staff.

RESOLUTION

Resolution No. 1658:632 Amending the Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area for the District 18 Plan Map by adding thereto housekeeping amendments caused by approval of zoning ordinances not in accordance with the adopted District 18 Plan, and amendments pertaining to the Corridor designation (addition and deletion) as related to proposed changes in the Metropolitan Development Guidelines.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock questioned the addition of the Corridor designation north of 91st Street and east of the planned Mingo Valley Expressway. Mr. Gardner clarified that the Plan Map was amended, usually on an annual basis, to reflect the zoning that has occurred within the District, including this previously approved Corridor designation.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, VanFossen, Wilson, "absent") to **APPROVE Resolution No. 1658:632**, amending the **District 18 Plan Map**, as recommended by Staff, and as attached hereto as an exhibit to these minutes.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Date Approved

8-26-87



Chairman

ATTEST:


Secretary

