

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1681  
Wednesday, **January 20, 1988**, 1:30 p.m.  
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

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

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, January 19, 1988 at 9:50 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, 1st Vice-Chairman Paddock called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

**MINUTES:**

**Approval of Minutes of January 6, 1988, Meeting #1679:**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, Parmele, Kempe, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of January 6, 1988, Meeting #1679**.

**REPORTS:**

**Report of Receipts & Deposits for the Month Ended December 31, 1987:**

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, Parmele, Kempe, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Report of Receipts & Deposits for the Month Ended December 31, 1987**, as confirmed by Staff to be in order.

Committee Reports:

Mr. Paddock advised of the January 14th and January 20th meetings of the Rules & Regulations Committee to consider review of the final draft of the Historic Preservation Ordinance, whereby the Committee voted unanimously to recommend the January 15, 1988 draft to the full Commission. Along with this draft, the Committee requested a memo from Mr. VanFossen be transmitted regarding a suggested amendment.

Director's Report:

Mr. Gardner advised the newspapers had released the consultant's recommendation to the Oklahoma Turnpike Authority regarding a proposed 96th Street alignment of a tollway/expressway in south Tulsa.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT:

Lansing Industrial Park II, III (3602) E. Pine & N. Lansing Ave. (CH, CS, IL)

These plats are being reviewed together but they may be filed as two separate plats, depending on decisions to be made by TDA (formerly TURA). Lansing Industrial Park II has a preliminary approval, but some changes have been made so it is included again for review. Staff and TAC had no objection to filing the plats as one or separately.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plats of Lansing Industrial Park II and III, subject to the following conditions:

1. The underlying plat(s) shall be properly vacated in accordance with current legal procedures. (Not a condition of approval of plat, only a reminder.)
2. On face of plat(s) show number of lots and acres near location map. Identify Lansing Industrial Park I. Show all curve data and dimension completely.
3. Building lines:
  - a) Any building lines on the interior, non-arterial streets that are greater than 25' are volunteered by applicant. (Applies to both II & III)
  - b) Identify 50' building line on Lot 1, Block 1, Phase II.

Lansing Industrial Park II, III - Cont'd

- c) Identify building lines on Lot 2, Block 1. This lot is zoned CH except for the west 10'. CH does not require a building line, so the lines shown are volunteered. (The west 10' would require a 50' building line since that is zoned CS). (#11)
  - d) The 25' building lines on Lots 1 & 2, Block 1, Phase III do not meet the CS zoning of 50' on Pine. Board of Adjustment approval will be required. (Part of Lot 1 is zoned CH and does not require a building line, but that part that is CS requires the waiver.)
4. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. (11' x 11') Existing easements should be tied to or related to property lines and/or lot lines. Additional easements required in Block 2, Phase II.
  5. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat. Include language for Water and Sewer facilities in covenants.
  6. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s). Include the following in covenants: THE OWNER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF ANY LANDSCAPING AND PAVING LOCATED WITHIN THE UTILITY EASEMENTS IN THE EVENT IT IS NECESSARY TO REPAIR ANY UNDERGROUND WATER OR SEWER MAINS, ELECTRIC, NATURAL GAS, COMMUNICATIONS OR TELEPHONE SERVICE.
  7. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
  8. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer.
  9. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by Stormwater Management and/or City Engineer, including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by City Commission. Fees-in-lieu of detention has been approved for this development as per letter dated 6/22/87.
  10. Limits of Access shall be shown on the plat as approved by City and/or Traffic Engineer. Include applicable language in covenants. Applies to Pine Street and Cherokee Expressway. A 25 mph curve design is required around Block 2 on Kenosha - see Traffic Engineering.
  11. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineering during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)

**Lansing Industrial Park II, III - Cont'd**

12. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
13. A loop water line is required around Block 2 along Kenosha for water service and fire protection. Water and Sewer Department and Fire Department requirement. There will be some water and/or sewer lines to abandon and others to be rehabilitated.
14. Identify vacated portion of Madison next to church site for reference and clarity.
15. Show existing ONG easements (if applicable) on Lot 12, Block 1, Phase II.
16. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations.
17. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

**Comments & Discussion:**

In reply to First Vice-Chairman Paddock, the applicant stated agreement to the listed conditions.

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughton, Harris, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Lansing Industrial Park II & III**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

**EXTENSION OF APPROVAL:**

**Quail Ridge Amended (PUD 221)(2894)** East 44th St. & So. 131st East Ave. (RS-3)

**Quail Ridge II (PUD 221-B)(2894)** East 44th Street & South 131st East Avenue  
(RM-1, RD, RS-3)

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughton, Harris, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Extension of Approval for Quail Ridge Amended and Quail Ridge II** for one year, as recommended by Staff.

**Mesingale Worldwide Inc. (PUD 411)(2483)** NE/c of 101st St. & South Memorial

This is a review of a proposed golf driving range that will be on leased land as a temporary use until the property is fully developed and platted under the terms of the PUD and the Corridor District. The site lies within the proposed commercial and office areas of the conceptual PUD plan. Only one part of this PUD has actually been platted and developed at 98th Street and South Memorial ("9700 Memorial").

The TAC and TMAPC approved a similar request approximately 3/4 mile south on the west side of Memorial (BOA-14410, 5/6/87). One major difference in these two projects is that the previous case approved 3/4 mile south is in an AG District and was only a Board of Adjustment approval; no rezoning was involved. The current application not only involves a zoning application (Z-5842), but a PUD and a Corridor District, all of which have platting requirements and site plan requirements.

Since this is a "temporary use" the Staff has no objections to the request, with certain conditions and limitations, including:

- a) Dedication of right-of-way on 101st Street to meet the Street Plan requirement (60' from centerline).
- b) Dedication of 17.5' general utility easement parallel to both 101st Street and South Memorial, adjacent to the right-of-way line. No requirement is made for perimeter easements on the north and east sides. This would be accomplished in future platting when the actual uses are known. (Check easement for ONG along Memorial.)
- c) Grading and drainage plan approval by the Department of Stormwater Management, including detention and/or easements as required. (On-site detention required; WSDP in progress.)
- d) Approval of City/County Health Department for septic system.
- e) Approval of access as recommended by Traffic/City Engineering and County Engineer on 101st Street. Also requires State approval on Memorial Drive for US Hwy 64; as per ODOT letter dated 12.3.87.
- f) Extension of utilities if needed for this project, including water line extension.
- g) Approval of any "waiver of plat" to apply only to this temporary land use, and upon a change to a permanent use, in accordance with the PUD/CO, the property must be platted.
- h) Conditions applicable to the present project shall be filed of record by separate instrument in accordance with recommendations made in the PUD review process.

The applicant was not represented at the TAC meeting.

Further explanation from the Water Department was that no temporary service will be allowed and water main must be extended, as per (f) above. Traffic Engineer advised for the record, that all access points would be "right-turn-only".

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the waiver of plat, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and TAC as items (a) through (h) above.

In conjunction with the Waiver Request above, Staff presented the following for TMAPC review:

**PUD 411-A and Z-5842-SP-3:** NE/c of East 101st Street and South Memorial

**Staff Recommendation: Major Amendment & Detail/Corridor Site Plan**

PUD 411/Z-5842 has a total area of approximately 160 acres and underlying zoning of CO Corridor. A Detail/Corridor Site Plan was approved for several development areas ranging in use from various types of commercial/retail, automobile sales, office, multifamily residential, and single-family residential uses. The applicant is requesting a Major Amendment and approval of a Detail/Corridor Site Plan for the five year temporary use of a 14 acre tract located at the intersection of South Memorial and East 101st Street for a golf driving and practice range, pro-shop and concessions, miniature golf facilities, and off-street parking. The "Temporary Use Area" is included in Development Area 1 (approved for retail uses), Development Area 7 (approved for office uses), and abuts Development Area 6 (approved for office uses). The Site Plan and Text indicates the location of golf tees, the location of parking areas along Memorial with future access to East 101st Street, the arrangement and location of tee boxes for the driving range, an 18' x 20' office building location, future location for a miniature golf course, plus a future location for the temporary pro-shop and concession building. Consistent with the application, all proposed uses are understood to be temporary and recommended to be subject to review by the TMAPC and City Commission in three years. The proposed temporary use is considered to be compatible with the character of adjacent areas which is relatively undeveloped at this time; further, the three year time limit would provide the option to the approving agencies to review this compatibility at a specific point in time.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD 411-A/Z-5842-SP-3 for temporary uses based on a three year period with approval for two more years as a minor amendment with notice to abutting property owners, and APPROVAL of the Detail/Corridor Site Plan as follows:

1) That the applicant's Detail/Corridor Site Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

2) **Temporary Use Area and Development Standards:**

Land Area: 14.047 acres

Permitted Uses: Golf driving and practice ranges, miniature golf facilities, pro-shop and food concessions and off-street parking

Maximum Building Height: 20'

Maximum Building Floor Area: 5,000 sf

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

Minimum Building Setbacks:

from Centerline of S. Memorial 160'

from Centerline of E. 101st 225'

from East Boundary None required

from North Boundary None required

Minimum Landscaped Open Space: Not specified

Signs:

Ground signs shall be limited to one per each arterial street frontage with a maximum of 160 square feet of display surface area and 25 feet in height.

Wall signs shall be permitted not to exceed 1.5 square feet of display surface area per lineal foot of building wall to which attached.

No flashing or intermittently lighted signs are permitted.

Lighting:

The golf driving and practice range light standards shall be limited to 30 feet in height with hoods and deflectors directing range lighting to the east (from the west boundary) and north (from the south boundary) away from the said boundaries of the temporary use area.

3) That all parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas as provided above.

4) 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.

5) No requirement is made that a Detail Landscape Plan be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval and installed prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit for the golf driving range and associated improvements.

- 6) Subject to TMAPC review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
- 7) That a Detail Site Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit for construction of the miniature golf course and pro-shop/concessions building(s).
- 8) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants. Considering that the requested uses are temporary, staff would be supportive of a waiver of these requirements based on TMAPC policies in this regard subject to filing of appropriate applications and associated fees.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman (909 Kennedy Building), representing the applicant, stated agreement with the Staff recommendation, except for a few minor modifications. Mr. Norman reviewed the existing development in the area and commented that, due to lack of a market, the existing plans for a major commercial/shopping area have been amended to accommodate the requested temporary use for the golf facilities. Mr. Norman requested a maximum building size be permitted of up to 5,000 square feet in the event the operator would like to develop a small pro shop. He added the initial plan was for a very small, temporary building (shown as 18' x 20' on the Plan) to sell tickets, house the staff and equipment. Therefore, Mr. Norman asked that the applicant be permitted to construct a building of up to 1,000 square feet without returning to the TMAPC for Detail Site Plan approval. Should a larger building(s) be proposed in the future (beyond the 1,000 square feet), then it would be resubmitted to the Commission for review as a Detail Site Plan.

In regard to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) presentation, Mr. Norman remarked the TAC was making some rather strong requirements for dedication of right-of-way on 101st Street in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, which would have been required at the time of platting. He commented the applicant was willing to do this as a part of their companion request to waive the plat requirement at this time.

Mr. Norman advised that the Water and Sewer Department had requested the applicant extend a 12" water line on Memorial as a part of the plat waiver request. He stated there was an existing 12" water line along 101st Street which would provide service for their limited use. Therefore, the applicant was requesting a waiver of the water line extension before the Utility Board. Mr. Norman commented that, if granted, he wanted to assure the TMAPC was aware of this and would have no objection.

In regard to condition #8 of the Staff recommendation, Mr. Norman requested the TMAPC grant a waiver of the requirement that restrictive covenants be filed of record on this temporary use. He pointed out Staff's notation stating support of the waiver considering the uses requested were temporary.

In reply to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Norman clarified the applicant had no objection to the TAC's recommendations, except for item (f) regarding the water main extension, which was currently under review by the Utility Board.

Mr. Doherty discussed with Staff the applicant's request for a 1,000 square foot temporary building, as indicated on the concept plan (18' x 20' approximate), which would be permitted without additional approval by the TMAPC, so as to not withhold the Building Permit.

Ms. Wilson inquired if the three year time limit was proposed by the Staff or by the applicant. Mr. Norman stated the applicant had asked for five years and Staff had recommended three years, with an option for two additional years by TMAPC approval of a minor amendment with notice to abutting property owners. Mr. Norman stated the applicant had no objection to coming back in three years should the golf facilities still be in operation, and present a minor amendment for the two additional years. Mr. Gardner added that if this area remained undeveloped then the applicant should not have a problem in three years. However, if there were permanent buildings constructed abutting this tract, then the Commission might want to review this, and allow any interested parties an opportunity to comment on any proposed extension of the temporary use.

Comments & Discussion:

In regard to the TAC conditions of approval, Mr. Wilmoth suggested amending condition (f) to read, "extension of utilities, if needed for this project, including water line requests as agreed upon with the Water and Sewer Department". Mr. Wilmoth advised that item (h) would be affected by the PUD, and should the PUD not require the restrictive covenants to be filed, then the TAC conditions would not require it.

Mr. Doherty moved for approval with the additional amendments of striking condition #8 of PUD 411-A/Z-5842-SP-3, and amending item (f) of the TAC conditions as suggested by Mr. Wilmoth. In response to Mr. Norman, Mr. Doherty confirmed that his motion be amended by adding condition #9 to reflect the TMAPC had no objection to allowing the 1,000 square foot temporary building without requiring further TMAPC approval of a Site Plan, in addition to the 5,000 square feet shown in the Development Standards.

Mr. Norman requested early transmittal of the TMAPC minutes, as there were no protestants in attendance at this hearing.

**TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for Mesingale Worldwide, Inc. (PUD-411), and the Major Amendment and Detail/Corridor Site Plan for PUD 411-A & Z-5842-SP-3**, as recommended by the TAC and Staff, with the following modifications, as well as Early Transmittal of these minutes:

- a) Amend item (f) of the TAC recommendation to read: Extension of utilities if needed for this project, including water line requests as agreed upon with the Water and Sewer Department.
- b) Waive condition #8 of the Staff recommendation relating to the filing of restrictive covenants, as the requested uses were of a temporary nature.
- c) Add a condition #9 to allow the construction of a building up to 1,000 square feet without TMAPC review and approval of Detail Site Plan in addition to the 5,000 square feet of future floor area. Future floor area would be subject to TMAPC requirements for a Detail Site Plan.

**Legal Description:**

A tract of land containing 14.0479 acres, being a part of the SW/4 of Section 24, T-18-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and being described as follows, to-wit: Commencing at the southwesterly corner of said Section 24; thence N 89°37'01" E along the southerly line a distance of 515.80' to the POB; thence due north a distance of 24.75' to a point on the northerly R/W line of East 101st Street South; thence N 84°38'13" W along said northerly R/W a distance of 402.02'; thence N 49°13'17" W a distance of 86.54' to a point on the easterly R/W line of South Memorial Drive; thence due north along said R/W parallel to and 50.0' easterly of, as measured perpendicularly to the westerly line a distance of 478.05'; thence N 89°37'01" E and parallel to the southerly line a distance of 1,060.02'; thence due south and parallel to the westerly line a distance of 600.01' to a point on the southerly line; thence S 89°37'01" W along said southerly line a distance of 594.22' to the POB.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-16972 Walton (1993)

1439 East 34th Street

(RS-3)

This is a request to split a 100' x 140' tract into two 50' x 140' lots. A check with the land use maps reveals that there are several 50' x 140' lots on the same block, and many other 50' lots in the immediate area (56 to be exact). This action would require a variance of the lot width requirement from 60' to 50' from the City Board of Adjustment as per the current bulk and area requirements in the RS-3 zoning district.

Staff recommended approval be subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Approval of City Board of Adjustment Case #14702 which is to be heard 1/21/88.
- 2) Approval of Department of Stormwater Management is required. Watershed Development Permit required based on increase in impervious area covered by new buildings.
- 3) Any utility easements required to service the subject tracts. Provide standard 11' total utility easement at the rear, except where house is closer on the east lot.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the L-16972 subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and TAC. The applicant was present.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Lot Split Waiver for L-16972 Walton**, as recommended by Staff.

\* \* \* \* \*

L-16966 Stan White (1893)

South Victor Avenue at East 27th Street

(RS-1)

This is a request to create three tracts from Lot 1 and part of Lots 2 and 15, Block 11, Forest Hills Addition. There have been numerous splits in this block (occurring prior to adoption of City regulations), and the smallest created is an 80' wide lot with 12,750 square feet of area. The two smaller lots being created in this split will be 90' and 95' and taper to 64.98' at the back containing approximately 10,321 square feet and 9,360 square feet. The zoning is RS-1 which requires 13,500 square feet of area and an average lot width of 100'. The lots being created will not meet either of these requirements. The applicant has added additional land to his previous request, but because of the existing structures, this configuration is the best that can be achieved.

The TAC had no objections to the request, subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval from the Board of Adjustment for case #14690 to allow a variance of the bulk and area requirements in the RS-1 District in order to permit the lot split.
2. Approval of Department of Stormwater Management required. Watershed Development Permit required based on increase in impervious area covered by new buildings.
3. Utility easement that may be necessary in order to permit development, including easements to cover existing lines. (See Water & Sewer Department regarding easement for existing sewer.) Check ONG service lines to pool house to make sure that no service lines will cross the newly created lots.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of L-16966 subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and TAC.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Wilmoth reviewed other lot splits in the area, and confirmed for Mr. VanFossen that these lot splits still met RS-1 standards, as did all of the other lots depicted on the map, with the exception of one 80' width lot.

Ms. Suzette Birch (2687 South Utica) spoke in protest to this application and advised that she was representing other residents in the neighborhood who also requested denial of this lot split. Ms. Birch commented the lot split request, if granted, would be detrimental to the character of the neighborhood, and she felt this application should meet the RS-1 standards as did the other lots in this area, in order to preserve the quality and value of the neighborhood. Therefore, Ms. Birch requested denial of the application.

Mr. Rick Dotson, representing the applicant (Mr. & Mrs. White), advised that he would be the prime recipient of the lot split. Mr. Dotson stated the one recourse available to meet 12,750 square feet would be demolition of an existing pool house. However, they would like to save the pool house if possible. Mr. Dotson, as a former resident in this area, commented he was very familiar with the character of the neighborhood, and it was not his intent to do anything that might lessen the quality or value. He submitted photos of a house he constructed south of the subject tract. Mr. Dotson pointed out that the two new houses would look no different from others along Victor and Utica.

Mr. Dotson advised that they have notified the two abutting property owners of their intentions, and had received no objection from one property owner, but they were awaiting a reply from the other. He suggested the TMAPC approval be subject to obtaining written approval from the remaining abutting property owner.

In reply to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Dotson advised the pool house that they were wanting to preserve was approximately 30' x 25'. Mr. Doherty commented that, although there appeared to be similar frontage, he had a problem going that much under RS-1 standards. Mr. Carnes concurred, as he did not see the need for "chopping" up these lots as proposed.

Mr. Paddock stated concern with the square footage, and inquired how much square footage would be obtained should the pool house be demolished. Mr. Dotson commented that should the applicant be able to get 12,750 square feet for each lot, he guessed the Commission might feel easier with approving this request. He added they have taken the quality of the area and appearance from the street into consideration, which was why the applicant was attempting the 90' and 95' widths. Mr. Dotson reiterated that they could get the 12,750 square feet with the demolition of the pool house, but this was a last resort consideration.

Mr. VanFossen stated he would be opposed to anything less than RS-1 standards; therefore, he moved for denial of the request. He remarked that, since the Commission reviews these on a case-by-case basis, he had some concern about setting a precedent in this particular instance. Ms. Wilson commented that, should the applicant demolish the pool house and acquire more land in order to come closer to meeting the RS-1 standards, then she felt this would be a better solution, considering the area. She commented on Mr. Dotson's reputation as a builder of some of Tulsa's better homes. Mr. VanFossen commented on the RE zoning now available, and encouraged the areas of this nature to consider reapplying for RE zoning.

**TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present**

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the TMAPC voted **6-1-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris Paddock, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; Wilson, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **DENY L-16966 White, Lot Split Waiver.**

**LOT SPLITS FOR DISCUSSION:**

**L-16856 Jones/Atherton (1914) NE/c of East 92nd St. N. & N. 97th E. Ave. (RS)**

In the opinion of the Staff, the lot split(s) listed above meets the Subdivision and Zoning Regulations, but all residential lot split applications which contain a lot having more than three side lot lines cannot be processed as a prior approval lot split. Such lot splits shall require a five day written notice to the abutting owner(s). Deeds for such lot splits shall not be stamped or released until the TMAPC has approved said lot split in a public hearing. **APPROVAL** is recommended on this application.

L-16856 Jones/Atherton - Cont'd

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Crawford, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **APPROVE L-16856 Jones/Atherton**, as recommended by Staff.

**LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:**

L-16819-A ( 182)	M & W Partnership	L-16987 (1793)	Park 21/Schuller
L-16982 (3194)	Arnold/Cannon	L-16988 ( 182)	M & W Partnership
L-16983 ( 693)	State Supply/Kouri	L-16990 (3292)	Unit Rig/Savage
L-16984 ( 783)	ORU/Morehead	L-16991 ( 383)	Warren/Johnsen
L-16985 ( 693)	Fed Nat'l/Guaranty		

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Crawford, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Above Listed Lot Splits for Ratification of Prior Approval, as recommended by Staff.

**ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:**

Mr. Gardner advised that the zoning/PUD applications listed below needed to be continued to February 17, 1988, pending a decision by the City Engineer as relates to the location of the extension of the Riverside Parkway:

**Z-6180 Jones** SE/c of the proposed Riverside Pkwy & East 91st St. (OL to CS)

**Z-6178 & PUD 306-B Jones (Grupe Development)** NE/c & SE/c of East 95th Street and South Delaware (RS-3 to CS)

**Z-6185 Norman (Elson Oil Co.)** NW/c of South Delaware & East 95th Street (Jenks Bridge) AG to CS

**TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Crawford, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of the Above Listed Zoning/PUD Applications** until Wednesday, **February 17, 1988** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

OTHER BUSINESS:

**PUD 416-1:** 4011 South Yorktown, Lot 2, Block 2, Yorktown Estates

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment for Building Height

The subject tract has underlying zoning of RS-1 per PUD 411 and has been approved for large lot development of single-family detached residences. The applicant is requesting approval of a minor amendment to allow a building height of approximately 38.5' per the submitted plans and elevations.

These portions of the structure exceeding the 35' limitation are basically confined to the interior of the lot and would have a minimal impact on adjacent structures; further, the TMAPC is permitted to establish building heights in accordance with the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD 416-1 per the submitted plans.

Comments & Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked for a review of the submitted plan after confirming the structure had not yet been built. Mr. VanFossen stated this request was in compliance with several others in the area; therefore, he moved for approval.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Harris, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Crawford, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment to PUD 416-1**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the First Vice-Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.

Date Approved 2-3-88  
[Signature]  
Chairman

ATTEST: [Signature]  
Secretary

