

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1689
Wednesday, **March 16, 1988**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes	Crawford	Frank	Linker, Legal
Coutant, Secretary	Draughon	Gardner	Counsel
Doherty	Harris	Matthews	Connelly, City
Kempe, Chairman		Setters	Development
Paddock, 2nd Vice-Chairman		Wilmoth	
Parmeale, 1st Vice-Chairman			
Wilson			
Woodard			
Selph, County Designee			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, March 15, 1988 at 10:15 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of Minutes of March 2, 1988, Meeting #1687:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of March 2, 1988, Meeting #1687.

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts & Deposits for the Month Ended February 29, 1988:

Mr. Paddock asked how the current figures compared with the same period a year ago. Mr. Gardner advised that the averages for the past couple years have been in the \$7,000/month range; however, \$10,000 - \$12,000/month was the normal business range. In reply to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Gardner explained that BOA fees and revenue was shown on this report since the INCOG Staff services both the TMAPC and the City and County Boards of Adjustment. He added that this report was to advise of the amounts of money received by INCOG and that zoning and BOA fees were transmitted to the City or County accordingly.

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Coutant, "abstaining"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Report of Receipts & Deposits for the Month Ended February 29, 1988.

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Kempe requested former TMAPC Commissioner Gary VanFossen to come forward in order to receive a Resolution of Appreciation for his service to the TMAPC, as approved by the TMAPC on March 9, 1988:

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (TMAPC) wishes to acknowledge members who have made significant contributions toward the orderly growth and development of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, **Mr. Gary VanFossen** has served on the TMAPC from October 2, 1984 until January 18, 1988, a total of three years and three months; and

WHEREAS, he served as Secretary to the Commission in 1987, and Chairman of the Comprehensive Plan Committee during 1985, 1986 and 1987; and

WHEREAS, he has given freely of his time, experience and abilities toward the development of a better environment for present and future citizens; and

WHEREAS, such service has been given at considerable personal sacrifice.

THEREFORE, the members of the Commission wish to express our deepest appreciation for the concern and service which was given by our former member, Gary VanFossen.

Committee Reports:

Mr. Carnes, Chairman of the **Comprehensive Plan Committee**, advised the Committee had met this date to review Capital Improvements Program (CIP) projects for FY 88-89, and had voted to recommend approval as being in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, he moved for approval by the TMAPC.

In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Pat Connelly of the Department of City Development, reviewed the standards and/or criteria for Secondary Arterial Alternates providing for five lane widening to accommodate left turn lanes, as established by the City Traffic Engineers. Ms. Dane Matthews of the INCOG Staff confirmed that Secondary Arterials, as shown on the Major Street and Highway Plan Map, were constructed at the discretion of the City Traffic Engineers as far as determining the appropriateness of four or five laning. She added that the INCOG Staff concerns would be passed on to the Traffic Engineering Department.

REPORTS: Committee - Cont'd

Mr. Paddock also stated concern as to the inclusion of Stormwater Management projects where the Master Drainage Plans (MDP) had not yet been submitted for adoption. Mr. Carnes commented this concern had also been raised in the Committee meeting and, accordingly, he revised his motion to make the Department of Stormwater Management (DSM) projects subject to adoption of the applicable MDP's, which was also included in the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan Committee.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-1** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Selph, "abstaining"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the FY 88-89 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) projects as being in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, **EXCEPT** for the Department of Stormwater Management projects which shall be subject to adoption of the applicable Master Drainage Plans as a condition of approval.

* * * * *

Mr. Paddock advised the **Rules & Regulations Committee** would be meeting on Wednesday, March 23rd, to consider amendments to the Subdivision Regulations pertaining to requirements for development of septic tank systems.

* * * * *

Mr. Parmele advised the **Budget & Work Program Committee** had scheduled a meeting on Tuesday, March 22nd, with Mr. Jerry Lasker at the INCOG offices to review the FY 88-89 budget and work program.

Director's Report:

Request to call for a **Public Hearing April 13, 1988** to consider approval of an amendment to the Comprehensive Master Plan, being the District Plan Map and Text for **District 8**, pertaining to changes resulting from the Arkansas River Corridor Task Force report; and for **District 11** to change the district boundaries.

Ms. Matthews reviewed the proposed amendments; and confirmed for Mr. Parmele that District 8 was in agreement with the proposals.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** a Public Hearing for April 13, 1988 to consider amendments to the District 8 and District 11 Plans, as outlined above and as recommended by Staff.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL:

Owasso Assembly of God (2114) South of the SE/c of East 96th North and
North 129th East Avenue (AG)

Southbrook V (784) S & W of the SW/c of East 71st Street & Garnett Rd. (CO)

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of the Preliminary Plats** for Owasso Assembly of God and Southbrook V until Wednesday, **April 20, 1988** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

Amberjack (Z-6010-SP-3)(2994) NW/c of East 51st & S. 129th E. Ave. (CO, CS)

On 10/11/84 the TAC reviewed a plan titled "Corporate Center" and that plan was incorporated into the Corridor District (CO) approval of zoning. Subsequently State Farm Insurance is purchasing the entire tract, including the platted corner ("Motel Site") for development of a regional office complex. In the previous review TAC and Staff was concerned about stub streets to the west and north. The street being provided in the present application more nearly aligns with proposals made a number of years ago for an east-west collector system. Also at that time Cities Service had not platted their development to the north and a stub street was recommended if Cities did not plat to the north line of this development. Cities did plat and according to the previous TAC review, a stub street is no longer required to the north.

An amendment to the original site plan review is in process and is scheduled 3/16/88 along with this plat.

The Staff presented the plat to the TAC with the applicant represented by Jack Cox, Bill Montgomery, Brown and Gould.

There were numerous graphics to be changed or shown on the plat. However, in the interest of "fast-tracking" this project, there was no objection to preliminary approval, subject to a full TAC review of the draft final plat prior to release.

Traffic Engineering had numerous items of discussion and/or requirements, which are briefly itemized herein, and being made a part of the conditions of approval. Comments were:

- a) Medians recommended on 48th Street as 14' with 4' minimum islands, and 12' from curb to right-of-way.
- b) Provide 10' minimum clearance from face of curb to the silos.
- c) No left turns south of the most southerly drainage ditch on 129th East Avenue; right turns only on 51st Street.
- d) Show 30' property line radius at 48th Street and 129th East Avenue intersection; 24' median is OK.

The Fire Department advised that access should be provided to the building site during construction. There were other details of drainage, etc. discussed, but the applicant would be having a subsurface coordinating meeting in which all the necessary requirements would be outlined in detail.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plat of Amberjack, subject to the following conditions:

1. Although the southeast corner of Lot 2, Block 1 is now platted as "Motel Site" it should be set aside as a separate lot even if the plat is vacated. It is zoned CS and does not have any Corridor Zone restrictions and should be separated from the rest of the tracts. The vacating process shall comply with present legal requirements, through the City and the District Court if necessary.
2. If the applicant desires, the "Motel Site" tract can be left out of this plat since it is already platted. If it is left in, condition #1 above applies. Also, an additional 8' of right-of-way is required parallel to 129th East Avenue for a right-turn lane in accord with the Major Street Plan.
3. All conditions of Corridor District Site Plan #Z-6010-SP-3 shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat. Include approval dates and references to Section 800-850 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
4. Format of plat: (Show the following on the face of plat)
 - a) All easements and the storm water detention area should be outlined by dashed, not solid lines.
 - b) Extend plat boundaries to the centerline of South 129th East Avenue except where previously dedicated either by plat or separate instrument.
 - c) Identify the entry boulevard as "East 48th Street South".
 - d) Show building lines in accordance with the CO District provisions:
 - Lot 1, Block 1: 60' on the north; 50' on the east; and 100' on the south and west
 - Lot 2, Block 1: 50' on the north; 150' on the east (129th)
 - Lot 3, Block 1: The Motel Site tract; 50' on east and south
 - Lot 1, Block 2: 50' on all perimeters except where easements are greater

- e) Show a location map; Show total acres and number of lots
 - f) Include under title that this is a resub of Motel Site and a subdivision of the SE/4 of Section 29-19-14
 - g) Identify adjacent land as "unplatted" or by name of plat of record
5. Show all dimensions, bearings, curve data, etc. on perimeter of plat and where required in the interior.
 6. Limits of Access or (LNA) shall be shown on the plat as approved by Traffic Engineering. Show LNA along Broken Arrow Expressway and other locations as recommended.
 7. Show name and address and phone of owner/developer. Show same for engineer/surveyor.
 8. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property lines and/or lot lines. (Easements parallel to the drainageways may be required.)
 9. Water plans shall be approved by the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
 10. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s). See #20(b).
 11. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
 12. 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.
 13. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the City Engineer.
 14. A topo map shall be submitted for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (Subdivision Regulations). Submit with drainage plans as directed.
 15. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
 16. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineer 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.)
 17. 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.

18. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
19. A Corporation Commission letter (or Certificate of Nondevelopment) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged.
20. Covenants:
 - a) Add dates and information supplied by staff in paragraph #4, page 1.
 - b) Omit Section II (D), renumber paragraph E to D. Add a separate number as follows: "3. LANDSCAPING AND PAVEMENT REPAIR: 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."
 - c) Add information from Staff review for Section I (site plan review standards). (This would include the basic square footages allowed on each block, along with the heights, etc. set forth in Staff review.)
21. 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.
22. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

NOTE: Mr. Wilmoth advised the following was presented in conjunction with the Preliminary Plat for Amberjack, as they both dealt with applications for the State Farm Headquarters Office.

Z-6010-SP-3: West of the NW/c corner of East 51st & South 129th East Avenue

Staff Recommendation: Detail/Corridor Site Plan

The total area of Z-6010, which has C0 zoning, is approximately 128 acres and is located west of the northwest corner of East 51st Street and South 129th East Avenue. The first phase of development is a parcel of 46.1 acres located along the west and south boundary on which the regional corporate headquarters for State Farm Insurance is to be built. The purpose of Z-6010-SP-3 is to realign development area boundaries within the tract and establish tentative allocations of floor areas, open space, and similar design considerations based on first phase construction. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for Z-6010 has been established at .75 FAR with a total of 4,220,964 square feet permitted. Initial approval also established that: initial allocations to Development Areas A-K could be changed by the Detail Site Plan process (which does not require City Commission approval); plans include elevations of proposed buildings; and that commercial floor area (non-hotel/non-office) allocations may not be transferred to another development area plus be limited to areas south of the east/west collector street which accesses South 129th East Avenue.

The applicant for this Detail Site Plan is processing a Preliminary Plat at this time for which notice has been given to all property owners within 300' and requests that the TMAPC not require any additional notice for this amendment. Staff is supportive of this request and considers this a way in which the development can be fast-tracked through the approval processes and into construction. The site of first phase construction is included within an original development area that was intended for corporate offices (Area G).

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of Z-6010-SP-3 Minor Amendment and Detail/Corridor Site Plan for Phase I construction as follows:

- 1) That the applicant's Detail/Corridor Site Plan, Text, and Elevations be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- 2) **Development Standards:**
Land Area (Total/Z-6010): 127.6808 acres

SUMMARY OF CORPORATE OFFICES

(Formerly Development Areas A, B, C, G & H)

Land Area (Net):	61.4 acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within an OMH Office District (excluding Use Unit 8 Multifamily Dwellings) and as permitted within an IR Industrial Research District.
Floor Area Allocation:	2,751,468 sf
Maximum Coverage of Buildings:	30% of Net Area
Maximum Building Height:	2 stories if within 150' of north or east development boundaries
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	As required by the applicable Use Units
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from interior collector (C/L)	100'
from S. 129th E. Avenue (C/L)	100' *
from Broken Arrow Expwy (R/W)	100'
from other development boundaries	50'
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space:	20% of Net Area **

* Add one foot of setback for each one foot of building height exceeding 35 feet.

** Internal required landscaped open space shall include perimeter landscape area within the development area boundaries, parking islands and plazas, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.

Sign Standards: Signs accessory to the office uses are permitted and shall comply with the following additional restrictions:

- a) Ground Signs: For each building ground signs shall be limited to two monument signs identifying the office building and not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a total display surface area of 120 square feet.
- b) Wall or Canopy Signs: Shall be permitted for each principal building not to exceed a display surface area of 0.5 square feet per 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.

SUMMARY OF COMMERCIAL/OFFICE

(Formerly Development Areas F, I, J)

Land Area (Net):	24.7 acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within an OMH District and the uses included within Use Unit 12, Entertainment Establishments; Use Unit 13, Convenience Goods and Services; and Use Unit 14, Shopping Goods and Services; but excluding Use Unit 8, Multifamily Dwellings. *
Floor Area Allocation:	1,106,859 sf *
Maximum Coverage of Buildings:	30% of Net Area
Maximum Building Height:	NA
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	As required by the applicable Use Units
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from S. 129th E. Avenue (C/L)	200' **
from Broken Arrow Expwy (R/W)	100'
from Interior collector (C/L)	100'
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space:	20% of Net Area ***

* Within each commercial/office development area, non-office use shall not exceed 20% of the total floor area allocation and not more than 10% of the floor area allocation shall be free standing non-office use.

** Add one foot of setback for each one foot of building height exceeding 35 feet.

*** Internal required landscaped open space shall include perimeter landscape area within the development area boundaries, parking islands and plazas, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.

Sign Standards: Signs accessory to the principal uses are permitted and shall comply with the following additional restrictions:

- a) Ground Signs: For each building ground signs shall be limited to two monument signs identifying the building and not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a total display surface area of 120 square feet.
- b) 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.

SUMMARY OF COMMERCIAL

(Formerly Development Area D)

Land Area (Net):	6.3 acres
Permitted Uses:	As permitted within a CS District, but excluding Use Unit 8, Multifamily Dwellings
Floor Area Allocation:	96,050 sf
Maximum Coverage of Buildings:	30% of Net Area
Maximum Building Height:	2 stories
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from S. 129th E. Avenue (C/L)	200'
from Interior collector (C/L)	50'
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	As required by the applicable Use Units
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space:	15% of the Net Area *

* Internal required landscaped open space shall include perimeter landscape area within the development area boundaries, parking islands and plazas, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.

Sign Standards: Signs accessory to the commercial uses shall comply with the following restrictions:

- a) Ground Signs:

S. 129th E. Avenue frontage	One
Maximum Display Surface Area	120 sf
Maximum Height above Grade of Abutting Street	20'
- b) Wall or Canopy Signs: Wall or canopy signs shall not exceed a display surface area of 1.5 square feet per each lineal foot of building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed. Wall or canopy signs shall not exceed the height of the building.

SUMMARY OF HOTEL/COMMERCIAL
(Formerly Development Area E)

Land Area (Net):	10.2 acres
Permitted Uses:	Hotel and the uses permitted within a CS District, but excluding Use Unit 8, Multifamily Dwellings.
Floor Area Allocation:	266,587 sf
Maximum Coverage of Buildings:	30% of Net Area
Maximum Building Height:	NA
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from S. 129th E. Avenue (C/L)	200' *
from interior collector (C/L)	50'
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	As required by the applicable Use Units
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space:	15% of the Net Area **

* Add one foot of setback for each one foot of building height exceeding 35 feet.

** Internal required landscaped open space shall include perimeter landscape area within the development area boundaries, parking islands and plazas, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.

Sign Standards: Signs accessory to uses within the hotel/commercial development area shall comply with the following restrictions:

- a) Ground Signs:
- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------|
| S. 129th E. Avenue frontage | One |
| Maximum display surface area | 120 sf |
| Maximum Height above Grade of Abutting Street | 20' |
- b) Shopping Area Wall or Canopy Signs: Aggregate display surface area limited to 1.5 square feet 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.

SUMMARY OF COMMON OPEN SPACE
(Formerly Development Area K)

Land Area (Net): 12.7 acres
Permitted Uses: Open space, landscaping, detention and other drainage facilities

It is intended that the drainageway traversing the project shall be improved to not only meet City of Tulsa drainage criteria, but also to achieve a project amenity through the planned sculpting of the drainageway, provision of a wet detention area, and selective landscaping and lighting. The improved area will be conveyed to a property owners' association for maintenance. In the alternative, the amenities provided by the drainageway may be included as a feature of the various development areas within Z-6010-SP-3 and all future phases of development.

PHASE I DEVELOPMENT: CORPORATE OFFICE

Land Area (Net): 46,097 acres
Permitted Uses: As permitted by right within an OMH District (excluding Use Unit 8 Multifamily Dwellings) and as permitted within an IR, Industrial Research District.
Maximum Building Height: 60'
Maximum Building Floor Area: 600,000 sf *
Maximum Building Coverage:
First floor maximum 30% of Net Area Maximum
Phase I total/construction 300,000 sf proposed **
Minimum Off-Street Parking: As required by applicable Use Units **
Minimum Building Setbacks:
from C/L of boulevard on north 100'
from west boundary 100'
from south boundary (R/W) 100'
from east boundary 50'
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space: 20% of Net Area ***

- * 2,151,468 sf of corporate office floor area remaining to be allocated.
- ** A parking ratio of one space per each 300 sf of gross floor area is required for general office uses. 600,000 sf of general office space requires a minimum total of 2,000 parking spaces.
- *** Internal required landscaped open space shall include perimeter landscape area within the development area boundaries, parking islands and plazas, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.

Sign Standards: Signs accessory to the office uses are permitted and shall comply with the following additional restrictions:

- a) Ground Signs: For each building ground signs shall be limited to two monument signs identifying the office building and not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a total display surface area of 120 square feet.
- b) Wall or Canopy Signs: Wall or canopy signs shall be permitted for each principal building not to exceed a display surface area of 0.5 square feet per 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.

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

In addition to the accessory signage permitted within the various development areas, and the entry signage above provided for, a sign identifying the development may be located along the expressway frontage, not exceeding 40 feet in height and a display surface area of 240 square feet.

- 4) **Floor Area Allocation:** The maximum aggregate floor area within the project shall not exceed a floor area ratio of .75 (4,220,964 sf). An allocation of floor area has been made by major use categories per Z-6010-SP-3. It is intended that this initial allocation may be changed upon Detailed Site Plan approval by the TMAPC not to exceed the aggregate maximum above set forth, provided however, that the commercial floor area (non-hotel/non-office) allocations may not be transferred to another development area and shall be limited to Development Areas south of the collector street entrance at South 129th East Avenue (formerly Areas D, E, F, I and J).
- 5) That a Detail Site Plan for each Development Area be approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, including elevations of all exterior walls showing the architectural treatment to be used.
- 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.
- 7) 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.

- 8) That all parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas.
- 9) 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.
- 10) Subject to TMAPC review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
- 11) General conceptual and land use relationships established by the initial approval of Z-6010-SP shall continue to serve as guidance for delineation of future developments beyond Phase I.

Comments & Discussion:

The applicant, represented by Jack Cox and Bill Montgomery, responded they were in agreement with the listed conditions of the TAC for the Preliminary Plat, as well as Staff's recommended conditions for the Detail/Corridor Site Plan.

Mr. Frank commented that Staff found this presentation a much more forward thinking arrangement of the street system, as other properties would also be served by this collector system. Mr. Parmele complimented Staff for their assistance and cooperation to the applicant in "fast-tracking" this through the system.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Preliminary Plat for Amberjack, and the companion Detail/Corridor Site Plan for Z-6010-SP-3**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

REQUEST FOR WAIVER (Section 260):

CZ-161 (Unplatted)(3214) North of E. 69th St. N. & Mingo Valley Expwy (IL)

This is a request to waive plat on a tract of approximately 2.5 acres at the above location. The applicant is expanding the existing use to the south which was in place prior to zoning (Z-4737, 1/24/75). This area is part of a special study approved by TMAPC on 12/4/74 to allow industrial uses along the expressway in this location. Other zoning and Board of Adjustment cases have been processed since the special study. Only one plat was ever processed in this area, at the northeast corner of East 66th Street North and the Expressway. That plat was never completed and expired. Owners of the property to the south of this application are also

CZ-161 (Unplatted) - Cont'd

the applicant in this request. Board of Adjustment approval was granted on a setback variance 9/25/81 and a building permit issued. (Property was "subject to platting" at that time; Case #115.) No plat waiver application has ever been processed on this property even though permits have been issued.

Since this tract only involves about 2.5 acres, the rights-of-way area already dedicated, the applicant may be able to meet the provisions of Section 260 if the following conditions are met:

- a) Grading and drainage approval by the County Engineer through the permit process. (Check minimum floor elevation if required in the permit process.)
 - b) Health Department approval of septic system if required.*
 - c) Grant utility easements if required by utilities. (Provide 17.5' utility easement along service road if not already filed of record.)
- (The applicant should be made aware of screen fencing requirements through the building permit process.)

* No water or sewage proposed for the additional warehouse buildings so no septic system will be needed. Existing building has sanitary facilities.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the **waiver of plat** subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and TAC.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Paddock inquired as to the number of permits issued by the County without either a plat or plat waiver approval. Mr. Wilmoth stated he did not have a total number, but guessed this has occurred three or four times in various parts of the County. He added that the County was now catching more of these tracts that were subject to platting, but recommended the County Building Inspector use the record search process as established for the City. In reply to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Wilmoth advised that the inspection of the screening in an IL zoned area was a function of the Building Inspector and that the screening fence usually had to be in place before the Occupancy Permit was granted.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughton, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for CZ-161 (Unplatted)**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. David Tracy, representing Stokely Outdoor Advertising, stated the applicant was attempting to preserve the status quo at this location that has been in existence for approximately four years. He commented the sign complied with the City Code as it existed in April of 1984, and the rezoning application was to satisfy the requirements of the Oklahoma Department of Transportation in regard to the Outdoor Advertising Highway Control Act of 1972. In response to Mr. Parmele, Mr. Tracy reiterated that the sign was in compliance with the Zoning Code regulations of 1984, and they were here today to meet State requirements.

NOTE: Staff advised that they had been given information from the Inspections Department that this sign gained a permit through a different address than where the sign was actually constructed. Discussion followed, with the applicant stating they had not been approached in regard to legality of their city permit.

Mr. Tracy pointed out that their rezoning to IL would not block any planned construction access. He further added that there were currently several signs in the city located within railroad right-of-way where there was also Department of Transportation right-of-way on either side. Mr. Bill Stokely (10111 East 45th Place) submitted and reviewed photographs indicating such locations. He added that this was the first he has heard about the sign being illegal, as the sign had been in place for four years. In reply to Ms. Kempe, Mr. Stokely confirmed the signs in the pictures were zoned either commercial or industrial, with the exception on a billboard adjacent to the railroad and the Broken Arrow Expressway (behind Tulsa Screw Products) which was possibly zoned residential.

Mr. Paddock asked if the State has singled out the subject billboard to raise questions, but has not questioned the applicant's other billboards. Mr. Stokely stated he felt this to be correct, and contended that the State's concern was not with the right-of-way, but with proper zoning.

Mr. Tracy stressed that the photos were presented only to indicate that there were currently several other signs in various part of Tulsa involving highway right-of-way, and this case would not be setting a precedent.

Additional Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Parmele commented that the Commission should confine themselves to the issue of appropriateness of the IL zoning, and not the sign. He pointed out that, had the City acquired the railroad right-of-way, it would obviously also be expressway right-of-way; however, this was not the case. Mr. Parmele further stated that the surrounding zoning was IL and it was improbable and impractical that anyone would present a plat for this 50' strip of land. Additionally, strictly from a land use standpoint, he did not feel the IL zoning was inappropriate. Therefore, Mr. Parmele moved for approval of IL zoning.

Z-6182 Tracy (Stokely) - Cont'd

Commissioner Selph agreed with Mr. Parmele that the questions about the sign were irrelevant, and the IL zoning was totally appropriate at this location. Mr. Doherty also agreed that the sign was not an issue; however, he did feel the issue was whether the industrial use on expressway right-of-way was appropriate, and agreeing with Staff, he could not support the requested IL zoning.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **4-5-0** (Carnes, Parmele, Selph, Woodard, "aye"; Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6182 Tracy for IL zoning**, as requested by the applicant.

That motion failing, Mr. Doherty moved for denial of the request. Mr. Paddock commented that he would have preferred the opportunity to sort out the facts in this case; however, as the location of the sign was the State's concern and not an issue with the Commission, he felt they could proceed with voting.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **5-4-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, "aye"; Carnes, Parmele, Selph, Woodard, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **DENY Z-6182 Tracy for IL zoning**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

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

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Parmele, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of the Above Listed Zoning/PUD Applications** until Wednesday, **April 20, 1988** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 142-5: 3809 East 66th Street South

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment & L-17009 to Modify Lot Line

PUD 142 is a residential development located on the north and south sides of East 66th Street South at South New Haven Avenue. The PUD contains 129 lots and considerable open space. The applicant is requesting to modify a rear lot line, by decreasing abutting open space 204 square feet (4' x 51'), and attaching it to the subject tract to accommodate an existing 3.7' addition encroachment. The TMAPC approved a similar modification, PUD 142-A, on January 25, 1984 for a 3.4' encroachment. Notice of the application has been given to abutting property owners. For the record, the applicant has provided a consent letter from the homeowners association evidencing written support by more than 65% of the present property owners.

The subject tract is located at 3809 East 66th Street South and is described as Lot 5, Block 7 of the Point South Addition. Review of the applicant's plan also indicates encroachment into a 20' utility easement. Staff can support the requested amendment based on the open space reduction being a minor percent of the overall per the following conditions:

1. The applicant obtain for the file a release from the homeowners association for title to the open space and receive approval from the TMAPC for the necessary Lot Split and filing of a tie-contract.
2. The applicant properly vacate the easement encroached upon or enter into agreements with the utility companies which would allow the encroachment to remain.
3. Per applicant's submitted plans.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Chairman Kempe, the applicant stated agreement to the listed conditions of Staff's recommendation.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment to PUD 142-5 and L-17009 to Modify the Lot Line**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 325-1: 5335 South Harvard

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan

The subject tract is located at 5335 South Harvard and is the site of the Elks Lodge 946. PUD 325 has underlying zoning of RM-2 and has been approved for clubhouses and multifamily uses, plus private lodge facilities. Sign standards for the lodge permit one identification sign on Harvard not to exceed 32 square feet of display surface area and a maximum of 15 feet tall.

The applicant is requesting approval of a sign with a display surface area of 40 square feet that is 15 feet tall which would be located north of the Harvard entrance to the lodge. The location of the sign (less than 150 feet from a residential area) would require approval of a variance from the Board of Adjustment (BOA).

Considering the character of development within this general area and retail uses with similar signs in place across Harvard, Staff considers the request for increased display surface area minor recognizing the proposed location would require a variance from the BOA.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD 325-1 subject to the submitted plans and subject to **APPROVAL** of a variance as to sign location from the BOA unless the location is revised to meet the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan for PUD 325-1, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 385-4: NW/c of East 71st Street and South Utica Avenue

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan

PUD 385 is approximately 1.7 acres in size and is located on the northwest corner of East 71st Street and South Utica Avenue with underlying zoning of CS and OL. It is abutted to the north by a developing office park, to the west by the Joe Creek Channel, to the south, across East 71st Street, by an apartment complex and to the east across Utica by an office park. The applicant is requesting approval of a Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan to change the center identification sign to include tenant information and to increase the height of the sign from 11'-0" to 15'-3". The TMAPC approved minor amendments (PUD 385-2 & PUD 385-3) for increased signage and established overall sign design criteria for PUD 385.

As noted in previous minor amendments, "When PUD 385 was approved, uniform consideration was given to the tenants by allowing 12" vertical bands with sewn or silkscreened letters on awnings for tenant signage [as submitted by the applicant]." Staff would also note, that this is not a retail area and the structure and abutting structures are office in nature.

PUD 385 was approved and intended to be an in-fill development (the last vacant parcel in this immediate area) surrounded by quality office and multifamily developments. Rigorous sign controls have been placed upon PUD 385 as previously offered by the owner as a condition of TMAPC approval. The pylon/ground sign should be reserved for a center identification sign and include limited signage for major tenants only not having exposure on East 71st Street; a large sign with a tenant reader board would not be appropriate at this location based on the character of adjacent developments and signage.

PUD 385 permits the tenant which has frontage on East 71st Street to have a 3' tall wall sign; therefore, no tenant advertising for this space should be permitted on the center identification sign. Further, tenant information on the ground sign should be limited to a maximum area not to exceed that proposed per PUD 385-4, approximately 47 square feet. The total area of the sign is approximately 110 square feet.

Plans submitted for the sign indicate that the exterior facade of the sign will be textured to match the building. Sign face lettering and materials will be designed to match or be compatible with similar materials used on the building awnings, etc. according to the submitted plans. The sign location would be unchanged. Staff is conditionally supportive of the Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan, and recommends **APPROVAL** as follows:

1. Subject to the submitted plans and information demonstrating design compatibility and coordination of sign materials with the existing building.
2. Tenant information on the center identification sign permit only identification of businesses in the center not having a wall sign on East 71st Street and that the maximum display surface area for tenant advertising be 47 square feet per the submitted Detail Sign Plan.
3. The sign shall be internally lighted by constant light and no flashing or intermittently lighted signs are permitted. Neon tubing around the sign perimeter is permitted according to the submitted Detail Sign Plan.
4. All other sign standards for PUD 385, as previously approved by the TMAPC, shall remain in full force and effect unless specifically revised herein.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Parmele confirmed the applicant was in agreement to Staff's recommendation and, therefore, moved for approval. Ms. Wilson inquired if there was a possibility that other "major" tenants might want additional signage in the future, and how best to define "major" tenant. Mr. Frank stated that a basis of Staff's support was that this envelope of signage should be the maximum, and the applicant could place whatever tenant name within the proposed display surface area so long as it was done with good design and materials consistent with the building. Ms. Kempe confirmed that, essentially, all tenants would have to use this signage, should the need arise.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, Draughon, Harris, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment and Detail Sign Plan for PUD 385-4**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Date Approved April 6, 1988
Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

Robin C. Coutant
Secretary

