

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1700
Wednesday, **June 8, 1988**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes	Harris	Brierre	Linker, Legal
Coutant, Secretary	Randle	Frank	Counsel
Doherty		Gardner	
Draughon		Lasker	
Kempe, Chairman		Setters	
Paddock, 2nd Vice-Chairman			
Parmeale, 1st Vice-Chairman			
Wilson			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, June 7, 1988 at 9:25 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 1:36 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of May 25, 1988, Meeting #1698:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of May 25, 1988, Meeting #1698**.

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Kempe advised receipt of a letter asking the TMAPC to hear a revised application for Village South National Bank, formerly PUD 267-3, Minor Amendment for a Ground Sign. She reiterated that the Commission was to consider the request for a rehearing only, as the application was not advertised to be heard at this time. Chairman Kempe and Legal Counsel confirmed for Commission members that this would not go against TMAPC policy as the application has been revised. Therefore, it was not a request to reconsider or rehear what was previously presented at the TMAPC meeting of 5/18/88.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Request to Consider the Revised Application for PUD 267 (Minor Amendment for a Ground Sign), and to **SET** this item on the June 22, 1988 TMAPC agenda.

Committee Reports:

Mr. Carnes advised the **Comprehensive Plan Committee** had met to review the INCOG/TMAPC role as to services provided and Staff support offered to the District Planning Teams. Based on this review and the Committee recommendation, he moved to approve the Staff recommendation as to procedures and/or alternatives, presented by Ms. Dane Matthews on 6/1/88. Chairman Kempe noted the District Planning Teams would be advised and this matter would be reviewed at the upcoming workshop with the District officers.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Staff Recommendation as staff support and services offered to the District Planning Teams.

* * * * *

Mr. Paddock announced the **Rules & Regulations Committee** would be meeting on June 15th to review a revised proposal for amendments to the Zoning Codes regarding manufactured housing and related matters.

* * * * *

Mr. Parmele commented the **Budget & Work Program Committee (BWP)** has met several times and has had work sessions with the full Commission to review the General Planning Funds available to INCOG and the TMAPC. At their last meeting the BWP reviewed the work programs, additional activities and suggestions from Committee members and Staff, and unanimously voted that the revised Work Program be approved as indicated in the TMAPC agenda. Therefore, Mr. Parmele moved the TMAPC adopt the General Planning Funds breakdown and TMAPC Activities and Work Program, as reviewed and recommended by the BWP, and to also recommend to the City and County Commissions that this portion of the INCOG Budget be approved. Chairman Kempe advised she would draft a letter to the City and County Commissioners on behalf of the TMAPC expressing this consideration.

REPORTS: Committee - Cont'd

Mr. Doherty complimented the BWP on their work in this process. In response to Mr. Draughon, Mr. Parmele clarified and explained the BWP recommendation on a few specific items of the work program. Mr. Parmele also commended the Committee, as well as the INCOG Staff for their work and input over the past few weeks.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the General Planning Funds breakdown and TMAPC Budget and Work Program, as reviewed and recommended by the BWP, and to also **RECOMMEND** to the City and County Commissions that this portion of the INCOG Budget be approved.

Chairman Kempe echoed compliments to the INCOG Staff for their work with the BWP and the TMAPC in arriving at, what she felt to be, a very realistic budget in light of today's "tough times". Mr. Paddock mentioned that the BWP and INCOG had agreed to have a quarterly review of the work program so as to monitor the progress of the work program activities. In reply to Mr. Parmele, Mr. Lasker advised that the City Commission had scheduled a public hearing for the City budget, but no specific meeting had been set to discuss the INCOG portion of the budget. Should one be arranged, Mr. Lasker stated he would advise the TMAPC. Ms. Wilson commented she was pleased with the TMAPC's positive approach in getting the TMAPC budget and work program accomplished, as this was something that has not been done by the Commission in many years, and upon review of the original and additional activities, the Commission should be able to see some good results during the next year.

Director's Report:

Mr. Jerry Lasker briefed the TMAPC on House Bill 1828, which was passed and would eliminate Use Variances in the Code; therefore, the TMAPC could possibly see an increase in the zoning applications. He advised that Senate Bill 602, which dealt with Deeds and Conveyances, had also been signed and, unfortunately, the amendments suggested by the TMAPC were not included in the final draft.

CONTINUANCE(S):

PUD 232-A & Z-6198 Johnsen North side of West Pine & North Union Avenue
(PUD, RS-3, & RM-1 to CS)

Z-6199 INCOG West side of the Osage Expressway at West Pine (CS to RS-3)

Staff advised there was a timely request for continuance to July 27th. Mr. Roy Johnsen advised the applicant was in the process of filing an accompanying PUD with Z-6198, as discussed at the previous TMAPC hearing on the abandonment of PUD 232-A.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, "absent") to **CONTINUE** Consideration of the Above Listed Applications until Wednesday, **July 27, 1988** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **Z-6200** Present Zoning: RS-2
Applicant: **Calhoun** Proposed Zoning: OL
Location: SW/c of East 51st Street and South Columbia Avenue
Date of Hearing: June 8, 1988
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Greg Golden, Route 7, Claremore 74017

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

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

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested OL District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .28 acres in size and is located at the southwest corner of East 51st Street South and South Columbia Avenue. It is partially wooded, flat, contains a single-family dwelling, and is zoned RS-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north across East 51st Street by an apartment complex, zoned RM-2; on the east across South Columbia Avenue by a single-family dwelling, zoned RS-2; and on the south and west by single-family dwellings, zoned RS-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Similar OL zoning was denied west of the subject tract at East 51st Street and South Birmingham Place in 1982. OL zoning was granted in 1971 on a vacant tract of land located at the southeast corner of Atlanta Place and 51st Street which fronted duplexes. Medium intensity residential uses have been developed to the north across East 51st Street in the corridor between 51st and I-44.

Conclusion: The subject tract is surrounded on three sides by detached single-family residences. The subject home also faces a single-family residence on the east side of South Columbia Avenue. Birmingham and Columbia Avenues provide the primary access to the single-family residential area. The subject tract is an integral part of this single-family neighborhood. The physical facts of the immediate area do not support rezoning the subject tract to a nonresidential zoning category.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of Z-6200 for OL zoning.

Comments & Discussion:

Chairman Kempe read a letter from the applicant requesting a continuance; however, this was not submitted in a timely manner and was not received in time to give notice.

Mr. Greg Golden, real estate agent for the applicant, addressed the TMAPC and explained the untimely request for continuance. Mr. Golden advised he had just learned that the adjacent property owner to the east of the subject tract would also be submitting a request for OL. He stated that the INCOG Staff indicated one of their reservations with this application was that it was not an orderly progression of nonresidential zoning along this side of 51st Street. Therefore, he felt that the request for OL on the subject as well as the abutting tract might offer an orderly zoning change. Mr. Golden reiterated that the applicant did not know of the abutting property owner's plans for rezoning until late Friday evening.

Chairman Kempe pointed out that there were several in attendance on this item, the continuance request did not specify a date and was not received in a timely fashion. Therefore, she asked for comment on the continuance request.

Mr. Cecil Frey and Mr. Calvin Epps, both protesting the application, also objected to the requested continuance as there were several in attendance who came expecting to hear this case as they had received no notice to the contrary. They indicated a petition was to be submitted with 98 signatures protesting OL zoning.

Mr. Parmele commented that, since it has been announced that another application was coming in on property across the street, the interested parties would probably be coming back anyway. Therefore, he suggested it might be appropriate to hear both cases on the same day and receive comments from the interested parties on the same day. Mr. Coutant verified with Staff that the application for the adjacent property was scheduled for the July 22nd agenda.

Mr. Paddock asked Staff, in view of the physical facts and the zoning patterns involved, if they thought their recommendation would be any different with the adjacent tract having submitted a similar rezoning application. Mr. Gardner advised that this would not affect their recommendation for denial. Mr. Carnes moved for denial of the continuance request, in view of Staff's reply that a second application would not affect their recommendation, and the fact that there were several people in attendance. The TMAPC voted UNANIMOUSLY to DENY the applicant's request for a continuance. Therefore, Chairman Kempe asked the applicant to proceed with his presentation.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Greg Golden submitted photos of the subject tract and pointed out that the only access to the subject tract was on 51st Street, not Columbia. He advised the prospective buyer intended to office and reside in the structure and would, therefore, not be making any changes to the exterior. Mr. Golden stressed the intent to keep the appearance residential in nature, as this was a major consideration of the applicant.

Mr. Carnes inquired if the prospective buyer had considered going to the BOA for a home occupation special exception if he intends to also live on the premises. Mr. Golden commented that he based his action on discussions with INCOG as to alternatives. Mr. Golden confirmed for Chairman Kempe that the contract was contingent on the OL zoning.

Interested Parties:

Address:

Ms. Frances Doerner	5205 South Columbia Avenue	74105
Mr. Cecil Frey	5125 South Birmingham Place	"
Mr. Ed Ownby	5113 South Columbia Avenue	"
Ms. Virginia Poe	5808 East 63rd Street	74136
Ms Sherry Jackson	5119 South Columbia Avenue	74105
Mr. Calvin Epps	5118 South Columbia Avenue	"

Ms. Frances Doerner stated protest to the rezoning as she would like this area to remain residential, and she did not want to see any form of business allowed.

Mr. Cecil Frey commented that, as indicated on the Staff recommendation, this type of rezoning has been protested in the past and was denied on three other occasions. Mr. Frey reiterated the homeowner's desire to see this area remain residential. He stated the applicant only spoke of "intentions" to keep the structure residential in appearance, but once rezoned, anyone could come in at a later time and change the structure. Therefore, he requested this application be denied.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Frey if he would object to someone living in the house, but operating a home occupation for office use, as has been suggested through BOA action. Mr. Frey stated he felt somewhat unqualified to answer this, as the residents had no way knowing what the "down the road" affect might be, because if they acquiesced to a use which was not specifically in the purview of its present zoning, it could possibly have a future negative impact.

In regard to suggestions for BOA review for a home occupation, Mr. Paddock stated that it was very difficult to police; in fact, these have been an ever present problem for Code Enforcement. Therefore, he would be very reluctant to even suggest this might be a possible alternative.

Mr. Ed Ownby, who lives adjacent to the subject property, submitted petitions with 98 signatures protesting the rezoning to OL. Mr. Ownby commented on the poor condition of the structure.

Ms. Virginia Poe, District 18 Chairman, expressed mutual concern as to further encroachment of office use or zoning. She, therefore, requested this neighborhood be protected by denying this request.

Ms. Sherry Jackson advised she has recently moved into this neighborhood, and did so because she was attracted to the residential environment offered. She stated concern as to parking and traffic problems that could arise with an OL use. Ms. Jackson reiterated concerns as to future use and/or changes should the OL zoning be granted.

Mr. Calvin Epps echoed the protest statements made by the other interested parties. He mentioned concerns as to traffic and signage associated with office uses.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Golden mentioned the difficulty of entering/leaving the subject residence, which fronts on 51st Street, and the impact this had on the salability of the structure for residential use. Further, this was one of the reasons the owner was wanting to sell his home, and he felt any future owner would be penalized if forced to strictly residential use. He reiterated the intent to keep the structure residential in appearance. Mr. Paddock suggested, should this rezoning be denied, it might be possible for the applicant to obtain a curb cut on Columbia Avenue. Mr. Golden remarked that, due to the layout of the structure on the property, this would not be feasible.

Review Session:

Mr. Parmele advised he was very familiar with this neighborhood and, although the subject property was one of only four residential properties along this area of 51st Street, he felt it was evident that the homeowners did maintain a high quality and character in the single-family neighborhood on Columbia and Birmingham. Therefore, he moved for denial of the request.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, "absent") to **DENY Z-6200 Calhoun for OL Zoning**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Application No.: CZ-168 Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: Duke Proposed Zoning: IH
Location: North of NE/c of East 126th Street North & Garnett Rd (US Hwy 169)
Date of Hearing: June 8, 1988
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Carl Duke, Rt 2 Box 198, Chelsea (1-789-2679)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The Collinsville Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property High Intensity - Industrial.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested IH District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately six acres in size and is located north of the northeast corner of East 126th Street North and North Garnett Road (US Highway 169). It is nonwooded, gently sloping, contains several scattered mobile homes, and is zoned AG.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by vacant property zoned AG; on the east by residential and vacant property zoned AG; on the south by a mobile home park zoned AG; and on the west across US 169 by vacant property once used for strip mining zoned AG.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: None

Conclusion: Although the Collinsville Comprehensive Plan 1981-2000 designates the subject tract High Intensity - Industrial, the predominantly residential land use abutting the tract indicates a lesser intensity than IH is more appropriate at this point in time. IL zoning would permit a number of industrial uses while providing a measure of protection for the existing residential uses, plus prohibit such uses as auto salvage or landfill operations which would be permitted by right in an IH District. To grant IH zoning at this time would not achieve an orderly transition from low to medium or high intensity uses. The applicant could seek Board of Adjustment approval of more intense uses in the IL zoning and the Board would consider appropriate safeguards as conditions of approval. Land uses south of the subject tract indicate some medium intensity uses may be present which are either illegal or nonconforming.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of the requested IH rezoning based on the established residential uses in this area and **APPROVAL** of IL zoning in the alternative.

Comments & Discussion:

Staff advised the Collinsville Planning Commission and City Commission had submitted a letter advising "both Commissions recommended industrial zoning be granted in accord with the adopted Collinsville 1981-2000 Comprehensive Plan." The Collinsville City Commission recommended IM zoning be granted in lieu of IH zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Carl Duke confirmed the action of the Collinsville City Commission as to the recommendation for IM zoning. Mr. Duke stated he intends to rebuild trucks, mount truck equipment on truck bodies, etc.

In reply to Mr. Carnes, Mr. Gardner explained that although the application was for IH zoning, the TMAPC could consider recommending IL, IM or IH zoning. Mr. Gardner further advised the applicant's intended use would be permitted by right in IM or IH, but would require County BOA action with IL zoning.

Mr. Parmele stated that, when the TMAPC has a referral from another community's Planning Commission and/or City Commission, he felt the TMAPC should respect their recommendation. Therefore, he moved for approval of IM zoning. Mr. Doherty commented that he would have been happy going with Staff's recommendation for IL requiring BOA controls; however, he agreed with Mr. Parmele in supporting a municipality's recommendation, and would be voting in favor of the motion.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE CZ-168 Duke for IM Zoning**, as recommended by the Collinsville City Commission.

Legal Description:

IM Zoning: The East 509.0' of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NW/4 of the SW/4, LESS AND EXCEPT a road easement across the sough 15.0' thereof. AND a tract of land of land beginning at a point 330.0' south of the northwest corner of the NE/4 of the SW/4 thence east 300.0' to a point, thence south 75.0' to a point, thence diagonally to a point 50.0' south of the POB, LESS the west 75.0' thereof for read easement, situated in Section 32, T-22-N, R-14-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the US Government Survey thereof, containing 4.30 acres, more or less. AND, that part of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NW/4 of the SW/4, lying east of US Highway 169, LESS EXCEPT the east 509.0', all in Section 32, T-22-N, R-14-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, said tract subject to road easement over the south 15.0' containing 2.0 acres, more or less.

* * * * *

Application No.: PUD 435-A (Major Amendment) Present Zoning: OM, OL, RS-3
Applicant: Johnsen (St. Teresa Hospital) Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: South and East of South Yale Avenue & East 66th Street
Date of Hearing: June 8, 1988
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Roy Johnsen, 324 Main Mall (585-5641)

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract has an area of 46 acres and includes only that part of PUD 435 which is located south and east of South Yale Avenue and East 66th Street. The applicant is requesting approval to: permit an existing off-site electrical substation to be relocated from East 66th Street to a location on the south boundary of the PUD; increase the permitted floor area of the St. Teresa Campus Hospital from 125,000 square feet to 175,000 square feet; substitute the surveyed legal description for that description used in the original PUD 435 ordinance for land lying south of East 66th Street; permit development of the wet stormwater detention area on the east boundary of Area A to be constructed as a dry facility in the first phase (hospital construction), and changed to a permanent lake area before an occupancy permit is granted for any phase two construction; reduce an internal setback from 100' to 20' between Areas A and B; and to increase the building height from two stories and 35' maximum to three stories and 54' maximum.

The underlying zoning for the subject tract is OM, OL, RS-3, and AG which will remain unchanged. PUD 435-A includes three development areas which have been previously approved as follows: Area A Psychiatric Hospital; Area B Doctors Building and Research Center; and Area C General Medical Uses. The area north of East 66th Street is referred to as the Warren Medical Center and will remain unchanged and as originally approved by the TMAPC and City Commission per PUD 435.

The electrical substation will be relocated from the south side of East 66th Street and across from a single-family residential area, to a place on the southern boundary of the subject tract adjacent to and with access from South Yale. A proposed small lake area and water feature will be constructed at the former substation site. The new substation will be abutted on the south by an existing office complex and parking area and separated therefrom by a 10' landscape buffer and screening. The present overhead high-voltage power lines will be replaced with underground service east of the new substation, and the height above ground level of portions of the substation will be reduced by some grade cuts. Staff is supportive of this change subject to approval of a Detail Site Plan and Detail Landscape Plan by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

The requested increase in floor area for the St. Teresa Campus Hospital from 125,000 square feet to 175,000 square feet continues to be a relatively low intensity use of this area considering that the underlying zoning would permit more than twice the requested floor area on a conventional/special exception basis. No change is being requested in the 25,000 square feet of floor area previously approved for 30 "cottage residences" to be used for transitional living units.

The substitution of the actual survey of PUD 435-A for the previous legal descriptions of those areas south of East 66th Street and east of South Yale is considered an administrative change. This change does not alter the original area covered by PUD 435 in any significant manner.

The construction of the stormwater detention area east of the hospital as a dry facility in the first phase (which will be those buildings included in Area A and interim parking in Area B to the west), and as a permanent lake area before occupancy of phase two construction should not significantly impact the overall project design or amenities. The lake will provide a design amenity to the public only at that point in time when streets are extended into presently undeveloped areas to the east. Staff is supportive of this request and the proposed timing of lake construction. Other new water features are also shown along East 66th Street per PUD 435-A.

A change in the internal setback between the hospital buildings in Area A and a doctors office building in Area B from 100' to 20' will permit more convenient pedestrian linkage. The ultimate test of the design and building relationships will be met at the time of submission of a Detail Site Plan. This change is considered to be an internal design matter and is supported by Staff.

The maximum building height of two stories and 35' was established basically upon RS-3 design standards with only general design knowledge about the site and its topography, and with only a very basic conceptual design layout for functional use relationships for the various hospital uses that will be located in Area A. Transitional cottage areas have been moved to the south and east away from single family detached areas and the previously permitted 250' setback for a patient wing south of 66th Street will be 300' for uses described as the "children's unit". The more detailed design and conceptual elevations of the hospital now indicates that in order for the levels to connect across this site of approximately 30 acres and to remain enclosed, portions of the hospital will vary from one to three stories tall plus a residential style hip roof. The closest portion of the hospital to the centerline at 66th Street will be setback 300' to the wall, include two habitable stories with lower service level (much of which will be buffered by natural vegetation), plus the roof area. Total height of this part of the facility to the ridge of the roof will be approximately 54' according to submitted building elevations. The exterior facade of the structure is indicated to be masonry and brick. Other architectural features (towers or spires) will exceed 54' tall, but are exempt under the Zoning Code unless limited by the PUD. These features will be located almost midway between 66th and 68th Streets; approximately 600' from 66th Street. Staff is supportive of the requested height changes subject to final design details and elevations being required at the time of submission of a Detail Site Plan and prior to issuance of a building permit.

PUD 435-A Major Amendment - Cont'd

Staff review of PUD 435-A finds it to be: (1) Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with the existing and expected development of surrounding areas; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site and; (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD 435-A (including only Development Areas A, B, and C located south of East 66th Street) as follows:

- 1) That the applicant's revised Outline Development Plan (Illustrative Site Plan) and Text (including landscape concept plans, elevations, and other character sketches) be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- 2) **Development Standards:**

INTENSITY SUMMARY

	<u>Non-Hospital Floor Area</u>	<u>Hospital Floor Area</u>
Proposed Floor Area: (in square feet)		
<u>Warren Medical Center - PUD 435</u>		
Warren Professional Bldg.	150,362	
Kelly Medical Bldg.	163,072	
William Medical Bldg.	171,431	
Fourth Medical Bldg. & Diagnostic Clinic	<u>289,920</u>	
TOTAL WARREN MEDICAL CENTER		774,785
<u>Saint Teresa Campus - PUD 435-A</u>		
Hospital	175,000	
Cottage Residences *	<u>25,000</u>	
		<u>200,000</u>
Medical Research Center	50,000	
Psychiatric Doctors Bldg.	50,000	
General Medical Office Bldg.	<u>120,000</u>	
TOTAL SAINT TERESA CAMPUS		<u>220,000</u>
TOTAL PROPOSED FLOOR AREA	993,784	200,000
TOTAL PERMITTED BY ZONING/PUD	1,038,688	522,720

* 30 Transitional Living Units

AREA A AND PHASE ONE - PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Land Area (Net):	30 acres (+/-)
Permitted Uses:	Use Unit 5, psychiatric hospital with 135 beds, including accessory administration building and residences, to include transitional living units.

PUD 435-A Major Amendment - Cont'd

Maximum Building Height:	3 stories, 54' tall per Detail Site Plan (measured from the lowest floor elevation to the highest point on the structure)
Maximum Building Floor Area:	200,000 sf total
Hospital	175,000
Transitional Living Units	25,000
Maximum Number of DU:	30 transitional living units
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	As required by the Zoning Code
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from Centerline of East 66th	300'
from West Boundary	20'
from South Boundary	100'
from East Boundary	50'
Minimum Natural and Landscaped Open Space:	18.6 acres *

- * See Condition #3. Required open space shall also include natural wooded areas such as the buffer south of East 66th Street which shall remain substantially in its natural state, but subject to changes approved by a submitted landscape plan. The lake, shown on the eastern boundary of PUD 435-A, is also a condition of approval and a part of the natural buffer area. This lake is permitted to be a dry detention facility during phase one but must be constructed as a wet detention facility prior to issuance of any occupancy permits for phase two construction.

Sign Standards: No signs are permitted on north or east building facades. Signs accessory to the office uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Project Identification: One monument sign identifying the project may be located at the Yale entry, not exceeding 8' in height and 120 square feet in display surface area.

Interior Ground Signs: Ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign identifying each principal building, not exceeding 6' in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 32 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 32 square feet.

Exterior Finish Standards: All exterior finishes within Area A shall be earth tones such as to blend, to the maximum extent possible, with the natural wooded areas maintained as a buffer.

Access Standards: No access to Area A from East 66th Street is permitted east of that location shown on the Illustrative Site Plan. No street connection is permitted between East 68th Street and Granite Avenue. A cul-de-sac shall be constructed at the presently improved east end of East 68th Street (at the northeast corner of the existing apartment development) and private internal drives within PUD 435-A revised accordingly.

AREA B - DOCTORS BUILDING AND RESEARCH CENTER

Land Area:	9.5 acres (+/-)
Permitted Uses:	As permitted by right in an OM District, including medical clinics and laboratories, and including an electrical regulating substation per Use Unit 4.
Maximum Building Height:	5 stories *
Maximum Building Floor Area:	100,000 sf
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	1 space/250 sf of floor area
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from Centerline of Yale Avenue	110'
from Interior Boundaries	20' *
Other Bulk & Area Requirements:	As required in an OM District
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	15% of net area (See Note #3) **

* The parking structure on the south side of Area B shall be limited to two parking levels above grade, within 150' of the south property line with a 50' building setback for the structure.

** The electrical regulating station shall be screened and buffered by a minimum 10' wide landscape buffer and/or screening wall as determined at the time of submission of later detail plans being consistent with submitted concept plans for PUD 435-A. All grade cuts shall be stabilized with retaining walls/plantings including, but not limited to, the access way embankments to the electrical regulating station from South Yale.

Sign Standards: No signs are permitted on north or east building facades above the first floor. Signs accessory to the office uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Ground Signs: Ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign identifying each principal building, not exceeding 6' 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 32 square feet.

AREA C - GENERAL MEDICAL OFFICES

Land Area (Net):	7.5 acres (+/-)
Permitted Uses:	As permitted by right in an OM District
Maximum Building Height:	10 stories
Maximum Building Floor Area:	120,000 sf
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	1 space per 250 sf of floor area
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from Centerline of Yale	110'
from Centerline of East 66th	55'
from Other Interior Boundaries	20'
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	15% of net area (See Note #3)

Sign Standards: No signs are permitted on north or east building facades above the first floor. Signs accessory to the office uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Interior Ground Signs: Ground signs shall be limited to one monument sign identifying each principal building, not exceeding 6' 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 32 square feet.

- 3) 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.
- 4) That all trash, mechanical and equipment areas (including roof mounted equipment) shall be screened from public view.
- 5) That all parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas. All parking light standards in Area A shall be limited to a maximum height of 15' and shielded to direct light downward and away from residentially developed areas.
- 6) 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 limited herein.
- 7) That a Detail Landscape Plan for each development area 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, including existing natural wooded areas and a lake shown in Area A, shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continued condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit.

- 8) Subject to review and approval of conditions, as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee. Access to Area A is further restricted and conditioned upon the Development Standards for Area A.
- 9) That a Detail Site Plan, including building and parking garage elevations and electrical substation details, shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a Building Permit, to include specific requirements for exterior building finish as stated in the Area A Development Standards, and details of landscape and other proposed buffering and screening.
- 10) 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.
- 11) Unused floor area allocation is permitted to be transferred within the various Development Areas, except no unused floor area from the Warren Medical Center, Area B, or Area C is permitted to be transferred into Area A.
- 12) An over/under pass crossing be considered as a fourth alternative for the East 66th Street crossing/access.
- 13) Substitute surveyed legal description for that part of the PUD lying south of East 66th Street being PUD 435-A. The legal description for the Warren Medical Center portion of PUD 435 (located north of East 66th Street and east of South Yale) remains unchanged.

NOTE: Changes related to phasing of the detention area facility, internal building setbacks, and building heights were submitted by the applicant on May 31, 1988 as amendments to the original PUD 435-A Plan and Text. A letter generally describing these changes was sent to various property owners by the applicant approximately one week prior to that time.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner reviewed modifications to the PUD since the engineering and actual planning have now been submitted as to building height, increase in the size of the hospital (not an increase in beds), increase in open space due to relocation of PSO substation, etc.

Mr. Roy Johnsen, representing the applicant, stated he had no exception with the Staff recommendation. He advised that he had discussed with Staff a request to phase in the wet detention area, and Staff was in agreement with constructing this within two years, and not prior to Phase II as stated in the Staff recommendation. Mr. Gardner confirmed that Staff had no problem with this amendment to the condition regarding development of the detention pond from a wet to a dry facility as proposed.

PUD 435-A Major Amendment - Cont'd

In reply to Mr. Doherty, Mr. Gardner clarified the condition as to measurement of height from the lowest floor elevation to the highest point on the structure. Mr. Johnsen added that he and the architects had discussed this with Staff and was in agreement to the 54' measured from the lowest floor elevation as a uniform standard. Mr. Johnsen answered, in reply to Mr. Parmele, that he was basically in agreement with the Staff recommendation.

Mr. Johnsen reviewed the Site Plan pointing out that the relocation of the PSO substation will offer more open and scenic space for this project. He reviewed other aspects of the amendment stating they were still within the PUD standards and well within that permitted by the zoning. Mr. Johnsen advised that there would not be a need for a screening wall along the PSO substation (as suggested by the site drawing) as the facility would be partially recessed. Mr. Johnsen continued review of the Site Plan for this Phase I project.

In reply to Mr. Paddock, Mr. Johnsen stated they had examined the possibility of an overpass across East 66th Street to accommodate traffic and access concerns. However, due to problems with utilities and the cost involved, he stated this would not be feasible. Mr. Johnsen further clarified for Mr. Draughon the two year time limit for changing the detention from a dry to a wet facility, and that the pond would serve a dual function: stormwater detention as a dry pond in Phase I, and a permanent wet facility during later phases. Mr. Johnsen confirmed for Ms. Wilson that 66th Street will remain open and 68th Street will have a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Carnes commented that he felt this presentation represented what PUD's were all about and Mr. Johnsen, his client, and Staff should be complimented for their efforts in this project. Mr. Paddock agreed with Mr. Carnes and pointed out that this particular PUD deals with a large amount of acreage, which he contends is what the PUD was originally designed to do.

Ms. Virginia Poe, District 18 Chairman, commented she was very pleased with the plans for this PUD amendment. She added that the widening of Yale to six lanes should provide sufficient traffic control.

Mr. Gardner commented that this project was a good example of the PUD review process in that, although this major amendment offers change, it is very similar to the original PUD reviewed by the TMAPC. This means that the review process was realistic in the beginning. Mr. Gardner added that one of Staff's main concern was traffic, and he pointed out that most all of the delivery type traffic would be coming in behind the building off 68th Street and would not even interfere with hospital traffic.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Major Amendment to PUD 435-A Johnsen (St. Teresa)**, as recommended by Staff, amending conditions regarding the lake on the east boundary so as to permit a two year time limit for development of the detention area from a dry to a wet facility.

Legal Description:

PUD 435-A: A tract of land, containing 46.0617 acres, that is part of Lot 1 in Block 2 of "Amended Plat of Warren Center South", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, part of "Reserve Area C" of "Warrenton", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, part of "Block 1 of Canyon Creek, a private office park", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and part of the N/2 of the SW/4 of Section 3, T-18-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: starting at the southwest corner of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of the SW/4 of said Section 3; thence S 89°50'13" E along the southerly line of the NW/4 of the NW/4 of the SW/4 for 60.00' to the POB of said tract of land, said point being the northwest corner of Block 1 of "Burning Hills", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; thence due north and parallel to the westerly line of Section 3 for 688.52' to a point on the southerly R/W line of East 66th Street South; thence N 89°48'24" E along said R/W line for 59.90' to a point of curve; thence easterly and northeasterly along said R/W line on a curve to the left, with a central angle of 13°21'51" and a radius of 456.79', for 106.54' to a point of tangency; thence N 76°49'45" E along said R/W line on said tangency for 77.96' to a point of curve; thence northeasterly, easterly and southeasterly along said R/W line on a curve to the right, with a central angle of 44°29'08" and a radius of 459.04', for 356.41' to a point of tangency; thence S 58°41'07" E along said R/W line on said tangency for 137.87' to a point of curve; thence southeasterly along said R/W line on a curve to the left, with a central angle of 28°55'37" and a radius of 748.24', for 377.76'; thence S 00°00'34" W and parallel to the easterly line of the NW/4 of the SW/4 of Section 3 for 260.77'; thence S 89°48'25" E for 200.00' to a point on the easterly line of the NW/4 of the SW/4; thence N 00°00'34" E along said easterly line for 260.22' to a point on the southerly R/W line of East 66th Street South, said point being 174.00' southerly of the northeast corner of NW/4 of the SW/4; thence S 89°48'24" E for 0.00' to a point of curve; thence easterly and southeasterly along said R/W line on a curve to the right, with a central angle of 07°10'59" and a radius of 1118.20', for 140.19' to a point of tangency; thence S 82°37'25" E along said R/W line on said tangency for 95.86' to a point of curve; thence southeasterly along said R/W line on a curve to the left, with a central angle of 07°10'59" and a radius of 1304.60', for 163.55' to a point of tangency; thence S 89°48'24" E along said R/W line on said tangency for 62.89' to a point of curve; thence southeasterly along said R/W line on a curve to the right, with a central

angle of 55°00'00" and a radius of 450.25', for 432.20' to a point of tangency; thence S 34°48'24" E along said R/W line and an extension of said R/W line on said tangency for 100.00' to a point of curve; thence southeasterly, parallel to and 60.00' southerly of the southerly line of Lot 4 in Block 2 of "Warrenton South", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, along a curve to the left, with a central angle of 18°44'04" and a radius of 360.00', for 117.71'; thence S 00°36'20" W for 756.96' to a point on the southerly line of the N/2 of the SW/4 of Section 3, said point being the northeast corner of Block 1 of "Corporate Oaks", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; thence N 89°50'02" W along the southerly line of the N/2 of the SW/4 for 959.95' to the southeast corner of the NW/4 of the SW/4 of Section 3; thence N 00°00'34" E along the easterly line of the NW/4 of the SW/4 for 232.00' to a point on the easterly line of Block 1 of "Canyon Creek, a private office park", said point being 428.44' southerly of the northeast corner thereof; thence due west for 126.90'; thence S 26°30'57" W for 13.41' to the most northerly northwest corner of Lot 1 in Block 1 of said "Canyon Creek, a private office park"; thence N 83°01'40" W for 186.52' to the most northerly corner of Lot 2 in Block 1 of "Canyon Creek, a private office park"; thence due west for 171.94' to a point on the westerly line of Lot 3 in Block 1 of "Canyon Creek, a private office park"; thence due north along said westerly line for 88.98' to the most southerly southeast corner of Lot 4 in Block 1 of "Canyon Creek, a private office park"; thence N 89°50'08" W along the southerly line of said Lot 4 for 170.38' to the southwest corner of Lot 4; thence due north along the easterly line of Lot 4 for 330.20' to the northwest corner of Lot 4; thence N 89°50'13" W along the northerly line of Block 1 of "Burning Hills", an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, for 599.62' to the POB of said tract of land.

* * * * *

Application No.: PUD 438 Present Zoning: OL
Applicant: Jones Proposed Zoning: Unchanged
Location: SW/c of East 49th Street and South Lewis Avenue
Date of Hearing: June 8, 1988
Continuance Requested to: June 22, 1988

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to CONTINUE Consideration of PUD 438 Jones until Wednesday, June 22, 1988 at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 289 (Adair): Detail Sign Plan

SW/c of East 71st Street and South Yale Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located at the southwest corner of East 71st Street and South Yale Avenue and has underlying zoning of OM and OL with RS-3 along the west boundary. TMAPC approval is requested for a 30' tall pylon sign with a display surface area of approximately 150 square feet which will be located at the southwest corner of the intersecting arterial streets. Two office buildings have been constructed within PUD 289 and a parking lot abuts the arterial street intersection which is 7'-6" lower than the street. The retaining wall has a steel railing along the top for vehicle and pedestrian safety.

Sign standards for PUD 289 permit signs as would be allowed by the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code. These standards limit signs to one sign per street frontage (wall or ground sign), a maximum height of 20', and a maximum of 150 square feet of display surface area based on the PUD 289 street frontage. A wall sign has been constructed on the south building; therefore, one additional sign would be allowed. Approval of this request as submitted would require approval by the TMAPC of the Detail Sign Plan subject to approval by the Board of Adjustment of a variance to the Zoning Code (i.e., height beyond 20').

The northeast and southeast corners of this intersection are regulated by PUD 260-A and PUD 208 respectively. Sign standards in these PUD's are very restrictive and although the TMAPC has granted sign minor amendments for PUD 208, signs similar to that requested for PUD 289 have been denied. The PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code provides that, "... the approving authority may impose such additional restrictions [in addition to the Code] as are necessary to maximize compatibility with other neighboring uses." Based on this language, a reduction in the proposed sign height and display surface area would be warranted such that the proposed signage would be consistent with what is presently permitted in PUD 260-A and in PUD 208 in particular. The center identification sign for PUD 208 (The Lighthouse Shopping Center) is 16' tall and has a display surface area 5' wide x 7' long (35 square feet). Ground identification signs in PUD 208 and PUD 260-A for the various businesses are a maximum of 8' tall and 64 square feet.

Therefore, Staff is not supportive of the proposed sign; however, would be supportive of a sign which does not exceed a height of 10' above the retaining wall which abuts the north and east boundaries of the parking lot and has a maximum display surface area of 64 square feet. If the TMAPC concurs with Staff, it is further recommended the applicant return to the next TMAPC meeting or first meeting for which he can be ready with the sign design and detail.

PUD 289 Detail Sign Plan - Cont'd /

NOTE: If the TMAPC concurs with Staff on the sign height (approximately 17'-6" from the parking lot ground level) no BOA approval of a variance would be needed. Notice of this request has not been given to abutting property owners.

Comments & Discussion:

After Staff review of the recommendation, it was noted the applicant was not present. Chairman Kempe suggested a continuance might be in order. Mr. Carnes moved for approval of the Staff recommendation for 17'6" with the requirement that the applicant come back before the TMAPC for a review of the revised sign design and detail. Mr. Carnes stated the purpose of his motion was that Staff has worked this out as to height and has suggested the applicant come back anyway. Chairman Kempe inquired if the applicant was aware of the Staff's recommendation as to the suggested reduction. Mr. Frank advised he has discussed this with the applicant prior to drafting the recommendation.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Randle, Woodard, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Sign Plan for PUD 289 Adair (Claude Neon Federal)**, as recommended by Staff for a maximum height of 17'6", with a review of the revised sign design and detail at a future TMAPC hearing.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Kempe advised receipt of a letter from Mr. Jeff Kirkham, which is in answer to the TMAPC's request for a listing of land uses Mr. Kirkham felt to be contrary to the County Zoning Code along North Peoria between East 66th and 76th Street North. She requested Staff investigate the locations and report back to the TMAPC.

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

Date Approved June 22, 1988
Cherry Kenge
Chairman

ATTEST: .
Wm C. Coutant
Secretary