

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1732
Wednesday, February 8, 1989, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes	Kempe	Compton	Linker, Legal
Coutant, Secretary	Parmele	Frank	Counsel
Doherty	Randle	Gardner	
Draughon	Selph	Matthews	
Paddock, 2nd Vice Chairman		Setters	
Wilson		Stump	
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, February 7, 1989 at 10:25 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Vice Chairman Paddock called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of January 25, 1989, Meeting #1731:

On **MOTION** of **COUTANT**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Parmele, Selph, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of January 25, 1989, Meeting #1731**.

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Carnes announced the **Comprehensive Plan Committee** would conduct a joint committees meeting on Tuesday, February 14th at the INCOG offices regarding the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and the TMAPC's role in the CIP projects ranking process.

Mr. Paddock advised the **Rules & Regulations Committee** had met this date to review proposed amendments to the Zoning Code as relates to sexually-oriented businesses. He stated the Committee would continue their discussions on this matter at a meeting next Wednesday, February 15th.

Ms. Wilson announced the **Budget & Work Program Committee** would be meeting on Wednesday, February 15th to begin discussions on the FY 89-90 TMAPC Work Program, and she invited all TMAPC members to attend.

Director's Report:

- a) Ms. Dane Matthews, INCOG, stated the District 1 Plan amendments had been reviewed and adopted by the City Commission, who adopted the Plan as presented. However, due to requests from interested parties at the hearing, the City Commission set aside June 13th as a possible public hearing date to review any new proposals that might arise between now and then. She advised that Staff and the District 1 Steering Committee would continue briefings with those interested parties seeking further information, and would review any new proposals before presentation to the TMAPC and City Commission.
- b) Mr. Irving Frank, INCOG, updated the TMAPC on the Sign Code Study and its review by the Sign Advisory Board. Mr. Doherty commented he felt the intent was to review the entire Zoning Code as to signage, and not just the area related to portable signs and/or backlit awnings. Discussion followed on the signage issue, with the consensus of the Commission being to present this matter to the Budget & Work Program Committee in order to keep this as an item of their FY 89-90 TMAPC work program list.
- c) Mr. Frank briefed the Commission on a meeting with homeowners in District 26 and the Turnpike Authority in regard to the proposed toll road. Mr. Frank stated that Dewey Bartlett, Jr. has offered to make presentation on the Turnpike Authority's proposals and progress to the TMAPC. The Commission members reiterated their desire to be updated on the status of the toll road. Ms. Wilson commented on the toll road situation for the homeowners and suggested the Long-Range Transportation Plan be renamed so that the general public can better comprehend its true meaning.
- d) Mr. Steve Compton, INCOG, advised the Infill Development Study was completed and suggested the study be referred to the appropriate TMAPC committee or committees for review. He also suggested the Board of Adjustment be involved in the review process and felt a joint work session might be scheduled to facilitate this. Mr. Compton stated that, after the initial TMAPC work session, he would then provide public forum briefings. After discussion, Mr. Paddock stated the TMAPC would receive the report and refer it to the Budget and Work Program Committee for review and scheduling of a work session for the TMAPC and BOA members.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6229 Present Zoning: RS-3
Applicant: Phillips (Durham) Proposed Zoning: IL
Location: West of the SW/c of East Pine Street & North 129th East Avenue
Date of Hearing: February 8, 1989
Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Jim Phillips, 7749 East 11th (832-0326)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 16 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District 2 - Industrial.

According to the Zoning Matrix, the requested IL District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map. All zoning districts are consider may be found in accordance with Special Districts.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately five acres in size and located approximately 2,000 feet west of the southwest corner of North 129th East Avenue and East Pine Street. It is nonwooded, flat and contains a single-family dwelling and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by two single-family dwellings zoned AG; on the east by vacant property and a single-family dwelling zoned RS-3; on the south by vacant property zoned AG; and on the west by vacant property and a single-family dwelling zoned RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Industrial zoning has been approved in the immediate area with IL zoning being limited south of East Pine Street, and both IL and IM on the north side.

Conclusion: Staff would note the subject tract and abutting properties to the east and west make up the last remaining residential property in the area. This area is in transition from AG and RS-3 zonings to industrial. Staff can support the rezoning request based on the Comprehensive Plan and existing zoning pattern.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of IL zoning for Z-6229 as requested.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Jim Phillips, representing the applicant, stated agreement to the Staff recommendation.

Ms. Wilson commented it appeared the area was in a transitional stage to industrial, and she would be in favor of the request.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Parmele, Selph, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6229 Phillips (Durham)** for **IL Zoning**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

IL Zoning: The E/2 NW/4 NW/4 NE/4, Section 32, T-20-N, R-14-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the US Government Survey thereof.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 357-A-2: Minor Amendment to Replace an Existing Ground Sign
East of the SE/c of East 71st Street & South Quincy Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

PUD 375-A is a 7.8 acre tract east of the southeast corner of East 71st Street South and South Quincy Avenue containing an existing shopping center and an area for a future office complex. There is an existing ground sign fronting on 71st Street which is architecturally compatible with the shopping center buildings and is limited by the PUD to 20' in height and 120 square feet of display surface area. The applicant wishes to remove this existing ground sign and place a new ground sign at a new location along the 71st Street frontage which is 25' in height and contains 204 square feet of display surface area. Since the tract has 285' of frontage on 71st Street, the new sign would be built at a ratio of 0.72 square feet of display area per linear foot of frontage. Signage ratios permitted in other PUD's fronting on 71st Street in this general area have ranged from 0.14 to 1.0 square feet of display area per linear foot of frontage. The maximum height of these signs has ranged from 20' to 25'.

After review of the applicant's proposal, Staff finds the request to be minor in nature due to the range in signage ratios existing in the area and the proposal's potential impact on the overall character of the PUD. Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of minor amendment PUD 357-A-2, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Only one ground sign fronting East 71st Street South may be erected with a maximum height of 25' and a maximum sign display area of 205 square feet.
- 2) That the sign be setback at least 70' from the centerline of 71st Street.

PUD 357-A-2 Minor Amendment - Cont'd

- 3) That the sign location be approved by the appropriate City departments so as not to be in conflict with any utilities in the area.
- 4) That the style of the sign be architecturally compatible with the shopping center buildings.
- 5) No building permits shall be issued for erection of the sign within the PUD until a Detail Sign Plan has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Coutant advised he would be abstaining from the vote due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. James Adair (1738 South Canton) agreed to the conditions of the Staff recommendation, but requested an opportunity to work with Staff regarding the setback. Staff clarified that the 70' setback was measured from the centerline of 71st Street, not from the property line. Mr. Adair commented the applicant would have no difficulty providing a plot plan. Mr. Gardner confirmed that, upon completion of the plot plan, the applicant could seek relief, if needed, to adjust the sign setback'.

TMAPC ACTION: 6 members present

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **5-0-1** (Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Coutant, "abstaining"; Carnes, Kempe, Parmele, Selph, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment to PUD 357-A-2 Adair**, subject to the conditions as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Date Approved February 22, 1989
Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

Steven C. Coutant
Secretary

