

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1767
Wednesday, **November 1, 1989**, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Coutant	Carnes	Gardner	Linker, Legal
Doherty, Chairman	Parmele	Setters	Counsel
Draughon, Secretary	Randle	Stump	
Kempe			
Paddock			
Selph			
Wilson, 1st Vice Chairman			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, October 31, 1989 at 12:48 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Doherty called the meeting to order at 1:39 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of October 18, 1989, Meeting #1765:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **5-0-2** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Kempe, Wilson, "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, Selph, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of October 18, 1989, Meeting #1765**.

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Mr. Coutant announced the Comprehensive Plan Committee would be meeting on November 8th to review amendments to the District 5 & 16 Plan Maps & Text as relates to the results of the Tulsa International Airport FAR Part 150 Noise Study.

Director's Report:

- a) Ms. Dane Matthews request a public hearing be set for November 29th to consider amendments to the District 5 & 16 Plan Maps & Text as relates to the results of the Tulsa International Airport FAR Part 150 Noise Study.

Hearing no objection from the Commission, Chairman Doherty instructed Staff prepare the notice for the public hearing as requested.

REPORTS: Director's - Cont

- b) Mr. Gardner submitted a request to amend the TMAPC policies regarding PUD minor amendments by adding changes in the PUD sign, landscaping and/or screening development standards, provided said changes are permitted by the Tulsa Zoning Code. Mr. Gardner commented the said provision should also be added to the previously reviewed amendments to the PUD Chapter which were awaiting review of the City Commission. As an example, Mr. Gardner remarked that an approved fence height of 8' being reduced to 6' would now require a major amendment to a PUD rather than being handled by the minor amendment process. After discussion as to the timing of the City Commission review, the consensus was to not wait for Rules & Regulations Committee review, but have Staff present this matter at the City Commission work session on November 3rd.

Mr. Gardner reminded the Commissioners of this Saturday's workshop and briefing for the newly-elected District Planning Team officers and TMAPC/BOA members.

SUBDIVISIONS:

PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL:

Camelot Park Estates (2783) East 104th Street & South Granite Avenue (RS-1)

Staff suggested this item be tabled until review of the related agenda items for Wexford, Z-6267 and PUD 454. Based on the outcome of these items, a continuance of the preliminary plat approval was requested by the applicant.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Coutant, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **CONTINUE** Consideration of **Camelot Park Estates** until Wednesday, **November 29, 1989** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:

Southern Pointe Second (1583) East 88th Street & South Hudson Avenue (RS-3)

Staff advised the second point of access required on the overall plan is still a condition of approval on the second phase plat.

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, Selph, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Final Plat of **Southern Pointe Second** and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

* * * * *

Joy Lutheran Addition (2183) 3737 East 101st Street (AG)

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, Selph, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Final Plat of **Joy Lutheran Addition** and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

REQUEST FOR WAIVER (Section 260):

Z-6261 (Unplatted)(1182) 704 West 71st Street (OL)

This is a request to waive plat on approximately one acre at the southwest corner of West 71st Street and South Jackson Avenue. An existing structure is being remodeled into an office and a new detached garage added in the rear, as per plot plan submitted. Note that the entire tract is 435.6' deep from the centerline of 71st Street, but only the north 200' has been zoned OL. The remainder of the tract is still RS-3 and not part of this waiver request. It is shown, however, since the ownership is still on the 435.6' deep tract. Staff has no object to a waiver on the one acre as requested, subject to the following:

1. Grading and/or drainage plan approval of Stormwater Management. (Reference zoning case review by Department of Stormwater Management dated 8/14/89: A Watershed Development Permit required prior to further development. Fee-in-lieu of detention will be acceptable.)
2. City-County Health Department approval required for existing septic system.

Z-6261 (Unplatted) - Cont

3. Access points subject to approval of Traffic Engineering. (Existing OK as shown.)
4. This tract within the waiver request should not be separated from the remainder since the septic laterals extend beyond the zoning line. Care should be taken in installing screen fence so that it does not interfere with the existing lateral field.
5. Should the remainder of this tract be combined with additional land that may be acquired and rezoned by the owner(s), then a plat may be required at some future date for development of a larger parcel of combined tracts.

The applicant was represented by Ted Sack.

The TAC inquired about the dedication on South Jackson Avenue. Later in the meeting Mr. Sack provided a copy of the dedication (Book 3456, Page 285) verifying that it was a dedicated street.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of WAIVER OF PLAT ON Z-6261, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Selph, "abstaining"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Waiver Request for Z-6261 (Unplatted)**, as recommended by Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR WAIVER:

L-17237 Homart Dev. (183) E of the NE/c of 71st St. & S. Memorial (CS, AG)

This tract is located at Woodland Hills Mall and borders East 71st Street. The tract is approximately 319' along 71st Street and is the remainder of a previous lot split to the west (L-17103). The proposed tract is approximately 142' x 195' and has CS zoning with AG landscape buffer along 71st Street. The split is being reviewed by the TAC because the AG landscaping strip requires Board of Adjustment action. Board of Adjustment application will be heard 11/2/89 for variance of required 200' lot width. The lot will have access from the private "ring-road" around Woodland Hills.

Staff recommended approval subject to:

- a) Grading and drainage plan approval subject to Department of Stormwater Management review.

L-17237 Homart Development - Cont

- b) Extension of utilities or necessary easements including sewer main extension.
- c) Approval from the City Board of Adjustment (#15298) for variance of lot width from 200' to 177.94' and 142.0'.

The applicant was not represented.

The Water Department advised that water is available, but it is on the south side of 71st Street, which would require a bore under the paving. City Engineer advised pavement cut would not be permitted. Traffic Engineer noted for the record that the platted "Limits of No Access" to 71st Street still applies.

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of L-17237, subject to the conditions outlined by Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE L-17237 Homart Development**, subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

* * * * *

L-17238 Tower/Duvall (1614) N. 135th E. Ave. & Mingo Valley Expwy (AG)

This tract is located east of the Mingo Valley Expressway, fronts on North 135th East Avenue and is 330' x 305'. It is approximately 2.3 acres in size and zoned AG. The applicant is requesting to split the tract into north and south halves. The north 165' has an existing dwelling. The south 165' is vacant. The applicant plans to install two mobile homes on the south 165'. Approval of City-County Health Department for two septic systems is being sought. Application to the County Board of Adjustment to allow two dwellings as well as variance of lot width to 165' and 1.25 acres has been filed (CBOA #926, 11/21/89). Since there are other lots of similar size in the area, Staff had no objection to the request for the lot split, but note that the septic system approvals must be made by the City-County Health Department

The applicant was represented by Mr. Tower, seller and Mr. Duvall, buyer

The TAC voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the L-17238 subject to the following conditions:

L-17238 Tower/Duvall - Cont

- a) Board of Adjustment approval of lot sizes and widths.
- b) City-County Health Department approval of septic systems.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE L-17238 Tower/Duvall** subject to the conditions as recommended by the TAC and Staff.

LOT SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-17240 (1503) Baker	L-17243 (3104) Sellmer (Reynolds)
L-17241 (603) Laugel	L-17244 (3104) Sellmer (Reynolds)
L-17242 (283) Shadow Mtn (Lansford)	

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Above Listed Lot Splits for Ratification of Prior Approval, as recommended by Staff.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6267 & PUD 454	Present Zoning: RS-1
Applicant: Hammond Engineering (Wexford)	Proposed Zoning: RS-2
Location: East of 105th Street & South Canton Avenue	
Date of Hearing: November 25, 1989	
Presented to TMAPC by: Mr. J.C. Joyce, 515 South Main Mall	585-2751

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 26 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property both Low Intensity - Residential and Special District 2 (sump area). According to the Zoning Matrix the requested RS-2 District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map if accompanied by a PUD.

Staff Recommendation: Z-6267

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately 20 acres in size and is located east of the intersection of East 105th Street South and South Canton avenue. It is partially wooded, flat, vacant and is zoned RS-1.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by a single-family subdivision under development zoned RS-2; on the east by a detention pond and vacant land zoned RS-1; on the south by vacant land zoned AG; and on the west by single-family subdivisions zoned RS-1 and RS-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: RS-2 zoning has been approved to the north and northeast of the tract, however, the intensity of the actual development has been in conformance with the land area requirements of RS-1 zoning.

Conclusion: The density of development proposed in the accompanying PUD 454 is allowed under the existing zoning. Staff feels there is no need to rezone the property to RS-2.

Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of RS-2 for Z-6267.

Staff Recommendation: PUD 454

The applicant is proposing an extension of the existing Wexford Addition to be called Wexford Estates. The new addition ties into the existing 104th and 105th Streets. There is also a stub street provided to the southern boundary of the property. The 104th and 105th Street entrances are proposed to have decorative landscaping and paving. A total of 52 lots are proposed, all restricted to single family dwellings with customary accessory uses. The minimum lot width is to be 90' except on cul-de-sacs and the minimum lot size is to be 12,265 square feet. The existing underlying zoning of RS-1 would allow the intensity of use proposed.

Staff finds the use and intensity of development proposed to be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code. Based on the following conditions, Staff finds PUD 454 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 454 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

2) **Development Standards:**

Site Area (Gross):	20.1 acres	875,605 sf
Permitted Uses:	Single-family dwellings and customary accessory uses.	
Maximum Dwelling Units:	52	
Minimum Lot Dimensions:		
Lot Width & Area:	90'	12,265 sf
Maximum Building Height:	35'	
Minimum Livability Space per Lot:	5,000 sf	
Minimum Required Yards:		
Front	30' except on semi cul-de-sacs where 25' is permitted.	
Side	7.5' on each side	
Rear	20' abutting a street	
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	25'	
	2 per dwelling unit	

- 3) No zoning clearance permit shall be issued within the PUD until a Detail Site Plan has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
- 4) A Detail Landscape Plan shall be submitted to the TMAPC for review and approval. A landscape architect registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify to the zoning officer all required landscaping has been installed in accordance with the approved landscape plan prior to issuance of an Occupancy Permit. The landscaping materials required under the approved Plan shall be maintained and replaced as needed, as a continuing condition of the granting of an Occupancy Permit.
- 5) A subdivision identification sign shall be permitted at each entrance to the subdivision, but each shall not exceed 35 square feet in display surface area nor 4' in height.
- 6) Streets shall be connected to the stub streets on the west of the tract and stub streets shall be provided to the east and south property lines at an appropriate location as determine in the Detail Site Plan review.
- 7) All easements along the west side of the property shall be setback from the property line an adequate amount to prevent any significant damage to existing trees in that area.
- 8) The Department of Stormwater Management or a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify that all required stormwater drainage structures and detention areas have been installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.

- 9) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code has been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.
- 10) Subject to review and approval of conditions as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.
- 11) A homeowners association shall be created and vested with sufficient authority and financial resources to properly maintain all common areas or required landscaping within the PUD.

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Gardner commented a known point of contention with the Staff recommendation involved condition #6 regarding stub streets. He reiterated Staff's position that subdivisions should be "tied" to provide accessibility in all directions to the major streets surrounding these subdivisions. Chairman Doherty confirmed Staff's recommended denial of the zoning request from RS-1 to RS-2 was due to the fact that RS-2 zoning was not needed since waivers for lot frontages, etc. could be handled under the PUD, and rezoning was not needed for density purposes.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. J.C. Joyce, attorney for Wexford Development Group, advised that disagreements between the developers of Camelot Estates and Wexford Estates have been resolved, and they were now presenting a unified front in opposition to the stub street to the east. Mr. Joyce referred to a letter from the Jenks Schools System Superintendent who stated a change of position regarding an east/west street connection, as follows: "It has since come to my attention that a pedestrian walk-through is being proposed by both subdivision developers. This would be beneficial to Jenks Public Schools in our ability to provide adequate transportation for students of the area; therefore, if this meets with your approval in the platting, we at Jenks Public Schools have no problem with this approach."

Mr. Joyce stated he felt there was no reason, other than the District 26 Plan, that the PUD was imposed on this particular tract. He emphasized the proposed regional detention facility addressed the sewer and water/drainage concerns in this Development Sensitive area. Further, the stub streets had nothing to do with either sewer or drainage. Therefore, the applicant was faced with the situation of "what is a normal residential subdivision". Mr. Joyce stated the TAC indicated this to be appropriate without the stub street, even though the PUD required an eastern stub street. He felt this should not even need to be addressed as this application only involved a 20 acre tract. Mr. Joyce remarked on the extensive costs involved in putting in this street. He reviewed this proposal as to comparisons with surrounding subdivisions having very few, if any, connections between adjacent subdivisions. Mr. Joyce commented the cul-de-sac approach to Camelot Estates made it a very desirable subdivision. Further, the proposed walkway access between Camelot Estates

and Wexford Estates into the Jenks School made this even more desirable. He pointed out there was adequate traffic flow with three streets out of Wexford Estates. Mr. Joyce also reviewed the traffic flow and accesses to the Jenks School campus, which he felt would force traffic through the residential subdivisions in order to avoid traffic back-ups associated with the school. Mr. Joyce stated that it was his understanding the residents living in subdivisions did not want the stub streets, as they were aware of the traffic problems from the school traffic.

Mr. Joyce stated "there was no good, logical precedental reason to have the stub street". Further, it would be a "gross burden" on both subdivisions involved, and after analyzing the situation, both developers concluded that, if a pedestrian connection was provided, then a stub street made no sense whatsoever. He added that Staff was proposing a stub street to a ten acre tract (since the other ten acres was detention), and he questioned how small a tract could be without recommending a stub street. Therefore, he felt the size of the tract was a critical factor.

Mr. Paddock asked if the proposed walkway would be located where the stub was proposed to be located. Mr. Joyce stated the developers had agreed to the walkway, but an exact location had not yet been determined.

Ms. Wilson commented that, in regard to the school location, it was her understanding that children walking would only be allowed to enter from the west side of Yale Avenue and would be discouraged from trying to cross Yale to get to school. Mr. Joyce commented there would be a traffic control light at some point of this intersection. He pointed out that the school site was a major playground facility for the entire area before and after school hours with children and adults walking to the site. Therefore, he did not feel "we can sit here and bank on the fact that Jenks would like to deliver all of their students to those schools by buses."

In response to Chairman Doherty, Mr. Joyce identified on the map the existing streets, the streets under construction and the proposed street layouts.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Terry Young	2311 North Elwood	74106
Mr. Jerry Ledford	8209 East 63rd Place South	74133
Mr. Bard Moss	10250 South Canton	74137
Mr. Shauna McCollough	10109 South Hudson	74137
Mr. John J. Yourek	10112 South Hudson	74137
Mr. Don Holt	10343 South Braden	74137
Mr. W. Leslie Pierce	PO Box 52281	74152

Mr. Terry Young, representative for the developer of Camelot Estates, provided background information leading to the agreement between the two developers for eliminating a stub street connection from Camelot Estates to Wexford Estates. Mr. Young reiterated the concerns for movement of school children would be fully satisfied with an amendment to the PUD condition #6 to require a pedestrian walkway. He urged the Commission to approve the request and suggested they be specific with this amendment by stating the "Lot 13" alignment, or generally where other easements would be provided. Mr. Young also requested approval of the Preliminary Plat for Camelot Estates which shows a cul-de-sac at this point.

In response to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Young clarified the pedestrian access was proposed so as to not inconvenience the Wexford development by being located where other easements would be located. He added it was important for Camelot Estates that this walkway come from the cul-de-sac as shown. Further, the amended condition #6 should define the walkway to be a hard surface of some sort. Mr. Young confirmed with Mr. Joyce that a homeowners association would be responsible for maintenance of the walkway.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Young's thoughts on leaving the burden of providing east/west street access to the developer of the southern abutting tract. Mr. Young commented that, "upon their review of what Staff sees today as the likely development of those south vacant tracts", he felt the configuration of the vacant tracts themselves would dictate residential development as proposed in the map provided. There would then be no burden beyond that which those developers would be expected to undertake at that time.

Ms. Wilson commented the regional detention pond did not currently exist and would not until the other developments finished the completion of this pond, which would then require inspections, dedication to the City, etc. She stated part of the requirement of the original development of Camelot Park indicated the homeowners in Camelot Park were to help maintain, through fees, the detention pond. Therefore, she inquired if the other subdivisions, through their own homeowners associations, would jointly combine to help maintain the regional detention pond. Mr. Young replied the costs of the detention pond, at this time, would not be shared by all of the developments in the area.

Mr. Jerry Ledford, engineer for Southern Oaks Estates, disagreed with comments by Mr. Young as to this southern abutting development. Mr. Ledford remarked that when Southern Oaks presents their preliminary plat, they would obviously review the costs of stub streets just as the developers for Camelot Estates and Wexford Estates did for their projects.

Mr. Bard Moss, a resident in Wexford Subdivision, advised this was the first he has heard of a pedestrian walkway. Mr. Moss stated support for the deletion of the stub street as the residents in Wexford and Wexford Estates favored having no connection to Camelot Estates. He submitted a

petition clarifying the reasons for the residents' request for denial of a stub street. Reasons cited for denial include traffic and safety concerns for the neighborhood children, as well as the detrimental effect on the peace and tranquility of the neighborhood. In reply to Ms. Kempe, Mr. Moss identified the accesses to Wexford and Wexford Estates.

Ms. Shauna McCollough spoke on behalf of approximately 20 residents from Camelot Park in attendance. Ms. McCollough presented a petition which also requested the TMAPC disapprove a "tie-in of the circulating street from Camelot Park to the Wexford Estates Subdivision." She reiterated concerns the additional traffic would increase hazards for the neighborhood children.

Mr. John J. Yourek concurred with statements made by Ms. McCollough for denial of a stub street connection.

Mr. Don Holt, a resident of Wexford Estates, expanded on comments made by Mr. Moss and Ms. McCollough. Mr. Holt stated he was unprepared to comment on the pedestrian walkway as this information was just very recently presented to the residents.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Joyce commented the applicant was certainly attempting to provide an alternative to the stub street proposal, which was what the residents indicated they desired. Mr. Joyce added the applicant also shared the desire expressed by a few of the interested parties to eliminate the stub street from Wexford Estates to Southern Oaks.

Mr. Paddock acknowledged a letter to the TMAPC from **Mr. W. Leslie Pierce** expressing concern for preservation and protection of a "300' line of 100 year old oak and hickory trees" on the western edge of Wexford Estates. Mr. Pierce's letter urged the Commission to "require the sewer to be in the front portion of these lots". Mr. Joyce commented that, from a developer's standpoint, they wanted to keep as many of these trees as these added value to the lots, and they supported Mr. Pierce's request. Mr. Wilmoth interjected that, per the engineer, the sewer would be going in front of these trees, and he pointed out condition #7 also addressed this matter.

TMAPC Review Session:

Ms. Kempe initiated discussion on the internal circulation system throughout this area among the various subdivisions, with Staff commenting on the need for at least two access points from each subdivision. Mr. Paddock noted the location of the regional detention pond appeared to put this entire matter in a different light as relates to the layout of these streets.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Coutant, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **DENY Z-6267 Hammond Engineering (Wexford) for RS-2 Zoning**, as recommended by Staff.

In regard to the related PUD, Mr. Paddock commented he does not agree with the concept to "compartmentalize" these subdivisions, and if this concept is extended, it will be difficult to justify denial of future applications seeking the same treatment. He acknowledged the efforts of the two developers compromise and efforts to meet the wishes of the residents, but he also noted that the real issues were good planning, good traffic circulations, access for emergency vehicles, etc.

Ms. Wilson remarked that she felt what might have, given such a "distaste" in the past for collector streets had to do with design. In this particular area with the street layouts and connection, traffic does not have "through path", thereby forcing drivers to drive slower. Ms. Wilson initiated discussion on the current layout of these particular subdivisions and existing/proposed stub streets and "through" circulation patterns to the surrounding arterials.

Mr. Young clarified that the stub street on 106th Street going east from Southern Oaks Estates II was voluntarily submitted. It was this volunteering "that triggered the reconsideration on the part of his client that there would, in fact, by his own submission be the outlet for a subcollector or routing through the entire section." Mr. Young added that was what caused this change of heart to occur, it was not done by force.

Chairman Doherty stated he did not like the concept of forcing the last developer to provide through traffic circulation. However, even though he was not comfortable with it, he could support the proposal for the routing along 106th Street which, in this case, might be the best solution.

Ms. Wilson stated favor for the Staff recommendation which required east, west and south connections as she felt good planning principles were involved in this decision. Further, if the Commission did not handle issues as they rose but waited until some undetermined point in the future, she was not sure this was fair to all developers concerned. Ms. Wilson added that, as far as planning was concerned, she did not feel opening this east/west stub connection was necessarily "a bad thing to do" when the entire street system was considered. Therefore, she moved for approval of Staff recommendation.

Ms. Kempe supported Ms. Wilson's comments, and stated she did not feel the Commission was building a "throughway" by calling for the east/west stub.

Mr. Paddock remarked the Commission has heard from the residents of Wexford Estates and Camelot Estates and it sounded as if a part of the sales pitch was that these subdivisions would be private communities, which was why these homeowners purchased their homes in this area. Further, it appears that "it is OK to connect the two Camelot subdivisions, but not OK to connect Wexford with Camelot". Mr. Paddock stated this concept bothered him.

Chairman Doherty read from Section 4, page 2, paragraph 1.A & 1.B of the Subdivision Regulations which regulated street arrangements for subdivisions. He noted the regional detention pond could possibly be considered "a topographical condition". Ms. Wilson commented when Forest Park South III was platted, the developer had knowledge of the space needed for this detention pond, which was why the streets were stubbed at particular locations. Chairman Doherty noted the map did not show the entire square mile section, the question basically appeared to be "do we want the internal circulation to be north or south of the detention pond." Ms. Kempe pointed out the Subdivision Regulations also call for the planned streets "to serve public convenience and safety", which she felt was an important consideration.

TMAPC ACTION: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **4-3-0** (Draughon, Kempe, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Doherty, Paddock, Selph, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Coutant, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD 454 Hammond Engineering (Wexford)** subject to the conditions as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

The W/2 of the SE/4 of the NW/4 of Section 27, T-18-N, R-13-E, City and County of Tulsa, Oklahoma.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 448: Detail Sign Plan & Detail Landscape Plan
NE/c of East 91st Street & South Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation:

Staff has reviewed the Detail Sign Plan and Detail Landscape Plan for Lot 1, Block 1 of Square Ninety-One and finds them to meet the development standards for PUD 448 with the following conditions:

- 1) All footings for ground signs shall be at least 10' from a high pressure gas line on the west side of the property.
- 2) No part of a ground sign shall be closer than 10' from overhead electric lines.

PUD 448 Norman (Robeson Prop.) - Cont

Therefore, Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Sign Plan and Detail Landscape Plan for Lot 1, Block 1 of PUD 448 subject to the above listed conditions.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to APPROVE the Detail Sign Plan & Detail Landscape for PUD 448 Norman (Robeson Prop.), subject to the conditions as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 435-A: Detail Sign Plan
SE/c of East 66th Street & South Yale Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

Staff has reviewed the proposed Detail Sign Plan for Laureate Psychiatric Clinic & Hospital and finds it to be in compliance with the development standards of PUD 435-A if the proposed directional signs are not considered to be ground sign as regulated in the PUD's development standards. If the TMAPC agrees with Staff's interpretation, then Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Sign Plan for PUD 435-A.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Johnsen (324 Main Mall), representing the applicant, reiterated the PUD did not include or establish any specifications regarding directional signs. Mr. Johnsen felt the Commission could appreciate that a project of this size needed a number of signs indicating directions to and identifying the specific buildings. He stated one sign was not included in the Detail Sign Plan because, when the PUD was originally submitted, Yale Avenue was identified as the primary entry to the project and only this entrance was provided with an identification sign.

There is also a secondary entry on 66th Street and there is concern among Laureate management that people turning on 66th Street would not realize they were on the hospital/clinic premises. Therefore, they feel a sign simply saying "Laureate" on a wall monument would be appropriate. Mr. Johnsen submitted and reviewed drawings to indicate the proposed location of this new identification sign. Mr. Johnsen emphasized the nearest residential structure was a great distance to the east along 66th Street. He suggested notice of a minor amendment to the PUD to allow this identification sign be provided to the those properties along 66th Street as well as the homeowners associations, rather than 300' notice. He felt this would be sufficient notice to those truly having an interest in these signs.

PUD 435-A Johnsen - Cont

Mr. Paddock commented he felt Mr. Johnsen's suggestion sounded reasonable and was a good one. On motion of Ms. Kempe, the TMAPC members voted unanimously to waive the usual policy and require notice only to those property owners on 66th Street, plus any interested parties of record at the previous PUD hearing.

TMAPC ACTION: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **COUTANT**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Coutant, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Selph, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Parmele, Randle, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Detail Sign Plan for PUD 435-A Johnsen (Laureate Psychiatric Clinic)**, as recommended by Staff.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Date Approved

11/15/89

James R. Robert
Chairman

ATTEST:

Art Draughon
Secretary