

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes of Meeting No. 2042

Wednesday, October 25, 1995, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

**Members Present**

Ballard  
Carnes,  
Chairman  
Doherty, 1st Vice  
Chairman  
Gray, Secretary  
Horner  
Ledford  
Midget, Mayor's  
Designee  
Pace  
Taylor

**Members Absent**

Boyle  
Selph

**Staff Present**

Gardner  
Hester  
Jones  
Stump

**Others Present**

Linker, Legal  
Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Tuesday, October 24, 1995 at 1:21 p.m., in the office of the County Clerk at 1:25 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Carnes called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

**Minutes:**

Approval of the minutes of October 11, 1995, Meeting No. 2040:

On **MOTION** of **HORNER**, the TMAPC voted **5-0-2** (Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Pace "aye"; no "nays"; Carnes, Taylor "abstaining"; Ballard, Boyle, Midget, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of October 11, 1995 Meeting No. 2040.

\*\*\*\*\*

**LOT-SPLIT FOR WAIVER OF SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS :**

L-18154 Roxana R. Lorton (W. Doyle) (1893)  
1841 E. 27th

**(PD-6)(CD-9)**

**Staff Comments**

Tulsa Subdivision Regulations require that applications for waiver must be heard by the Technical Advisory Committee prior to presentation to the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. Applicant is requesting a waiver of this requirement.

It is proposed to split an approximate 202' x 30' strip from Tract C and tie it to Tract B. This strip was originally designed as a private drive with mutual access for Tracts A, B, C & D with ownership of the strip going to the owner of Tract C. Tracts C & D have now been tied together. Tracts A & B are presently under one ownership but are not tied together. The owner of Tracts A & B would like to purchase this strip and tie it to Tract B so that Tract B would meet the street frontage requirement should he elect to sell Tract A in the future. Public Works has stated that it is satisfied that all of the tracts will abut public water and sewer line easements as required. However, Tract B will have more than three side lot lines, and therefore does not comply with Tulsa Subdivision Regulations requiring that residential lots have no more than three side lot lines. Applicant is asking for a waiver of this requirement.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Boyle, Midget, Selph, "absent") to **APPROVE** WAIVER of Subdivision Regulations prohibiting more than three side lot lines on a residential lot and **WAIVER** of Subdivision Regulations requiring review by the Technical Advisory Committee.

\*\*\*\*\*

Staff Comments

Tulsa Subdivision Regulations require that applications for waiver must be heard by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) prior to presentation to the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission. Applicant is requesting a waiver of this requirement

It is proposed to split an approximate 19' x 221' strip from Lot 5 of the Resubdivision of Lots 3, 4 and 5 of the Resubdivision of Block 10, Forest Hills Addition and attach it to Lot 6 of the Resubdivision of Lots 3, 4 and 5 of the Resubdivision of Block 10, Forest Hills Addition. Both lots (Tracts A & B) will meet RE zoning standards. However, Tract A will have more than three side lot lines, and therefore does not comply with Tulsa Subdivision Regulations requiring that residential lots have no more than three side lot lines. Applicant is asking for a waiver of this requirement.

The proposed split would cut across a portion of the west side of the existing dwelling. Should said waivers be granted, Staff would recommend that no deeds be released on this application until the dwelling has been removed.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jones pointed out that the applicant mailed letters to all TAC members explaining the proposal for the lot. The applicant also requested that if the TAC would require additional easements or have any concerns, they contact his office.

Mr. Jones recommended that the application be approved subject to a 5' general utility easement along the east side of the tract, if it is required by the utility companies. He informed that the applicant is in agreement with this condition.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **BALLARD**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Boyle, Midget, Selph, "absent") to **APPROVE WAIVER** of Subdivision Regulations prohibiting more than three side lot lines on a residential lot, **WAIVER** of Subdivision Regulations requiring review by the Technical Advisory Committee, as recommended by Staff and require a 5' general utility easement along the east side of the tract, if required by the utility companies.

\* \* \* \* \*

**CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:**

Application No.: **Z-6508 and PUD 386-A**

Applicant: Roy Johnsen

Location: North of Northeast corner E. 91st St. & South Memorial

Date of Hearing: October 25, 1995

Presentation to TMAPC: Roy Johnsen

Present Zoning: RM-1/AG

Proposed Zoning: CS

**Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:**

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property as Low Intensity - Linear Development on the west 550', Low Intensity - No Specific Land Use and Development Sensitive on the eastern portion of the property.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested CS zoning is **not** in accordance with the Plan Map.

**Staff Comments:**

**Site Analysis:** The subject property is 3.75 acres in size, wooded, sloping, has an office building on it and is zoned RM-1/PUD-386.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The subject tract is abutted on the north by a church, zoned AG; to the east by vacant land and beyond that residential dwellings, zoned RS-3; to the south by a shopping center, zoned RM-1/PUD-448; and to the west by vacant property, zoned CS/PUD-529.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** The history of zoning actions in this area indicate that commercial development has been approved on the intersection of E. 91st Street S. and S. Memorial Drive. All the developments in this particular area have been within Planned Unit Developments.

**Conclusion:** The Comprehensive Plan does not support CS zoning on this parcel, nor does this parcel abut any commercial zoning. The closest commercial zoning is across Memorial Drive to the southwest where PUD-529 was approved for mini-storage. If the mini-storage amendments to the Zoning Code proposed by TMAPC are adopted by City Council, the Planning Commission has said it will initiate a rezoning application to downzone this CS tract to an office or multifamily zone.

If the subject property is rezoned CS, it will be spot-zoning far from the medium intensity node at 91st Street and Memorial Drive and could lead to Memorial Drive being strip-zoned commercially between 81st and 91st Streets. Such a development pattern would overload planned roadways and negate the intent of the Development Guidelines and Comprehensive Plan. Therefore staff recommends **DENIAL** of Z-6508.

**AND**

**PUD 386-A** North of the northeast corner of 91st Street South and Memorial Drive.

The applicant is proposing to add a commercial development area to the west side of PUD 386 and reduce the allowable office building floor area on the remainder of the tract to 70,000 SF. The existing office building would remain and an additional 50,000 SF of office space could be constructed on the eastern portion of the PUD with a maximum height of four stories. The western development area which abuts Memorial Drive is proposed to have 31,000 SF of retail and restaurant uses. There is an accompanying rezoning request for CS zoning (Z-6408) on the west 330' of Lot 1, Block 1, Carman Ministries, Inc. Headquarters.

Staff cannot support commercial zoning or development this far from the node. It is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Guidelines. Therefore, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of PUD 386-A.

If the Planning Commissioners are inclined to support this PUD, Staff would suggest that the eastern boundary of Development Area "A" be moved 40' to the west, so that it extends no farther east than the commercial development area to the south in PUD 448. Staff would therefore suggest the following development conditions for PUD 386-A.

1. The applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
2. Development Standards:  
Land Area (Net) 13.942 acres

Development Area "A"

(New suggested eastern boundary of this development area would be \*\*505' from the west line of Section 13, T-18-N, R-13-E.)

Land Area (Net)	3.212 acres
Permitted Uses	Use Units 11, 12, 13 and 14 and customary accessory uses
Maximum Building Floor Area	
Use Unit 12 Uses	8,000 SF
All Uses	31,000 SF
Maximum Building Height	30'
Minimum Building Setbacks:	
from Memorial right-of-way	70'
from north boundary of development area	0'
from east boundary of development area	**20'
from south boundary	20'
Minimum Landscaped Open Space	10% of lot

\*\*Changes made by TMAPC.

Development Area "B"

Land Area (Net)	7.482 acres
Permitted Uses	Use Unit 11* and customary accessory uses
Maximum Floor Area	
Existing	20,000 SF
New Construction	50,000 SF
Maximum Building Height	4 stories
Minimum Building Setbacks	
from west line of Section 13	525'
from north boundary of PUD	115'
from south boundary	50'
from Development Area "C" boundary	0'
Minimum Landscaped Open Space	
Excluding drainageway	12% of lot
Including drainageway	30% of development area

\*Parking for uses in Development Area "A" shall not be provided in Development Area "B".

Development Area "C"

Land Area (Net)	3.248 acres
Permitted Uses	Open space, recreation and stormwater management

3. Signage

Signs accessory to the principal uses within the development shall be permitted, but shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Development Area "A" - Retail

Ground Signs

Ground signs shall be limited to three signs along South Memorial Drive, two of which may be pole signs not exceeding 25' in height nor exceeding a display surface area of 125 SF and the third sign shall be limited to a monument sign not exceeding 8' in height nor exceeding a display surface area of 96 SF for the use of the office development in Development Area "B".

Wall or Canopy Signs

The aggregate display surface area of wall or canopy signs shall be limited to 1 SF per lineal foot of the building wall to which the sign or signs are affixed. A wall or canopy sign shall not exceed the height of the building.

Development Area "B" - Office

Ground and Wall Signs

Ground and wall signage within the development area is not permitted.

4. No Zoning Clearance Permit shall be issued for a development area within the PUD until a Detail Site Plan for the development area, which includes all buildings and requiring parking, has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
5. A Detail Landscape Plan for each development area 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 that all required landscaping and screening fences have been installed in accordance with the approved Landscape Plan for that development area 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.
6. No sign permits shall be issued for erection of a sign within a development area of the PUD until a Detail Sign Plan for that development area has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD Development Standards.
7. All trash, mechanical and equipment areas shall be screened from public view by persons standing at ground level.
8. All parking lot lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas. Light standards shall be limited to a maximum height of 25 feet.
9. The Department Public Works or a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify to the zoning officer that all required stormwater drainage structures and detention areas serving a development area have been installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to issuance of an occupancy permit.
10. No Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 1170E 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 beneficiary to said Covenants.
11. Subject to conditions recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee during the subdivision platting process which are approved by TMAPC.

**Note:** If the Planning Commissioners are inclined to approve this major amendment with the amount of commercial development requested by the applicant on a portion of the land area requested for CS zoning in Z-6508 needs to be rezoned. Staff would suggest only rezoning the south 130' of the west 410' of Lot 1, Block 1 of Carman Ministries, Inc. Headquarters to CS.

### Applicant's Comments

Mr. Johnsen reminded the Planning Commissioners that a key physical fact of this tract is that along the entire north boundary there is an exists open space drainage committed for buffering which separates the subject tract from surrounding properties. He advised that Staff recommendations for the PUD are acceptable except for the 40' reduction in commercial area in Development Area "A". He pointed out that the proposed commercial use line is consistent with the commercial use to the south. Mr. Johnsen revealed that if the 40' of commercial is lost, the opportunity to install a drive behind the easternmost commercial structure will be lost, as well planned employee parking at the rear.

Mr. Stump explained that when development to the south was analyzed, Staff determined that commercial zoning should not be moved farther than abutting commercial zoning to the south.

Mr. Johnsen stated that in reviewing the application, the applicant determined that reducing the drive by 20' would still accommodate the application.

Mr. Gardner explained that this application will establish the depth of commercial zoning on the east side of Memorial Drive.

Responding to inquiry from Mr. Doherty, Mr. Linker determined that if commercial zoning is moved farther east, it will set a precedent for future applications.

Mr. Johnsen noted that if the physical facts north of the large floodplain are different from those south of it, any action south of the floodplain it will not serve as persuasive precedent for properties to the north.

### TMAPC Review

Mr. Ledford concluded that to set a precedent, identical conditions would have to exist for approval of commercial zoning north of the subject tract. He expressed agreement with Staff to limit the depth of commercial zoning on the tract and expressed support of the compromise requested by Mr. Johnsen.

Ms. Ballard expressed support of the application and made a motion for approval as requested by the applicant of the eastern boundary of Development Area "A" to be 505' from the west line of Section 13, T-18-N, R-13-E and minimum building setback from the eastern boundary of Development Area "A" to 20'. Mr. Midget seconded the motion.

Mr. Midget stated that he opposed the application at the October 18, 1995 meeting because of the precedent and distance from the node; however, with the PUD conditions Staff has recommended he now believes the proposal to be an acceptable use.

### TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **BALLARD**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-1** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Pace "aye"; no "nays"; Taylor "abstaining"; Boyle, Selph "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of Z-6508 for CS zoning for only the south 130' of the west 410' of Lot 1, Block 1 of Carman Ministries, Inc. Headquarters and **APPROVAL** of PUD 386-A with the conditions suggested by Staff and as modified by TMAPC.



**PUD 386-A LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

Lot 1, Block 1, Carman Ministries, Inc. Headquarters, a subdivision in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**Z-6508 LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

Rezone the following to CS:

The south 130' of the west 410' of Lot 1, Block 1 of Carman Ministries Inc., Headquarters, a subdivision in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:**

Application No.: **Z-6509**

Applicant: Larry Johnston

Location: Southeast corner of 35th Street South and South Indianapolis Avenue.

Date of Hearing: October 25, 1995

Presentation to TMAPC:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

Present Zoning: RS-3

Proposed Zoning: PK

The District 6 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the property as Low Intensity - Residential.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested PK is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Comments:

**Site Analysis:** The subject property is approximately 295' x 125' in size and is located on the southeast corner of East 35th Street South and South Indianapolis Avenue. It is non-wooded, flat, has a three single-family dwellings, and is zoned RS-3.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The subject tract is abutted on the north by an apartment complex, zoned RM-1; to the east by single-family dwellings, zoned RS-3; to the south by a parking lot, zoned PK; and to the west by a church and accessory children's nursery, zoned CS.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** Previous rezoning applications have permitted PK zoning in this area on property directly south of the subject tract. A special exception has also been granted by the Board of Adjustment to allow off-street parking on the adjoining lot to the south.

**Conclusion:** Based on the earlier rezoning cases, the Board of Adjustment action which allowed parking on the adjoining property after acquisition by the church and the surrounding uses, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PK zoning for Z-6509 as requested.

Interested Parties

**Jeff Lower**

**3348 South Jamestown 74135**

Mr. Lower explained that he was not opposed to the rezoning and stated that he is addressing screening concerns with a representative from the church.

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Boyle, Selph "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of PK zoning for Z-6509 as recommended by Staff.

**Z-6509 LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

Lots 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, Block 3, Eisenhower Addition, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

\*\*\*\*\*

Application No.: **Z-6510/PUD 540**

Applicant: Roy D. Johnsen

Location: North of Northwest corner of 101st Street & South Yale

Date of Hearing: October 25, 1995

Presentation to TMAPC: Roy Johnsen

Present Zoning: AG

Proposed Zoning: RS-2

**Z-6510:** North of the northwest corner East 101st Street S. & S. Yale Avenue

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 26 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the property as Low Intensity - Residential.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested RS-2 is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Comments:

**Site Analysis:** The subject property is divided by E. 97th Place South into two separate tracts which represent approximately 19.2 acres in total size, it is wooded, gently sloping, with a single-family dwelling on each tract, and is zoned AG.

**Surrounding Area Analysis:** The tract is abutted on the north by the Creek Turnpike, zoned AG; to the east and west by single-family dwellings, zoned RS-1; and to the south by vacant property zoned RS-1 and PUD-503.

**Zoning and BOA Historical Summary:** The areas to the east, west and south have been approved for single-family development.

**Conclusion:** The proposed RS-2 zoning is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, but not in keeping with the surrounding zoning and existing development in the area. Staff, therefore recommends **DENIAL** of RS-2 and **APPROVAL** of RS-1 for Z-6510.

**AND**

**PUD-540 -- Southwest corner of the Creek Turnpike and Yale Ave**

**NOTE:** Staff has determined that the Hunters Pointe Property Owner's Association, which owns property within 300' of this request, was not mailed notice as required by law.

The applicant is proposing a single-family residential PUD on private streets containing up to 51 dwellings. Access would be from an existing private street currently serving Hunter's Pointe (97th Street South). No standards for the private roadway or minimum lot size were proposed by the applicant. The conceptual private street and lot layout is unacceptable to Staff and should not be endorsed by the Planning Commission. Minimum lot widths are proposed to be 60'. Staff feels these narrow lots are incompatible with the surrounding lots which are typically more than twice this wide. In Staff's opinion, a more appropriate minimum standard for these lots would be RS-1 bulk and area requirements. Also, no evidence has been provided that the homeowners association responsible for the maintenance of 97th Place has agreed to allow this new subdivision to use their street for access to Yale Avenue, and the proposed Preliminary Plat does not comply with the proposed PUD conditions.

Staff finds the uses, and with modification, the intensities of development proposed to be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code. Based on the following conditions, Staff finds PUD-540 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-540 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:**

Land Area (Gross):	19.2693 acres
(Net)	16.95 acres
Permitted Uses	Use Unit 6 and customary accessory uses
Maximum Number of Dwelling Units	46
Minimum Bulk and Area Requirements	RS-1

3. All streets may be private, but must be built to the same standards as a public minor residential street and provide at least a 30' right-of-way with easements and cul-de-sacs designed to meet the requirements of the TAC. Access to 97th Street South must be approved by the Hunters Pointe Property Owners Association, Incorporated.
4. A homeowners association shall be created and vested with sufficient authority and financial resources to properly maintain all common areas and private streets, including any stormwater detention areas within the PUD.
5. All private roadways shall be a minimum of 26' in width, measured face-to-face of curb. All curbs, gutters, base and paving materials used shall be of a quality and thickness which meets the City of Tulsa standards for a minor residential public street. The maximum vertical grade of private streets shall be 10%.
6. No Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 1107E of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval and making the City beneficiary to said covenants.
7. Subject to conditions recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee during the subdivision platting process which are approved by TMAPC.

#### Applicant's Comments

Mr. Johnsen, attorney for the applicant, informed that he has a letter from the homeowner's association (HOA) waiving the requirement of mailed notice and presented a copy of the letter for the record. He noted that 97th Street South, which extends between the subject tracts, is a private street and not part of the application. Mr. Johnsen informed that a decorative wall is planned for construction along Yale Avenue with a guard house to be erected on East 97th Place. The Hunter's Pointe Property Owner's Association have agreed that purchasers of lots of the subject tracts shall be members of the property owner's association, and in exchange, the subject lots may derive access from 97th Street. Mr. Johnsen disclosed that 52 lots are planned for the development and amended his request to RS-1 zoning. He presented the application, pointing out that there are two existing homes in the southern tract which development is designed around. Mr. Johnsen explained that the northern development will contain large homes on small lots. He commented that the development will be an extension of Hunter's Pointe and has the support of area residents. Mr. Johnsen called attention to the varying lot sizes in the northern tract and commented on topographical considerations and pipeline easements that had to be considered. He noted that older neighborhoods in Tulsa contained lots that were not uniform and the developer wants to achieve that same effect with this development. Mr. Johnsen deemed that it is not necessary for all the lots to be uniform and pointed out that the quality proposed is high and compatible with development in Hunter's Pointe. Mr. Johnsen explained that in an attempt to minimize unnecessary paving, hammerhead streets are proposed which will meet access requirements. He cited examples of other subdivisions where hammerheads have been successful. He pointed out areas reserved for guest parking. Mr. Johnsen advised that the two cul-de-sacs in the southern tract cannot be joined because of the existing house on Lot 18, which will be part of the subdivision. Mr. Johnsen reviewed development standards for the proposed development. He declared that it is not necessary to allow space for two cars

parked in the driveway end-to-end since there will be a two-car garage. Mr. Johnsen proposed a setback of 35' to centerline of the street.

Mr. Stump stated that Staff recommends at least the same setback as required in RS-3, 50' from centerline. He stated that this is necessary to accommodate vehicle stacking in the driveway.

Mr. Johnsen cited an instance in Colefax Hills where the Planning Commission required 35' to the centerline of the private street, recognizing there was sufficient space for two cars to be in the garage and two cars side-by-side in front of the garage. He reiterated that the intent of this development is to have smaller front yards.

TMAPC Review

Discussion ensued regarding sufficient driveway length.

Mr. Doherty deemed that the layout presented appears to contain a number of items requiring waiver of subdivision regulations, one of which is cul-de-sac length. He deemed RS-1 zoning to be appropriate for the area.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; Ledford "abstaining"; Boyle, Midget, Selph "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of RS-1 zoning for Z-6510 as recommended by Staff.

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION**

**HUNTER'S POINTE II**  
**ZONING LEGALS (GROSS)**

A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION-21, T-18-N, R-13-E, IN THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT: "BEGINNING AT A POINT" WHICH IS THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID NE/4 OF THE SE/4; THENCE N 0°10'55" E ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 FOR 610.17'; THENCE N 89°58'00" W AND ALONG THE SOUTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF EAST 97TH PLACE FOR 660.67' TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF BLOCK-1 OF "HUNTER'S POINTE", A SUBDIVISION IN THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA; THENCE S 0°10'25" W ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE FOR 610.30' TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION-21; THENCE S 89°58'40" E ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE FOR 660.58' TO THE "POINT OF BEGINNING" OF SAID TRACT OF LAND AND CONTAINING 403,136 SQUARE FEET OR 9.2547 ACRES MORE OR LESS;

**AND**

A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION-21, T-18-N, R-13-E, IN THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT: COMMENCING AT A POINT WHICH IS THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID NE/4 OF THE SE/4; THENCE N 0°10'55" E ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 FOR 660.17' TO THE "POINT OF BEGINNING" OF SAID TRACT OF LAND; THENCE CONTINUING N 0°10'55" E ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE FOR 660.17' TO THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF SAID NE/4 OF THE SE/4; THENCE N 89°57'20" W ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 FOR 660.78' TO A POINT ON THE EASTERLY LINE OF BLOCK-2 OF "HUNTERS POINTE", A SUBDIVISION IN THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA; THENCE S 0°10'25" W ALONG SAID EASTERLY LINE FOR 660.30' TO A POINT ON THE NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF EAST 97TH PLACE; THENCE S 89°58'00" E ALONG SAID NORTHERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE FOR 660.68' TO THE "POINT OF BEGINNING" OF SAID TRACT OF LAND AND CONTAINING 436,234 SQUARE FEET OR 10.0146 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

TMAPC Review of PUD 540

Ms. Ballard made a motion for approval of PUD 540 as presented. Motion died for lack of a second.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that the applicant's request and Staff recommendation are so different that a continuance would be appropriate.

Mr. Johnsen requested guidance on issues the Planning Commission would suggest for redesign.

Mr. Carnes suggested that considering the length of the cul-de-sac, a turn-around rather than a hammerhead would be a better design. He noted that there are five 55' lots in the north section that is too much density for the area, and driveway length should be increased to accommodate vehicle parking.

Mr. Doherty expressed having problems with the design; however, he expressed no opposition to the variety of lot sizes. Mr. Doherty expressed being opposed to a gated community and private streets in this location, and with the number of lots in the northern tract, which is not in keeping with the development to the west. He stated that the northern and southern sections should be more balanced.

Mr. Stump suggested that bulk and area requirements be met for RS-2 districts and that the front building setbacks be 50' from centerline, which is RS-3 standard.

Ms. Pace was concerned over limits of access and stated that she could not support the application.

Mr. Midget was concerned over the high density in the development.

Mr. Johnsen requested a continuance in order to discuss the Planning Commission's concerns with his client.

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **TAYLOR**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-2** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; Ledford, Midget "abstaining"; Boyle, Selph "absent") to **CONTINUE** PUD 540 to November 1, 1995.

\*\*\*\*\*

Application No.: **PUD-128-E-3** Minor Amendment  
Applicant: Eric Nelson  
Location: 7700 Riverside Drive - Lot 1, Block 1 of 7700 Riverside Park  
Date of Hearing: October 25, 1995

The applicant is requesting approval of a minor amendment to allow increase in the size of two apartment identification signs. The request is to increase in size from 11.25 SF to 18 SF each.

Staff has reviewed the request and finds that the Commission approved the location of two signs at this site in October of 1994. The approval was subject to maximum size of 15 SF per sign. The site has frontage sufficient to approve signage of 110 SF.

The Board subsequently approved a request for variance to allow more than one sign on the frontage.

Staff opinion is that the signs as proposed are in keeping with the character of the PUD and therefore recommends **APPROVAL**.

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Boyle, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 128-E-3 Minor Amendment as recommended by Staff.

\*\*\*\*\*



**OTHER BUSINESS:**

A Resolution finding that the amendments to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP) area in connection with the twenty-first year Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program are in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan of the City of Tulsa.

**Staff Comments**

Ms. Matthews informed that these are amendments to the NDP Plans and she highlighted the proposed changes. She reported that Staff has reviewed the District 2 and District 4 Plans and find that they are in accord. Ms. Matthews advised that the Comprehensive Plan Committee also found the amendments to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

**TMAPC Action; 9 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; "abstaining"; Boyle, Selph "absent") to **FIND** that the amendments to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Neighborhood Development Program (NDP) area in connection with the twenty-first year Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program to be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area as recommended by Staff.

\*\*\*\*\*

PUD-537 Wm. Gregg Simpson.

**(PD-17)(CD-6)**

407 S. 129th East Avenue. Site Plan for a mini-storage development.

**Staff Comments**

Mr. Stump announced that Staff has found this item requires a minor amendment and is not yet ready for site plan approval.

Hearing no objection, Chairman Carnes struck this item from the agenda.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PUD-510 - Detail Site Plan for Development Areas A and C -- northwest corner of 12th Street South and Yale Ave.**

The Will Rogers United Methodist Church is proposing a major expansion of their facilities and converting two lots on the west side of Winston Avenue to a parking lot. Staff has reviewed the proposed site plan and finds it complies with the PUD conditions with the following conditions:

1. The existing church and proposed expansion do not exceed 75,000 SF of building floor area nor two stories in height.
2. The parking in Development Area C is setback at least 5' from the right-of-way of Winston Avenue.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **HORNER**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Ledford, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Boyle, Midget, Selph "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 510 Site Plan as recommended by Staff.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Request by Bruce Bolzle to have the TMAPC initiate a rezoning request to CH for City owned property at the northeast corner of 15th Street South and Cincinnati.**

**TMAPC Comments**

Although Mr. Ledford informed that he would be abstaining from voting on this item, Chairman Carnes asked him to address the request.

Mr. Ledford explained that Mr. Bolzle is attempting to redevelop the subject area and informed that the City owns property east of Cincinnati and north of 15th Street. Mr. Ledford stated that Mr. Bolzle is attempting to work with the City toward a plan where the City's stormwater property will be included in the development and also that most of the City's tract will be used as a detention facility.

The Planning Commissioners expressed concern over including property in a rezoning request without the owner's knowledge. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to instruct Staff to advertise for public hearing to include rezoning of the City-owned property at the northeast corner of 15th Street South and Cincinnati, as requested by Mr. Bolzle.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Gray, Horner, Midget, Pace, Taylor "aye"; no "nays"; Ledford "abstaining"; Ballard, Boyle, Selph "absent") to **AUTHORIZE** Staff to include within Mr. Bolzle's description for rezoning City-owned property.

\*\*\*\*\*

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Date Approved: 11-8-95

*[Signature]*  
Chairman

ATTEST:

*[Signature]*  
Secretary

