

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 2397

Wednesday, December 1, 2004, 1:30 p.m.

Francis Campbell City Council Room
Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Bayles	Jackson	Alberty	Romig, Legal
Carnes	Miller	Chronister	
Coutant		Fernandez	
Harmon		Huntsinger	
Hill		Matthews	
Horner			
Ledford			
Midget			
Westervelt			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Wednesday, November 24, 2004 at 9:50 a.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

After declaring a quorum present, Vice Chair Hill called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of November 3, 2004, Meeting No. 2395

On **MOTION** of **CARNES** the TMAPC voted 8-0-1 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Bayles "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of November 3, 2004, Meeting No. 2395.

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Ms. Hill reported that there are some housekeeping items to take care of. The plat waiver for Z-6903/PUD-689 has been stricken from the agenda. There are two requests for continuances: The Wal-Mart Supercenter No. 1597-03 and Indigo Run, preliminary plats to January 19, 2005.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **CONTINUE** the preliminary plat for Wal-Mart Supercenter No. 1597-03 to January 19, 2005.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **CONTINUE** the preliminary plat for Indigo Run to January 19, 2005.

Worksession Report:

Ms. Hill reported that there will be a worksession held at City Hall in Room 1102 immediately following today's meeting.

Director's Report:

Mr. Alberty reported on the November 18th City Council meeting and the upcoming City Council meeting on December 2, 2004.

Mr. Alberty reported that the Planning Commission will be receiving a request from the City Council to recommend text amendments to the Zoning Code to allow appeals of the Board of Adjustment go to the City Council. There will a discussion item on this topic at today's worksession.

SUBDIVISIONS:

LOT-SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

L-19748 – Holly Dowell (9030) (PD-23) (County)
5008 South 265th West Avenue

L-19762 – Sack & Associates, Inc. (8321) (PD-26) (CD-8)
9640 South Winston

L-19766 – Jeff Levinson (0334) (PD-16) (CD-3)
5803 East Easton

L-19767 – Kevin Coutant (9326) (PD-18) (CD-5)
4411 South Sheridan

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

All of these lot-splits are in order and staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller absent") to **RATIFY** these lot-splits given prior approval, finding them in accordance with Subdivision Regulations as recommended by staff.

FINAL PLAT:

Hadley Meadows – (2324) (PD-14) (County)
149th Street North and Mingo Road

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of five lots in two blocks on 7.1 acres.

All release letters have been received for this final plat and staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the final plat for Hadley Meadows per staff recommendation.

Bogart Center – (9401)

(PD-17) (CD-6)

18725 East Admiral Place

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of one lot in one block on 2.4 acres.

All release letters have been received for this final plat and staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HORNER**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the final plat for Bogart Center per staff recommendation.

Mr. Ledford announced that he would be abstaining from the following item.

Crosstimbers at Northwest Passage – PUD 624 (2202)

(PD 11) (CD 1)

North of Apache, between Gilcrease Drive and Osage Drive

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of 91 lots in five blocks on 28.2 acres.

All release letters have been received for this final plat and staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HARMON**, TMAPC voted 8-0-1 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Ledford "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the final plat for Crosstimbers at Northwest Passage Addition per staff recommendation.

EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY PLAT:

Trinity Creek – (9426)

(PD-17) (CD-6)

Northeast corner of East 51st Street South and South 161st East Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of a one-year extension of the additional phases (phase one has been platted) of this large residential addition.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HARMON**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the extension of the preliminary plat for Trinity Creek for one year per staff recommendation.

MINOR SUBDIVISION PLAT:

Arvest Midtown – (PUD 708) (9307)

(PD-6) (CD-4)

Southeast corner of East 15th Street and Utica Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of one lot, one block, on 1.17 acres.

The following issues were discussed October 21, 2004, November 4, 2004 and November 18, 2004 at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings:

1. **Zoning:** The property is zoned PUD 708. All PUD conditions must be met and shown on face of plat and in covenants as appropriate.
2. **Streets:** Add 28-foot triangle right-of-way dedication at intersection, ten-foot sidewalk and utility easements along 15th and Utica. There is a 1.05 deficiency for Victor Avenue which may need a waiver. Show book and page of the vacated alley on final plat. (An application to close the alley should be submitted to Public Works first.) The vacated alley referenced in the covenants in the legal description will require City Council action. Replace Victor sidewalks if existing.
3. **Sewer:** A revised plan has not been received. A minimum 15-foot wide easement is required for the existing sanitary sewer line that is within the mutual access easement.
4. **Water:** No comments.
5. **Storm Drainage:** At a minimum, the case number for the vacated alleyway must be added to the face of plat. Utility easement widths are substandard. If an overland drainage easement is required for the floodplain, then please add the standard language for it to the covenants. Add the 100-year water surface elevation for the Swan Creek City of Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain. If the boundary extends outside the Victor Avenue street right-of-way, then an overland drainage easement for the floodplain will be required.
6. **Utilities:** Release letters should be forthcoming.
7. **Other: Fire:** No comment.

Staff can recommend **APPROVAL** of the preliminary plat if the waiver is granted as required and with the following conditions:

Waivers of Subdivision Regulations:

1. A waiver to the Major Street and Highway Plan to the 40 feet of required right-of-way along 15th Street is required.

Special Conditions:

1. The concerns of the Public Works Department staff must be taken care of to their satisfaction, especially concerning right-of-way dedication along 15th, and traffic flow for Victor and Utica.

Standard Conditions:

1. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements shall be tied to or related to property line and/or lot lines.
2. Water and sanitary sewer plans shall be approved by the Public Works Department prior to release of final plat. (Include language for W/S facilities in covenants.)
3. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s).
4. Any request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Public Works Department Engineer prior to release of final plat.
5. Paving and/or drainage plans (as required) shall be approved by the Public Works Department.
6. Any request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Public Works Department.
7. A topography map shall be submitted for review by TAC (Subdivision Regulations). (Submit with drainage plans as directed.)
8. Street names shall be approved by the Public Works Department and shown on plat.
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. Bearings, or true N/S, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by the County Engineer.
11. All adjacent streets, intersections and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
12. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Public Works Department during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for plat release.)

13. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City/County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
14. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department. [Percolation tests (if applicable) are required prior to preliminary approval of plat.]
15. The owner(s) shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot: type, size and general location. (This information to be included in restrictive covenants on plat.)
16. The method of water supply and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department.
17. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
18. The key or location map shall be complete.
19. A Corporation Commission letter, Certificate of Non-Development, or other records as may be on file, shall be provided concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged. If plugged, provide plugging records.)
20. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be provided prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under 3.6.5 Subdivision Regulations.)
21. Applicant is advised of his responsibility to contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding Section 404 of the Clean Waters Act.
22. All other Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.
23. All PUD standards and conditions shall be included in the covenants of the plat and adequate mechanisms established to assure initial and continued compliance with the standards and conditions.
24. Private streets shall be built to City or County standards (depending upon the jurisdiction in which the plat is located) and inspected and accepted by same prior to issuance of any building permits in the subdivision.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the waiver of Subdivision Regulations and the minor subdivision plat, subject to special conditions and standard conditions per staff recommendation.

PRELIMINARY PLAT:

Country Club – (0234)

(PD-11) (CD-1)

Country Club Drive and West Haskell Street

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of 21 lots, two blocks, on 4.97 acres.

The following issues were discussed November 4, 2004 and November 18, 2004 at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings:

1. **Zoning:** The property is zoned RS-2, RM-2, CS with a Board of Adjustment variance request pending to lessen lot width on certain lots and for a Special Exception. Any conditions imposed by the Board will need to be met in the plat.
2. **Streets:** Show right-of-way dedications by platting or separate instrument, as appropriate. Include plat name or unplatted designation on all adjacent properties. Dimension the location of right-of-way points of interest near the northeast corner of Lot 1, Block 2, and the southeast corner of Lot 13, Block 2. Identify both "Blocks 1 and 2". Add language describing the purpose and maintenance of Reserve A.
3. **Sewer:** Check with Mark Rogers, with Underground Collections, concerning the condition of the existing sanitary sewer system. If rehabilitation of the existing line is required before any new taps are made, then it will be at the developers' expense.
4. **Water:** Show water line sizes and fire hydrant locations.
5. **Storm Drainage:** Filling or regrading of the proposed platted area cannot increase the quantity or the velocity of runoff off-site to the west onto the Tulsa Country Club. Topographic information should not be placed on the face of the plat. A storm sewer easement with a minimum width of 15 feet, centered on the existing pipe, must be added across the southwest corner of

Lot 13, Block 2. If the stormwater detention and overland drainage easements are required, then the standard language for these easements and facilities must be added. Correct typos.

6. **Utilities: ONG:** A 17.5 foot easement is needed along roadway. **PSO, COX:** Okay.
7. **Other: Fire:** No comment. **GIS:** Will need Osage County information and point of beginning tie to section corner (bearing and distance). Legal descriptions must match on the plat and the covenants. Show point of beginning. Need reference information in order to plot. Must have information (bearing and distance) connecting the two blocks. Match legal description with bearing and distance on plat. Show purpose of Reserve A (and maintenance).

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary plat subject to the special and standard conditions below.

Waivers of Subdivision Regulations:

1. None requested.

Special Conditions:

1. The concerns of the Public Works Department staff must be taken care of to their satisfaction.

Standard Conditions:

1. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements shall be tied to or related to property line and/or lot lines.
2. Water and sanitary sewer plans shall be approved by the Public Works Department prior to release of final plat. (Include language for W/S facilities in covenants.)
3. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s).
4. Any request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Public Works Department engineer prior to release of final plat.
5. Paving and/or drainage plans (as required) shall be approved by the Public Works Department.

6. Any request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Public Works Department.
7. A topography map shall be submitted for review by TAC (Subdivision Regulations). (Submit with drainage plans as directed.)
8. Street names shall be approved by the Public Works Department and shown on plat.
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. Bearings, or true N/S, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by the County Engineer.
11. All adjacent streets, intersections and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
12. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Public Works Department during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for plat release.)
13. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City/County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
14. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department. [Percolation tests (if applicable) are required prior to preliminary approval of plat.]
15. The owner(s) shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot: type, size and general location. (This information to be included in restrictive covenants on plat.)
16. The method of water supply and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department.
17. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
18. The key or location map shall be complete.

19. A Corporation Commission letter, Certificate of Non-Development, or other records as may be on file, shall be provided concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged. If plugged, provide plugging records.)
20. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be provided prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under 3.6.5 Subdivision Regulations.)
21. Applicant is advised of his responsibility to contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding Section 404 of the Clean Waters Act.
22. All other Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.
23. All PUD standards and conditions shall be included in the covenants of the plat and adequate mechanisms established to assure initial and continued compliance with the standards and conditions.
24. Private streets shall be built to City or County standards (depending upon the jurisdiction in which the plat is located) and inspected and accepted by same prior to issuance of any building permits in the subdivision.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted 8-0-1 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Ledford "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the preliminary plat for Country Club, subject to special conditions and standard conditions per staff recommendation.

Mr. Ledford announced that he would be abstaining from the following item.

Traditions at Southern Hills – (8305) (PD-18) (CD-2)

East 62nd Street, West side of Harvard Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of ten lots, two blocks, on 3.74 acres.

The following issues were discussed November 18, 2004 at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting:

1. **Zoning:** The property is zoned PUD-710. All PUD requirements must be shown correctly on the plat and in the covenants.
2. **Streets:** Provide 30-foot radii at southeast corner of Reserve E and northeast corner of Lot 2, Block 1, of property lines at intersection of private street and Harvard, per Subdivision Regulations. Show 50-foot wide strip from centerline of South Harvard to property line as right-of-way dedicated by the plat, to conform to language in deed, Section I.A., or clarify. Extend utility easement along Harvard through Reserves G and E for future South Harvard improvements. Delete language "less and except" the west 25.25 and show on face of plat as part of property description, with dedication as stated in Section I A. Public Works policy requires sidewalks on arterials. Show book/page of the west 25.25 feet of the arterial right-of-way and show ownership adjacent to the section line per the legal and dedicate the east 24.75 as public right-of-way. Change "60-foot access" to "54-foot access with median". Show a fence easement on private lots per Section III. Extend the 17.5-foot utility easement on private lots per Section III. Extend the 17.5-foot utility easement across both Reserves E and F outside the width of the proposed fence easement. Verify the dimension of the west property line and show bearings of all appropriate lines. In the dedication, change "street" to "street right-of-way". No objection to the 24 feet of paving with off-street parking per the PUD.
3. **Sewer:** The existing sanitary sewer line, which runs along the west side of the plat, should have an existing easement. Show that easement on the plat. Continue the 15-foot utility easement along the east side of Lots 2 and 3, Block 2 through Reserve D. Also continue the 11-foot utility easement along the north line of Lot 1 Block 2 through Reserve E. Add easement to Reserve B to accommodate the existing sanitary sewer line and the proposed water line. In Section II B, add "and utility easement" to private street. Also add it to the text and to the uses that are allowed within the street. Also add utility easement to Reserve G. In Lot 1, Block 2, the sanitary sewer must be within an easement.
4. **Water:** Need water easements in reserve areas B and F. The language for Reserve Areas B and F do not include the water main utility easement. Add to covenants for these reserve areas. All water mains to be in a utility easement, reserve or a restricted water line easement. The addition has only one feed; it is not a looped system. The 12-inch water main along Harvard Avenue is the only supply of water to this addition. Clarify the six-inch mainline looped back into itself as this may not be necessary. Further discussion is needed with Public Works on the water lines.

5. **Storm Drainage:** Need easement on east side of Lot 6 for storm sewer. Need offsite easement for stormwater drainage on northwest corner. Section II C needs to be rewritten. Fencing and landscaping are not allowed where stormwater is flowing overland. Identify what the ST lines are that are shown in Lots 4 and the cul-de-sac areas. If they are stormwater pipes, then what happens to them? Reserves C and D will carry stormwater overland. Clarify how this will flow to the detention pond. An easement is needed for the pipe that appears to be on the golf course on the northwest corner. Is the storm sewer that is shown along Harvard Avenue existing or proposed as shown on the drawing?
6. **Utilities: PSO, ONG and Cox:** Additional easements will be needed.
7. **Other: Fire:** No comment.

GIS: Show point of beginning. Include bearings with description. Legal description is incomplete. Property abutting along north property line, east side, needs to be identified as to ownership or platting status, easements, etc. In locations map include two blocks with ten lots description. Label point of beginning. Add legend. Property line dimensions do not agree with those on Deed of Dedication legal description. Please correct. Section II F3 a, "building line depicted" as referenced is not shown on face of plat. Please correct on plat. Add reserve descriptions in Section I.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary plat subject to the special and standard conditions below.

Waivers of Subdivision Regulations:

1. None requested.

Special Conditions:

1. The concerns of the Public Works Department staff must be taken care of to their satisfaction.

Standard Conditions:

1. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements shall be tied to or related to property line and/or lot lines.
2. Water and sanitary sewer plans shall be approved by the Public Works Department prior to release of final plat. (Include language for W/S facilities in covenants.)

3. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s).
4. Any request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Public Works Department engineer prior to release of final plat.
5. Paving and/or drainage plans (as required) shall be approved by the Public Works Department.
6. Any request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Public Works Department.
7. A topography map shall be submitted for review by TAC (Subdivision Regulations). (Submit with drainage plans as directed.)
8. Street names shall be approved by the Public Works Department and shown on plat.
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. Bearings, or true N/S, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by the County Engineer.
11. All adjacent streets, intersections and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
12. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Public Works Department during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for plat release.)
13. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City/County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
14. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department. [Percolation tests (if applicable) are required prior to preliminary approval of plat.]
15. The owner(s) shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot: type, size and general location. (This information to be included in restrictive covenants on plat.)

16. The method of water supply and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department.
17. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
18. The key or location map shall be complete.
19. A Corporation Commission letter, Certificate of Non-Development, or other records as may be on file, shall be provided concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged. If plugged, provide plugging records.)
20. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be provided prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under 3.6.5 Subdivision Regulations.)
21. Applicant is advised of his responsibility to contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding Section 404 of the Clean Waters Act.
22. All other Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.
23. All PUD standards and conditions shall be included in the covenants of the plat and adequate mechanisms established to assure initial and continued compliance with the standards and conditions.
24. Private streets shall be built to City or County standards (depending upon the jurisdiction in which the plat is located) and inspected and accepted by same prior to issuance of any building permits in the subdivision.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Ed Mascarin, 3203 East 62nd Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136, stated that he is opposed to this application for the same reasons he was against the PUD. He expressed concerns that his view of the golf course will be hindered by a parking lot. He further expressed concerns regarding the ingress/egress and the dangers they will cause. Mr. Mascarin concluded by pointing out that there is a covenant (filed of record) from 1952 restricting development in the 100-foot line along the southern boundary of the subject property. He indicated that this development will lower his property value and he is concerned about the safety issues.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Mascarin if the covenant is filed of record. In response, Mr. Mascarin answered affirmatively.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Tim Terral, Tulsa Engineering and Planning, 6737 South 85th East Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74133, stated that the parking lot Mr. Mascarin is talking about is a five-guest parking area and will not block anyone's view. There will not be any continuous 24-hour parking, no RV storage, no boat storage, etc. The access onto Harvard will be determined by the City of Tulsa and his client doesn't feel that it will be an issue. The subject property is being replatted and will have new covenants that will address any issues. The 100-foot line that Mr. Mascarin is talking about is from the previous covenants filed in 1954, and he is not sure how this will work out, since it is from a previous plat. The line will go away with the new plat.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Terral if he was aware of the old covenant. In response, Mr. Terral stated that this covenant has been brought up before. Mr. Harmon asked if the covenant is still in full force. In response, Mr. Terral stated that he is unsure if it is still in effect.

Mr. Westervelt stated that he could make a motion to approve this preliminary plat, noting that the covenants are a civil matter and if there is anything to be resolved, it would be handled as a civil matter and not before the Planning Commission.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 8-0-1 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Ledford "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the preliminary plat for Traditions at Southern Hills, subject to special conditions and standard conditions per staff recommendation.

BOA-19850 – Tulsa International Baptist Church - (9312) (PD-5) (CD-5)

8707 East 19th Street

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The platting requirement was triggered by BOA-19850 which allowed a church use in a RS-1 district.

Staff provides the following information from TAC at their November 18, 2004 meeting:

ZONING:

TMAPC staff: The plat waiver is for property zoned RS-1 with a Special Exception for a church use.

STREETS:

Confirm right-of-way for both streets. Recommend sidewalks on 17th and 19th.

SEWER:

Add a 17.5-foot easement along the west property line for future sanitary sewer extension.

WATER:

No comments.

STORM DRAIN:

No comments.

FIRE:

No comments.

UTILITIES:

Perimeter easements need to be dedicated.

Staff will have a recommendation for the plat waiver requested at the meeting.

A YES answer to the following 3 questions would generally be FAVORABLE to a plat waiver:

	Yes	NO
1. Has property previously been platted?	X	
2. Are there restrictive covenants contained in a previously filed plat?		X
3. Is property adequately described by surrounding platted properties or street right-of-way?	X	

A YES answer to the remaining questions would generally NOT be favorable to a plat waiver:

	YES	NO
4. Is right-of-way dedication required to comply with Major Street and Highway Plan?		X
5. Would restrictive covenants be required to be filed by separate instrument if the plat were waived?		X
6. Infrastructure requirements:		
a) Water		
i. Is a main line water extension required?		X
ii. Is an internal system or fire line required?		X

- | | |
|---|---|
| iii. Are additional easements required? | X |
| b) Sanitary Sewer | |
| i. Is a main line extension required? | X |
| ii. Is an internal system required? | X |
| iii. Are additional easements required? | X |
| c) Storm Sewer | |
| i. Is a P.F.P.I. required? | X |
| ii. Is an Overland Drainage Easement required? | X |
| iii. Is on site detention required? | X |
| iv. Are additional easements required? | X |
| 7. Floodplain | |
| a) Does the property contain a City of Tulsa (Regulatory) Floodplain? | X |
| b) Does the property contain a F.E.M.A. (Federal) Floodplain? | X |
| 8. Change of Access | |
| a) Are revisions to existing access locations necessary? | X |
| 9. Is the property in a P.U.D.? | X |
| a) If yes, was plat recorded for the original P.U.D. | |
| 10. Is this a Major Amendment to a P.U.D.? | X |
| a) If yes, does the amendment make changes to the proposed physical development of the P.U.D.? | |
| 11. Are mutual access easements needed to assure adequate access to the site? | X |
| 12. Are there existing or planned medians near the site which would necessitate additional right-of-way dedication or other special considerations? | X |

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Ledford stated that he is concerned that the TAC Committee didn't really answer the question on water, storm drains and utilities. He doesn't understand how this much proposed development could be done without proper extensions of those utilities.

Mrs. Fernandez stated that there are two representatives from Public Works Development Services and possibly they could address Mr. Ledford's questions. She commented that the comments were taken from the staff at the TAC meeting. They write their comments before the meeting and they do a thorough review of the applications. She stated that Mr. Sack is also present and could probably answer these concerns.

Applicant's Comments:

Ted Sack, Sack & Associates, 111 South Elgin, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74120, stated that the drainage plans and utility plans have all been submitted and approved for this project. This one item is holding up the building permit at this point and time. The drainage, sewer and water concerns have been addressed. The utilities are around the site and it is mainly service lines that are needed to be

extended. There was a sanitary sewer extended to the subject property and up closer to the site a fee-in-lieu onsite detention has been able to be paid being in the Mingo Basin. All of the issues have been addressed.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **LEDFORD**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the plat waiver for BOA-19850 – Tulsa International Baptist Church per staff recommendation.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING

Application No.: Z-6961

RS-3 to OM

Applicant: Tulio Remington/Perryman Family Trust (PD-18) (CD-7)

Location: South of the southwest corner of East 51st Street and South Vandalia Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

PUD-284-A August 1992: A request for a major amendment to PUD-284 to increase the permitted number of dwelling units within the PUD from 168 to 176 was approved. The property is located on the northwest corner of East 53rd Street and South Urbana Avenue.

Z-5680/PUD-284 June 1982: Approval was granted to rezone a 1.5-acre tract located on the northwest corner of East 53rd Street and South Urbana Avenue and abutting the subject property on the south from RS-2 to RM-1 for the expansion of an existing nursing and retirement center.

AREA DESCRIPTION:

SITE ANALYSIS: The subject property is approximately four acres in size. It is located on the west side of South Vandalia Avenue and south of 51st Street. The property is flat, non-wooded, contains a health club facility and is zoned RS-2.

STREETS:

Exist. Access	MSHP Design.	MSHP R/W	Exist. # Lanes
South Vandalia Avenue	Residential	50'	2 lanes

UTILITIES: Municipal water and sewer are available.

SURROUNDING AREA:

The subject property is abutted on the north by part of the health club, zoned CH; to the east by Barcelona Apartments, zoned RM-1; to the west by a mini storage facility, zoned CH; and to the south by a retirement community, zoned RM-2. Farther north of the health club is a bank, zoned CH. To the northeast of the subject property and due east of the bank is a Steak and Ale Restaurant, zoned CS; and south of that is a veterinarian's office, zoned CS.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the property as Medium Intensity-Residential land use. According to the Plan Matrix, the requested OM zoning is **not** in accord with the Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This area is one of extremely mixed uses. Although the proposed rezoning is not in accord with the Plan, many similar office and related uses are nearby. If the Plan specified Medium Intensity-No Specific land use, the requested zoning would be in accord. Based on existing land uses, staff can support the requested rezoning and recommends **APPROVAL** of OM zoning for Z-6961.

If the TMAPC deems it appropriate to recommend approval of this rezoning, they should direct staff to prepare a Plan map amendment to reflect it.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Steve Pauliny, 5225 South Toledo Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135, stated that he would like to know the maximum number of stories the office building could have.

Ms. Matthews stated that everything is based on the setbacks because there is no height limitation with OM zoning. She explained that for every feet of height the building would have to be set back from the adjacent district.

Mr. Pauliny asked how large the building would be. In response, Ms. Matthews stated that the building would be as big as the lot would accommodate and still meet the setbacks. Ms. Matthews stated that at some point in the future the applicant will have to plat, and at that time the size of the building would be determined.

Mr. Pauliny stated that if the building is two or three stories he has no objections. In response, Ms. Matthews explained that with straight zoning, the Planning Commission can't place any conditions.

Applicant's Comments:

Tulio Remington, 4530 South Sheridan, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145, stated that the plan would be to build a building two stories high and possibly only one story. He indicated that his client may not develop it at this time. He explained that his client wanted to change the zoning in order to have more options to build something in the future or do something with property.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Ms. Hill suggested that Mr. Remington explain and clarify this with Mr. Pauliny.

Ms. Bayles stated that East 51st Street is very narrow before it moves into Toledo and she agrees with the interested party's concern regarding the size of the building. It should be in conjunction and relative to its surroundings and maintain that scale and mass of its surrounding area.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HARMON**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** the OM zoning for Z-6961 per staff recommendation.

Legal Description for Z-6961:

The NE/4, SW/4, NE/4, NE/4, less and except the South 132.00' thereof, Section 33, T-19-N, R-13-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government survey thereof, and located south of the southwest corner East 51st Street South and South Vandalia Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, **From RS-2 (Residential Single-family Medium Density District) To OM (Office Medium Intensity District).**

Application No.: PUD-375-D

MAJOR AMENDMENT

Applicant: Ted Sack/Life Park Christian Fellowship, (PD-8) (CD-2)
Inc.

Location: Northwest corner of West 61st Street South and South Union Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The original PUD-375 was approved in September 1984 for residential, office and commercial uses. The Riverfield Country Day School property was part of that PUD. PUD-375-A, approved in May 1989, reduced the number of and acreages for single-family residential and multifamily residential uses for the

PUD, leaving the original 112-acre property with 79.8 acres. In October 2003, PUD-375-B was approved, combining PUD-375-A with PUD-375-B and thereby transferring 48 acres then owned by Riverfield to PUD-375-B, adding a ten-acre tract on the west as part of the PUD and dividing the Riverfield property into development areas. In December 2003, PUD-375-C was approved for commercial and multifamily residential uses on a 29.79-acre tract east of the existing PUD-375-B boundaries and zoned CS, OL, RM-1 and RS-3. Specified development areas were A (multifamily), B (commercial), C (commercial) and D (commercial). The current PUD-375-D appears to incorporate development areas A, B and C. Development Area D remains as a commercial development area outside PUD-375-D. No development standard changes are proposed except the deletion of building setbacks from adjacent development area boundaries. The addition of Use Unit 5 uses, with no change in underlying zoning, is requested. Uses proposed in PUD-375-D are church and church-related, including missionary housing.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-375-D 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:

DEVELOPMENT AREA A

Same as in PUD-375-C except for deletion of building setbacks from adjacent development areas (which are Areas B and C and are included in this PUD), as follows:

Minimum building setback from other development area boundaries: 25 FT

DEVELOPMENT AREA B

Same as in PUD-375-C except for deletion of building setbacks from adjacent development areas, as follows:

Minimum building setback from other development area boundaries:

From west boundary of Development Area (abutting Area A) 30 FT

DEVELOPMENT AREA C

Same as in PUD-375-C except for deletion of building setbacks from adjacent development areas, as follows:

Minimum building setback from other development area boundaries:

From west and north boundary of Development Area (abutting Area A) 30 FT

3. Signs:

- A. Within Development Area A, signs shall be limited to one project identification sign located along the 61st Street frontage and complying with the sign provisions of the RM-1 district.
- B. Within Development Area B, signs shall be limited to:
 - (1) One ground sign to be located along the Union Avenue frontage a minimum of 200 feet from the north boundary of the Development Area, not exceeding 25 feet in height and a display surface area of 160 square feet, and
 - (2) Wall signs not exceeding one square foot of display surface area per lineal foot of building wall to which affixed and the length of a wall sign shall not exceed 75% of the tenant space. No wall signs shall be permitted on the north-facing walls.
- C. Within Development Area C, signs shall be limited to:
 - (1) One ground sign to be located along the 61st Street frontage, not exceeding 25 feet in height and a display surface area of 160 square feet, and
 - (2) Wall signs not exceeding two square feet of display surface area per lineal foot of building wall to which affixed and the length of a wall sign shall not exceed 75% of the tenant space.

4. Access:

Mutual access shall be provided to and from Development Areas B, C and D [the latter not in PUD-375-D]. All access shall be approved by Public Works. Pedestrian access shall be reviewed during detail site plan review.

No access drive from Union Avenue to Development Area A shall be within 150 feet of the north boundary of the PUD. Emergency access only for multifamily with a 25-foot setback.

5. Transfer of allocated floor area shall be subject to approval by TMAPC of a minor amendment.
6. A six-foot screening fence or wall meeting the requirements of Section 212A shall be erected along the north boundary of Development Area A. A six-foot masonry wall shall be erected along the north boundary of Development Area B.
7. No zoning clearance permit shall be issued for a lot within the PUD until a detail site plan for the lot, which includes all buildings, parking, screening fences and landscaping areas, has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD development standards.
8. A detail landscape plan for each lot shall be approved by the TMAPC prior to issuance of a building permit. 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 the lot, 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.
9. No sign permits shall be issued for erection of a sign on a lot within the PUD until a detail sign plan for that lot has been submitted to the TMAPC and approved as being in compliance with the approved PUD development standards.
10. Flashing signs, running light or twinkle signs animated signs, revolving or rotating signs or signs with movement shall be prohibited.
11. All trash, mechanical and equipment areas, including building mounted, shall be screened from public view in such a manner that the areas cannot be seen by persons standing at ground level.
12. Lighting used to illuminate the subject tract shall be so arranged as to shield and direct the light away from adjacent residential areas. Shielding of such light shall be designed so as to prevent the light-producing element or reflector of the light fixture from being visible to a person standing in the adjacent residential areas or street right-of-way. Light

standards or building-mounted light heights shall be determined during detail site plan review and approved by the TMAPC.

13. The Department of Public Works or a professional engineer registered in the State of Oklahoma shall certify to the appropriate City official that all required stormwater drainage structures and detention areas serving a lot have been installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to issuance of an occupancy permit on that lot.
14. No building permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 1107F 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 that relate to PUD conditions.
15. Subject to conditions recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee during the subdivision platting process which are approved by the TMAPC.
16. Approval of the PUD is not an endorsement of the conceptual layout. This will be done during detail site plan review or the subdivision platting process.
17. There shall be no outside storage of recyclable material, trash or similar material outside a screened receptacle, nor shall trucks or truck trailers be parked in the PUD except while they are actively being loaded or unloaded. Truck trailers and shipping containers shall not be used for storage in the PUD.
18. There shall be no development in the regulatory floodplain.

Staff finds the uses and intensities of development proposed to be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code. Based on the above conditions, staff finds PUD-375-D to be: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with existing and expected development of surrounding areas; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the project site; (4) and consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

TAC Comments for December 1, 2004:

Stormwater: Detention will be required.

Wastewater: Sanitary sewer service must be provided to all proposed lots.

Transportation: May require right-of-way dedications; insufficient information shown. [Note: applicant and review staff agreed this will be addressed in the platting stage.]

Traffic: The original PUD-375 called for a north-south collector street. Due to the steep ridge diagonally crossing the southwest corner of this tract, this proposal will likely make a public street unfeasible.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Kay Price, 5815 South 31st West Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74107, stated that she lives west from the subject property. She commented that the subject property is virgin land and it is one of the last pieces of property west of the river that is not public property or under some other type of development.

Ms. Price stated that she is concerned about two issues. The first is the density involved because this is a heavily wooded area. She indicated that she does not have any problem with the church use, but she is concerned with the proposed missionary housing. Ms. Price read the PUD Chapter from the Zoning Code book and stated that she didn't believe it would be a good idea to allow Use Unit 5 because it allows an adult daycare. This would be a highly inappropriate area to put an adult daycare because it is a very rural setting. The subject property is one mile from the Creek County line and everyone knows what Creek County looks like and it would be inappropriate to put adults who need attention in an area that is this rural.

Ms. Price expressed concerns for Mooser Creek and it is supposed to remain a free-flowing creek. She is concerned about the impact of additional water flow into the creek if this is improperly developed. She requested that an impact study be done on Mooser Creek.

Ms. Price stated that she is concerned about the proposed missionary housing because there is no other housing nearby. There is a school next door and a public housing project across the street to the east and then there are some Section 8 duplexes to the north. There is a substantial amount of land between those properties and to have missionary housing in the middle of this virgin land would not make sense because they would be isolated. She is concerned about the transient type because missionaries come and go constantly. She doesn't think this would be a good usage. She requested that the missionary housing be denied.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Midget asked Ms. Price to indicate where she lives on the case map. In response, Ms. Price indicated that she lives west of the property. She explained that Riverfield Country Day School is between her property and the subject property.

Mr. Ledford stated that today is not the venue to discuss stormwater management and related issues. Today the Planning Commission is only considering a major amendment to the PUD. As this property moves forward into the platting phase, then the consulting engineer will be required to do what is required by Public Works to make sure that Mooser Creek is protected.

Ms. Price stated that she wanted to state one more thing and then she read from the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Code.

Ms. Bayles stated that she is having some difficulty understanding Ms. Price's concerns about density and the nature of the missionary housing being a detriment to the subject PUD.

In response to Ms. Bayles, Ms. Price stated that she believes that the missionary homes would be isolated. Riverfield Country Day School is to the west of the subject property and at night there is no one there except the security guard. It would be a substantial distance from the nearest residential area and she is concerned that they would be there with people coming and going. She doesn't believe it would be good to have this one pocket of people living there. She expressed concerns that the residents of the missionary homes would not be permanent residents, which puts it on the same plane as an apartment, with people moving in and out. She doesn't believe that helps to make the neighborhood solid because it is much better to have solid citizens who are there all of the time and who care about the property, than if to have someone coming and going.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Ted Sack, Sack & Associates, 111 South Elgin, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74120, stated that his client is not associated with the Riverfield Country Day School, but is currently leasing and utilizing Riverfield as a church facility on a part-time basis until the facility is built on the subject property. His client has purchased Development Areas A, B and C. With this major amendment he is not requesting a change in the zoning or the existing PUD, which is approved by the City Council. He is requesting the right to use Development Areas A, B and C for church use because it was not permitted under the original PUD.

Mr. Sack stated that the original PUD would allow approximately 800 units on parcel of A as it exists today. He is not changing anything as it is approved to, except the right to have church use on Development A, B and C.

Mr. Sack stated that there is floodplain to the west of the subject property and he knows that onsite detention or at least an analysis of the drainage will have to be shown and approved by Public Works Department to show that there is no impact on the property downstream from this development.

Mr. Sack stated that he does have a conceptual site plan for the church, which is a very non-dense type use and the missionary housing that has been requested was just a clarification of the church use, which would be an incidental use. From time to time there would be missionaries who would come to town and they would like to provide housing for them while they are visiting. It is a church use that would be very minor in nature.

Mr. Sack stated that the clarification that he is asking for is the fencing requirement along the north boundary line. He explained that the church has met with several of the residents that live to the north and they would prefer that a fence not be placed along the north boundary. He requested that this issue be resolved during detail site plan review by either showing landscaping or some appropriate screening or a fence to be determined at that time.

Mr. Sack stated that the front portion of the subject property, which was Development Area B, in the screening requirement there was a requirement that the screening be a masonry fence, which is appropriate as long as the front would be used as commercial. If it is church use, he would like to have the option to have a consistent wooden screening fence all the way along the north boundary, with the understanding that if it were to become commercial, then a masonry fence would be appropriate.

Mr. Sack pointed out that the only other changes being made are the internal setbacks between Development Areas A, B and C. There would be no setbacks because the buildings would overlap the development boundary lines.

Mr. Sack stated that Riverfield Day School, to the west of the subject property, owns approximately over ½ mile of frontage and the interested party would have to live over ½ mile away from the subject property. He believes that the church use would be preferred over apartment use.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Sack if the missionary houses would be a free-standing single-family dwelling. In response, Mr. Sack stated that he doesn't believe his client knows at this time, but it could be a duplex-type use. The conceptual plan is showing some cottages. On the site plan there are approximately five shown, which would be very minor in nature.

Ms. Hill asked Mr. Sack if the people who would be staying in the missionary homes would be going through missionary training. In response, Mr. Sack stated training or between assignments. Ms. Hill asked if the housing would be maintained by the church. In response, Mr. Sack answered affirmatively.

Mr. Midget asked Mr. Sack if he wanted the area west of Area B to be open space with landscaping for screening. In response, Mr. Sack stated that he would like that possibility and at the time of the detail site plan he would address

that situation. The neighbors would like an open area and see all of the trees. If there is enough distance between the neighbors and development with enough landscaping he would like the possibility to present that to the Planning Commission at the time of the detail site plan and detail landscape plan for Development Areas A and B. He indicated that Area B would probably need fencing if it develops first and is a parking lot, but he would like that option to present to the Planning Commission once he has all of the details.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** the major amendment for PUD-375-D per staff recommendation, subject to a screening fence or open landscaping along the north boundary being determined during the detail site plan review.

Legal Description for PUD-375-D:

A tract of land in the SE/4, SE/4, of Section 34, T-19-N, R-12-E, of the IBM, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government survey thereof, being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: Starting at the Southeast corner of said Section 34; thence N 89°56'27" W along the South line of said Section a distance of 356.08' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land; thence continuing N 89°56'27" W along said South line a distance of 911.56'; thence due North a distance of 1,068.95' to the Southwest corner of Block 6 of the Amended Plat of Woodview Heights, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof; thence N 75°00'00" E along the South line of said Block 6 a distance of 230.49'; thence due East along the South line of said Block 6 a distance of 1,045.00 to a point on the Easterly line of the SE/4 of Section 34, T-19-N, R-12-E; thence due South along said Easterly line a distance of 450.05'; thence N 89°56'27" W a distance of 356.08; thence due South a distance of 679.86' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land, and located on the northwest corner of West 61st Street South and South Union Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, **FROM CS/OL/RM-1/RS-3/PUD (Commercial Shopping Center District/Office Low Intensity District/Residential Multifamily Low Density District/Residential Single-family High Density District/Planned Unit Development [PUD-375-C]) TO CS/OL/RM-1/RS-3/PUD (Commercial Shopping Center District/Office Low Intensity District/Residential Multifamily Low Density District/Residential Single-family High Density District/Planned Unit Development [PUD-375-D]).**

* * * * *

OTHER BUSINESS:

Application No.: PUD-579-A

DETAIL SITE PLAN

Applicant: DeShazo, Tang & Associates

(PD-18) (CD-8)

Location: Southwest corner of South 101st East Avenue and East 80th Street
South

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for a new single-story, non-medical use (General) office building. The proposed use, Use Unit 11, Offices and Studios, is permitted by PUD development standards.

The proposed office building meets setback, floor area, building height and minimum landscape requirements. No parking lot lighting is planned. Because South 101st East Avenue is a collector, sidewalks may be required along this street per Subdivision Regulations.

The proposed bulk trash container is located adjacent to and is accessible solely through a required parking space. The applicant must either relocate or delete the bulk trash container. Development standards prohibit access to the bulk trash container from a public street and require that "the appropriate location of such containers shall be established during detail site plan approval". Due to the small size of the lot, relocation of the bulk trash container could substantially alter the arrangement of parking and landscaping, therefore, approval can only be recommended if the trash container is omitted from the site.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-579-A detail site plan contingent upon deleting the proposed bulk trash container and providing sidewalks along South 101st East Avenue.

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute landscape plan or sign plan approval.)

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Horner, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Jackson, Miller "absent") to **APPROVE** the detail site plan for PUD-579-A, subject to deleting the proposed bulk trash container and providing sidewalks along South 101st East Avenue per staff recommendation.

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 2:16 p.m.

Date Approved:

12/15/05

Chary E. Hill

2nd Vice Chair acting Chairman
Chair

ATTEST: Amy M. Bayles
Secretary