#### TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES of Meeting No. 1329 Wednesday, October 1, 1980, 1:30 p.m. Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Avey Eller Holliday Keleher, 2nd Vice Chairman Kempe, Secretary Parmele, Chairman Petty T. Young	Gardner Inhofe C. Young	Alberty Gardner Howell Wilmoth	Linker, Legal Dept.

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, September 30, 1980, at 10:50 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the TMAPC Offices.

Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and declared a quorum present.

#### **REPORTS:**

TMAPC Claims:

On MOTION of ELLER, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, Petty, C. Young "absent") to approve the 1979-1980 and 1980-1981 TMAPC Claims (attached).

## CHAIRMAN'S REPORT:

Approval of Agreement Effecting Merger of TMAPC and INCOG: Bob Gardner presented the Agreement effecting the merger of the TMAPC and INCOG staffs. Mr. Gardner advised that the merger would, in effect, transfer all of the assets, cash as well as inventory, to INCOG who would in turn agree to accept all of the liabilities. All assets and liabilities will be determined following the completion of an audit of the past three months.

Commissioner T. Young questioned if it would be appropriate to reference the Articles of Agreement for the TMAPC or in some way stipulate that, although the assets are being transferred to INCOG, if the merger is dissolved, the assets will be divided equally between TMAPC and INCOG.

Assistant City Attorney, Russell Linker, advised that this could be an added provision. He stated that an itemized receipt should be recorded at the time of the merger which would provide that the listed items are the assets of TMAPC.

In the event of dissolution of the TMAPC, all assets of the TMAPC will be divided equally between the City and the County.

(This statement was added as an amendment to Commissioner T. Young's comment - in Commission action of October 15, 1980.)  $\gamma - 5 - 80$ 

#### Approval of Agreement: (continued)

In the event of termination of the Agreement, Commissioner Keleher asked how any assets, acquired as a merged agency, would be divided. Mr. Linker stated that he felt this would be contingent on how the City and County approved the budget in the future and what stipulations they make at that time.

Noting other details of the merger, Mr. Gardner stated that TMAPC as a Board will remain intact. Therefore, the sign designating the area where most of the zoning activities take place will read TMAPC. The sign outside the reception area will read INCOG. The telephone number will remain 584-PLAN: however, the receptionist will answer calls "Planning Commission-INCOG" to alleviate confusion of the public concerning the merged agency.

Commissioner T. Young felt that, from the standpoint of organized business operation and the evaluating processes which affect the City, County and INCOG, the termination clause should read, "terminated at the end of the current fiscal year upon no less than thirty days notice." Mr. Linker agreed that this may be the way to handle the termination question and advised that this detail should be worked out between the City and the County at a later date.

Commissioner Keleher questioned how special studies, not budgeted, will be handled. Bob Garnder advised that allowances are made within the budget for anticipated special studies.

In line with the question concerning special studies, Betty Avey asked if a Commission request for a special study would need to be approved through the City and County Commissions. She felt this would take time and money away from other projects which were being undertaken. Mr. Gardner noted that approximately one special study a month has been included in the budget. He also advised that the Staff would suggest special studies when there was a need for them.

Mr. Keleher, speaking in regard to item No. 4 of the Agreement which referred to the TMAPC travel and training budget, stated that he understood the \$5,000 budgeted amount should be in the category of General Administrative and Support Services.

Commissioner T. Young advised that he felt the City and County may create a small TMAPC budget in subsequent fiscal years that will be administered by the TMAPC for such items as Commissioner's travel, subscriptions to publications and fees to professional associations.

Commissioner Avey questioned what assurnace there would be that the TMAPC budget item will be included each year. Mr. Linker advised her that the City could not agree to a budget item beyond one fiscal year. The Assistant City Attorney also pointed out that what the Commission was being asked to approve was a temporary Agreement.

Mr. Garnder noted that the temporary Agreement was very similar to interim zoning ordinances. He stated that it was necessary to adopt some type of agreement and then work out the details later.

Commissioner T. Young made a motion to approve the temporary Agreement which received a second by Lee Eller.

10.1.80:1329(2)

### Approval of Agreement: (continued)

Mr. Petty stated that this may be a good agreement; however, he had not had an opportunity to review the document previous to the meeting. He noted that it was a very serious decision when two agencies are to be merged and felt the Commission should have more time to study and discuss the Agreement. Commissioner Petty moved that the Agreement be tabled. The motion did not receive a second.

On MOTION of TERRY YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-2 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Kempe, Parmele, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; Keleher, Petty "abstaining"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young "absent") to authorize the Chairman of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission to execute the temporary Agreement as presented, with all comments of the Commissioners being reflected in the Minutes of the meeting.

.

# CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

# PUD #179-F -- Staff Recommendation

 $\left\langle \begin{array}{c} & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ & & \\ \end{array} \right\rangle$ 

Planned Unit Development #179-F is located on the south side of 71st Street west of Mingo Road. The total tract size is 102.34 acres, which with the approval of Z-5448 would permit a maximum number of 1,748 dwelling units. The Planning Commission recommended approval of Z-5448 to permit the requested dwelling units on September 10, 1980, and agreed with the Staff to continue the PUD to revise the standards for development and presented the site plan to the Technical Advisory Committee for comment. The applicant has submitted revised standards for development and the T.A.C. reviewed the site plan on September 25, 1980.

The Staff was concerned that the site plan developed for the entire tract did not consider the unique physical features of the site. The applicant has assured the Staff and has agreed to PUD conditions that will require that the development will utilize properly the physical features of the site. The T.A.C. has informed the applicant that they should:

- Coordinate the location of the intersection of 92nd East Avenue and 71st Street with the property owner on the north side of 71st Street;
- (2) approvals were being withheld for any additional units in Haikey Creek treatment area;
- (3) some off-site water line construction will be required; and
- (4) the processing and approval of the final plat is required.

The Staff is now satisfied with the conditions that will be imposed for approval that the Planning Commission may find that PUD #179-F:

- (1) Is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;
- (2) harmonizes with the existing and expected development of surrounding area;
- (3) is a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site; and
- (4) is consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #179-F, subject to the following conditions:

- That the applicant's original text, amended text and concept and site plan be incorporated as conditions of approval unless modified herein.
- (2) That the maximum number of dwelling units be 1,748, provided however, that to obtain the maximum numbers of units, a detailed site plan for each development area must be submitted and approved by the TMAPC meeting all the conditions of the approval. In meeting the conditions of approval a reduction in the number of units, conceptually approved for the development area, may be necessary.

10.1.80:1329(4)

# PUD #179-F (continued)

Units lost or reduced in one development area may be transferred to another development area providing that the conditions of that area can be met with the additional units.

- (3) That within the development sensitive areas a survey locating and typing every tree having a 6" diameter or greater be required, including the elevation of the ground at the base of the tree, to be submitted with the detailed site plan. The detailed site plan shall overlay the tree survey showing which trees will remain and which trees will be removed. It is the intent of this provision to retain the majority of the existing healthy, mature trees within the project area.
- (4) That the buildings and paved areas be located around existing water courses where possible. Where it is determined that it is not feasible to retain an existing water course, it will be replaced with an underground storm drain pipe and the proposed artificial stream with recirculating water. Provisions will be made to accommodate all on-site runoff in these artifical streams.
- (5) That due to the soil characteristics of the site, a post-tensioned slab construction, or other suitable construction methods which will counter the adverse conditions of the soil types, be used throughout the site.
- (6) That all conditions imposed by the T.A.C. for subdivision plat approval, including the construction of the collector street to connect with the Woodland Hills South Addition be met as conditions of the PUD.
- (7) That a homeowners association be created for the maintenance of all open areas, including the recirculating streams, landscaped areas, recreation areas and private roadways and streets.
- (8) Specific Development Standards:

Development Area A Gross land area ------ 26.95 acres Number of Dwelling Units - 432 Open Space ----- 62% of gross area Maximum Density per acre - 20 d.u.'s Development Area B Gross land area ------ 32.57 acres Number of Dwelling Units - 678 Open Space ------ 54% of gross area Maximum Density per acre - 22 d.u.'s Development Area C Gross land area ------ 11.38 acres Number of Dwelling Units - 236 Open Space ------ 60% of gross area

Maximum Density per acre - 22 d.u.'s

# PUD #179-F (continued)

	Development Area D Gross land area 11.05 acres Number of Dwelling Units - 200 Open Space 44% of gross area Maximum Density per acre - 20 d.u.'s
	Development Area E Gross land area 13.12 Number of Dwelling Units - 156 Open Space 58% of gross area Maximum Density per acre - 12 d.u.'s
	Development Area F Gross land area 7.28 acres Number of Dwelling Units - 46 Open Space 41% of gross area Maximum Density per acre - 12 d.u.'s
(9)	General Development Standards
• • • •	Building Setbacks From 71st Street and Mingo Road-35 ft. (95' from centerline of 71st and 85' from centerline of Mingo) From 75th Street and 90th E. Ave 25 ft. (55' from centerline) Between buildings - 10 ft. minimum From exterior boundary lines - 20 ft.
	Off-street Parking (min.) 1.5 per 1 bedroom dwelling unit or efficiency 2.0 per 2 or more bedroom dwelling unit
(10)	That apartment units (designed for rental) be limited to Development Areas B and C, and that Development Areas A, D, E and F be condominium units (designed for ownership).
(11)	That the customary recreational uses such as tennis courts, clubhouses and parks be permitted within each development area and be so designa- ted on the detail site plan.
(12)	That a subdivision plat be approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants, prior to the issuance of any building permits.
(13)	That 90th East Avenue, a collector street, which is to extend from 71st Street south to Woodland Hills South Addition, be constructed in its entirety prior to or at the same time, as the 1st phase of construction, or in the alternative, that a Bond or other type of assurance which is acceptable to the City Legal Department and City Engineer, be required up front to insure that the street and connect- ing bridge over the drainageway will be built by the applicant eventu- ally if these progress in development stages as their PUD Text states.

10.1.80:1329(6)

#### Applicant's Comments:

John Moody, representing Guardian Development Company of Oklahoma, the managing partner of the Gilcrease Hills development, advised that since the TMAPC had recommended the proposed zoning change and approved the number of dwelling units with the density requested by the applicant on September 10, 1980, he would dispense with further presentation on the PUD and address the conditions listed in the Staff Recommedation.

. .

··· · · · · ·

Mr. Moody addressing the T.A.C. recommendation that the applicant coordinate the location of the intersection of 92nd East Avenue and 71st Street with the property owner on the north side of 71st Street, advised that he had talked with Mr. Flynn, Flynn Energy Corporation. Flynn stated that he had no definite plans for the development of the property and in fact may sell the property in the near future. The street on the Flynn property is not fixed. Mr. Moody advised that the applicant proposed to locate his street as it is shown on the proposed plan.

Mr. Wilmoth advised that Traffic Engineering has decided they want to off-set the streets since any signalization on 71st Street would be from the Woodland Hills Mall area. The easterly portion of the Mall, which is being extended, has an access point which may be signalized.

Mr. Moody stated that the applicant felt he could not be restricted from nonrental property since this prohibition would run contrary to some requirements of condominimum documentation for the second mortgage market underwriters which have presale requirements and require the developer to say that if a certain number of units are not sold within a certain time-frame they must be able to rent those units, for mortgage purposes. Also, Mr. Moody noted that it was the intent of the applicant to locate any apartment units within Areas C and D. These areas are on Mingo frontage, across from the approved Corridor District, which permits apartment development. He requested that Condition No. 10 of the Staff Recommendation be changed to read, "apartment units (designed for rental) be limited to Development Areas C and D." Mr. Moody also requested that the applicant not be restricted to singlefamily ownership or condominimum units in the event that there would be rental of units.

Commissioner T. Young questioned what difference it would make as to which units are used as permanent residences and which are rental units.

Mr. Gardner stated that the Staff was mostly concerned with the overall density of the project. The project has increased from an average of 12 units per acre to 20 units per acre.

Mr. Moody advised that the applicant is willing to be limited by restrictive covenants to the density which is included in the PUD application.

The Staff suggested the letter designation be changed to Development Areas C and D, as requested by the applicant, and adding the statement, "designed for ownership, but would not prohibit rental of unsold units."

10.1.80:1329(7)

# PUD #179-F (continued)

Noting the concern of the residents of Woodland Hills South Addition regarding the collector street and the connecting bridge to be constructed over the drainageway, Mr. Moody advised that the applicant was concerned that if the street was required as the project was developed in phases, it would open up a large public street all the way through the property with a vast number of acres opened to public use, access, and would be a detriment to the protection of the area. Mr. Moody stated that he would be willing to commit to the Commission that they would not be able to get a building permit on the south 400' of Phase A or on Phase F until such time as a contract has been entered into for the completion of the street. He suggested this be made a condition of the PUD to run with the land.

Commissioner T. Young questioned if the storm sewer system, that would be constructed along with the completion of 90th East Avenue, would in any way create a runoff problem for the subdivision to the west of the subject tract when it is in an incomplete state.

George Jenkins, Vice President of Guardian Development, advised that the general flow of drainage on the tract is to the south and southeast with an existing channel through the middle of the subject property which collects most of the water. The installation of the street would not have any affect on the properties to the southeast of the tract. The detention facility is complete and has been accepted by the City.

Bob Gardner pointed out that the property, not owned by the applicant, is a very large strip of ground which is a drainage easement. He noted that the Staff could envision that the street in the subject tract could be built as far as the drainage easement and then it would become the City and taxpayer's burden to eventually build the bridge to connect the two areas.

Commissioner Avey questioned if the applicant developed the northern portion which is Phase 1 and then decided to sell the remaining tract, would it be feasible for someone to buy the remaining land, and with the development permitted, pay for the bridge; or should there be some type of bond whereby each unit pays for a certain portion of the bridge construction.

Mr. Moody advised that there would be over 20 acres in Phase E and F with an additional 7 acres in a portion of Phase A. He stated that the first phase of the project will require a great expenditure of money with the necessary extension of water lines from 61st Street and they did not wish to spend any more than what is necessary at the time.

Assistant City Attorney, Russell Linker, advised that a Restrictive Covenant could be entered into, possibly tying all the property to the bridge and street, with construction tied to a time certain. If the construction was not completed within the specified time, then this would place a lien on all the property.

Terry Young stated he felt the public improvements need to be completed to assure that they will not become a burden to the City and the taxpayers. He noted that the concern would be primarily that the bridge be built and suggested that the words "street and" be struck from Condition No. 13 of the Staff Recommendation. The Condition would then read"...or in the alternative that a Bond or other type of assurance which is acceptable to the City Legal Department and City Engineer, be required up front to insure that the

# PUD #179-F (continued)

connecting bridge over the drainageway will be built by the applicant eventually if these progress in development stages as their PUD Text states."

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 8-O-O (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, T. Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young "absent") to approve PUD #179-F, subject to the conditions of the Staff Recommendation with the following amendments, on the following described property:

- (10) That apartment units (designed for rental), be limited to Development Areas C and D, and that Development Areas A, B, E and F be condominium units (designed for ownerships, but would not prohibit rental of unsold units.
- (13) That 90th East Avenue, a collector street, which is to extend from 71st Street south to Woodland Hills South Addition, be constructed in its entirety prior to or at the same time, as the 1st phase of construction, or in the alternative that a Bond or other type of assurance which is acceptable to the City Legal Department and City Engineer, be required up front to insure that the connecting bridge over the drainageway will be built by the applicant eventually if these progress in development stages as their PUD Text states.

A part of the NE/4 of Section 12, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows, towit: Beginning at a point on the East line of said NE/4, said point being 50.00' North 00 -06'-40" East of the SE corner of said NE/4; thence South 89 -58'-54" West a distance of 267.01'; thence North 71 -30'-00" West a distance of 388.99'; thence North 53'-45'-00" West a distance of 459.86'; thence North 72'-43'-00" West a distance of 308.62'; thence North 48 -14'-00" West a distance of 446.00'; thence North 74°-20'-00" West a distance of 400.00'; thence North 56°-32'-39" West a distance of 339.61'; thence South 45°-30'-00" West a distance of 115.00'; thence North 48°-10'-00" West a distance of 256.00'; thence North 00°-02'-45" East a distance of 100.00'; thence South 89°-59'-27" West a distance of 60.00' to the SW corner of the NW/4 of said NE/4; thence North 00°-02'-45" East along the West line of said NE/4 a distance of 679.46'; thence due East and parallel with the North line of said NE/4 a distance of 450.00'; thence North 00°-02'-45" East and parallel with the West line of said NE/4; thence due East along the North line of said NE/4 a distance of 1,529.43'; thence South 00°-02'-45" East and parallel with the West line of said NE/4; thence Gouth 00°-02'-41" West a distance of 659.97'; thence North 89°-59'-44" East a distance of 329.81'; thence South 00°-06'-11" West a distance of 659.94'; thence North 89°-59'-27" East a distance of 329.72' to the NE corner of the SE/4 of said NE/4; thence South 00°-06'-40" West along the East line of said NE/4; thence South 00°-06'-10" West a line of beginning, containing 102.35 acres, more or less.

# ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application PUD #244Present Zoning: (CS)Application: Gordon McCuneLocation: SW corner of 51st Street and Yale AvenueDate of Application: July 31, 1980Date of Hearing: October 1, 1980

Presentation to TMAPC by: Lynn Myer Address: 5359 South Sheridan

2.47 Acres

Phone: 622-4111

#### Applicant's Comments:

Size of Tract:

Lynn Myer, representing Gordon McCune, stated he agreed with the Staff Recommendation with two exceptions. In regard to the Development Standards, Mr. Myer advised that it was proposed that building area, less the atrium area in the center, would equal 71,774 square feet.

Mr. Myer pointed out the minimum building setback from the south property line to the building was 67 feet and informed the Commission that in the corner where the dumpster and screening is located, there is a proposal for a cooling tower. The tower will be  $10' \times 20'$  and will be screened. It will be located adjacent to a wood screening fence.

The Staff suggested the applicant note the cooling tower on the plan, initial it, and then work out the details when the detailed site plan is reviewed.

Protestants: None.

Staff Recommendation:

Planned Unit Development #244 is located at the southwest corner of 51st Street and Yale Avenue. The property is zoned CS Commercial Shopping Center and the applicant is proposing a 6-story office building with 7,775 square feet. The applicant has filed the PUD asking for the maximum permissible floor area within the CS District. In exchange, the applicant is providing 18% of the net land area as landscape, open space and submitting to the site plan review policies.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Text and Site Plan and find that the PUD; 1) is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, 2) harmonizes with the existing and expected development of the surrounding area, 3) is a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the project site, and 4) is consistent with the stated purposes and standards of this Chapter.

The Staff therefore recommends APPROVAL of PUD #244, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the applicant's Text and Site Plan be incorporated as a condition of approval, unless modified herein.
- 2) Development Standards:
  - a) Area: Gross --- 3.29 acres, 143,550 sq. ft. Net ---- 2.41 acres, 105,000 sq. ft.
  - b) Maximum permitted floor area 71,775-(The atrim area shall not be deducted from or counted toward the surrounding permitted floor area.)

10.1.80:1329(10)

# PUD #244 (continued)

c) Permitted Uses: Those uses permitted as a matter of right in Use Unit 11, and that uses permitted as a matter of right in Use Units 12, 13 and 14, be permitted on the ground floor only.

- d) Maximum Building Height:---- 75 feet
- e) Minimum Building Setbacks: From Centerline of Yale----- 110 feet From Centerline of 51st St.---- 100 feet From South Property Line----- 67 feet (except cooling tower) From West Property Line----- 0 feet
- f) Minimum Parking:----- 240 spaces

(1 per 299 sq. ft. of floor area) 60 spaces may be compact size)  $(7\frac{1}{2}' \times 15')$ 

- g. Minimum Landscaped Open Space:-----18% of net land area
- h. Signs: Two ground signs (one each arterial street frontage), not to exceed 4' in height, nor 32 square feet of display surface area for each sign. These 2 signs shall identify the office complex only and no other free-standing pole signs, roof signs or exterior wall signs shall be permitted advertising commercial uses interior to the complex.
- 3) That a landscape plan be submitted for review and approval. Specify location and type of plant material for all of the open space area. Special concern will be the south boundary where the screening fence has been provided by the apartment owner to the south. Dense plant materials will be required in this area.
- 4) That a final detailed site plan be submitted for review and approval by the TMAPC as being in compliance with conditions of approval prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 5) That a subdivision plat be approved by the TMAPC, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants, and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office prior to the issuance of a building permit.

#### TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of HOLLIDAY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young "absent") to recommend to the Board of Commissioners that the following described property be approved, subject to the Staff Recommendation, as amended:

All of the NE/4, NE/4, NE/4, NE/4; and the East 105' of the NW/4, NE/4, NE/4, NE/4, NE/4 of Section 33, Township 19 North, Range 13 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the United States Government Survey thereof.

10.1.80:1329(11)

#### SUBDIVISIONS:

Halcyon: (PUD #217) (783) 7600 Block of South Lewis Avenue (RM-1, FD)

(----)

The Staff presented the plat noting the applicant was not represented.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat of Halcyon, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young "absent") to approve the Preliminary Plat of Halycon, subject to the following conditions:

- Access point(s) shall meet the approval of <u>Traffic Engineer</u>. (May depend on site plan and relation to the accesses on the east side of Lewis Avenue) (Make sure access points on <u>plat</u> and those on <u>plot plan</u> are the same.)
- Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utility companies. (<u>Utilities</u>) Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property and/or lot lines.
- 3. Water plans shall be approved by the <u>Water and Sewer Department</u> prior to release of final plat.
- 4. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
- 5. Drainage plans shall be approved by the <u>City Engineer</u>, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by <u>City Commission</u>.
- A Corporation Commission letter (or certificate of nondevelopment) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A 150' building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged.) (Staff)
- 7. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat. (Including miscellaneous documents required by the Subdivision Regulations.)
- 8. All Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat. (Staff)

Koger Executive Center II (1994)NE corner of 41st Street and South 102nd EastAvenue(CS)

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Ted Sack.

The Traffic Engineer recommended only <u>one</u> access to 41st Street, away from the corner, and cautioned that <u>all</u> access from 41st Street will be "right-turn only." (The developer has requested 2 accesses.)

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat of Koger Executive Center II, subject to the listed conditions.

10.1.80:1329(12)

# Koger Executive Center II: (continued)

On MOTION of KELEHER, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young "absent") to approve the Preliminary Plat of Koger Executive Center II, subject to the following conditions:

- Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. (Utilities) (Show additional easement for PSO at SW corner of lot or show 30' building line and easement to cover existing guy wires. Also show for PSO overhead lines on south and west.) (Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground services.)
- 2. Access points shall be approved by <u>Traffic Engineer</u>. (Recommend one access on 41st Street.)
- 3. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
- 4. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the <u>City Engineer</u>, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by <u>City Commission</u>.
- 5. 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.
- 6. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of the Subdivision Regulations.)
- All Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat. (Staff)

Minshall Park III (PUD #190) (1083) 76th Street and South Hudson Avenue (RS-3)

The Staff presented the plat noting the applicant was represented by Bob Nichols, attorney.

This plat has already been processed twice, as Minshall Park III and Amended Minshall Park III. Both of those plats were vacated in accordance with agreements made about May 1980. (Copy of Planning Commission minutes was provided.) The financing and/or bonding required when improvements were to be done was the primary reason the previous plats were vacated. This current plat replaces the first two. Since it has already been processed, including releases from all required departments, the applicant is requesting final approval release also. The following conditions were recommended by the Staff. These conditions have been met and all letters of approval are in the file.

- 1. Utilities:
  - (a) The usual release letter required from PSO, ONG AND SWB.
  - (b) PSO has requested that Item 4a in Covenants also include permission for overhead service and/or lines "within lots 6 & 7, Block 9." Also, their transmission line and easement lies 34' east of the 1/2 section line and 66' west of the 1/2

#### 10.1.80:1329(13)

# Minshall Park III (continued)

 $\left( \dots \right)$ 

1 :

section line. Show the 1/2 section line and/or references thereto on the plat so the easement can be accurately located.

- 2. <u>Engineering:</u> Require the usual release letter regarding the drainage and paying.
- 3. Staff recommends waiver of processing fees except for the minimum amounts of \$50 for preliminary and \$50 for final (\$100 total) since this is essentially the same plat processed twice before.

The T. A. C. and Staff advised that since this had been approved twice before, there were no objections and approval letters were already in the files, and new ones would not be necessary.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary and Final Minshall Park III, and release same for filing.

On MOTION of KELEHER, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young, "absent") for preliminary and final approval and release of Minshall Park III.

<u>Silver Springs (PUD #112) (182)</u> SE Corner of 61st Street and South 86th E. Ave. (RM-1)

The Staff presented the <u>plat</u> with the applicant represented by Clayton Morris and Fred Chadsey.

The utilities reminded the developer the importance of coordination due to the waterways planned in the development. O.N.G. cautioned developer about the M.P. Gas line on 61st Street and Water Department advised that one meter would be required for each building.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Preliminary Plat of Silver Springs, subject to the conditions:

Wayne Alberty presented the <u>detailed Site Plan</u> and advised that Development Area H of Planned Unit Development #112 is located at the southeast corner of 61st Street South and 86th East Avenue. The 5.5 acre tract was approved for 128 dwelling units to be developed under the RM-2 Bulk and Area Requirements, except for density standards. The applicant has submitted the detailed Site Plan for review and approval. The proposal has 120 condominium units comprising townhouse and apartment flat building types. 239 parking spaces are provided with 29 designated for R.V. parking. The open space will be 42% of the gross area, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 200 sq. ft. per dwelling unit. A screening fence will be required along the south and west boundaries adjacent to the single-family developments. The Staff therefore recommended approval of the detailed Site Plan for Development Area H, PUD #112, as submitted.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young "absent") to approve the detailed Site Plan as submitted and the Preliminary Plat of Silver Springs, subject to the following conditions:

# Silver Springs (PUD #112) (continued)

- 1. In covenants include any special conditions of the PUD, such as number of units, etc. Also include underground utility grant, if required by utilities.
- 2. All conditions of PUD #112 shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat. Include PUD approval date and references to Sections 910-970 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
- 3. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. (Utilities) Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property and/or lot lines.
- 4. Water plans shall be approved by the <u>Water and Sewer Department</u> prior to release of final plat.
- 5. Pavement repair within restricted water line easements as a result of water line repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner of the lot(s).
- 6. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Water and Sewer Department prior to release of final plat.
- 7. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the <u>City Engineer</u>, including storm drainage and detention design (and Earth Change Permit where applicable), subject to criteria approved by <u>City Commission</u>.
- 8. A topo map shall be submitted for review by T.A.C. (Sub. Regs.) (Submit with drainage plans).
- 9. Access points shall be approved by <u>City and/or Traffic Engineer</u>.
- 10. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Traffic Engineering during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)
- 11. 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.
- 12. The key or location map shall be complete. (Show other subdivisions, WH Mall, Glen Haugen, etc.)
- 13. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of the Subdivision Regulations.)
- 14. All Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

#### PLAT WAIVER:

Z-5370 Julia Becwar (694) 10845 East Admiral Place

 $(\frown)$ 

The Staff advised that this request is to waive plat on a tract approximately  $2\frac{1}{2}$  acres in size at 10845 East Admiral Place. The Staff has been advised by the applicant that he has contacted utilities and Water and Sewer Department regarding services to the property. The right-of-way on Admiral meets the Major Street Plan. Drainage plan and/or fee in lieu of detention, subject to approval of City Engineer. Note that the applicant was not aware that he had to have five acres minimum for a mobile home park, so the Staff has advised him that he must file a Board of Adjustment application for waiver of the minimum size. (This tract is not connected by ownership to the large MHP to the north.) As long as this property was not subdivided utilities and water and sewer can be provided for a rental mobile home park.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the Waiver of Plat on Z-5370, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of AVEY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young "absent") to approve the waiver of Plat on Z-5370, subject to the following condition:

(a) That the property be used as a rental mobile home park and not divided by lot-split or be sold in lots without a subdivision plat conforming to the RMH standards.

DeJarnette Plaza (3693) NE corner of 61st Street and South 89th East Avenue (RD, RS-3) (Final-Released)

Wedgewood VII and VIII (684) West side of Garnett Road, between 61st Street and 66th Street (RS-3) (Final - 2 plats)

Woodview Heights 2nd (3492) 58th Street and South Yukon Avenue (RS-3) (Final)

Mr. Wilmoth noted that there were 20 plats that would expire on this date; however, these are the only plats that have been requested for an extension. All 4 plats will be developed under the current Subdivision Regulations and drainage criteria. The Staff recommended a one-year extension for Dejarnette Plaza, Wedgewood VII and VIII, and Woodview Heights 2nd.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young, "absent") to approve a one-year extension of approval for Dejarnette Plaza, Wedgewood VII and VIII, and Woodview Heights 2nd.

#### CHANGE OF ACCESS ON PLAT:

Enterline Addition (3094) 41st Street and South 102nd East Avenue

(CS)

(RMH)

The Staff advised that this is a request to add one access point to Lot 2, approximately 232' east of the present access driveway. This will provide access east of the creek channel that was previously in an FD District. (The FD has been lifted from a small parcel in this area by Application Z-5062.

10.1.80:1329(16)

# Enterline Addition (continued)

For the record, this access change is the only requirement and no new plat would be required in connection with the zoning change.) The Traffic Engineer has approved the access point and it is recommended the Planning Commission also approve as submitted.

On MOTION of AVEY, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young, "absent") to approve an additional access point to Lot 2, approximately 232' east of the present access driveway.

#### LOT-SPLITS:

L-15025	Charles Drury	( 493)	L-15031 LaGere & N <b>a</b> sh,
15026		(3003)	Investment Partnership (383)
15027	Eddie & Carol Holland	(603)	15032 Stephen D. Heller (2903)
15028	TURA	(2502)	15034 Frank Wallace, et al ( 683)
15029	TURA	(3602)	15037 Don Welch (583)
15030	D. Leon Ragsdale, et. al.	(683)	

On MOTION of ELLER, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young, "absent") for ratification of prior approval of the above-listed lot-splits.

L-14953 James McGehee (2203) 6100 Block East 30th Street North (AG)

The Staff advised that this is primarily a request to clear title on two tracts of land with existing houses, but no approval on a lot-split. Two tracts have already been approved (L-12023) on smaller lots, prior to the increase in minimum size by the Health Department for lots on septic systems. The two tracts within this request are approximately 3/4 acre: Tract "A" being 200' x 180' with 33,150 sq. ft. and Tract "B" 115' x 280' containing 32,200 sq. ft. The applicant is willing to provide dedication (realizing that the City has no obligation to improve it just because it is dedicated), in order to provide some frontage for zoning purposes. The reason the dedication running north and south does not go completely through the tract is that the houses are too close together to provide 50' of right-of-way and building setbacks on both sides. Tract "A" appears to have a house and a mobile home on it as shown on the aerial photo. Tract "B" appears to be vacant. (If the lotsplit is approved, Board of Adjustment approval will be required for the split and the uses thereon.) The westerly part of this area, not included in the split, appears to be in the floodplain, with one small corner slightly inside at the SW corner of Tract "B".

Kathy Borchardt, attorney, was present at the T.A.C. meeting and briefly rereviewed the background of the request. A number of title problems were evident and some changes in the actual lot lines may be needed. Also, Water and Sewer Department advised sewer is available along the south line of Tract "B" and would permit more lots if septic systems were not used. Since the only waiver involved was one of frontage, the T.A.C. suggested that the Planning Commission grant the waivers to permit a loo' minimum front on the lots, with the exact dimensions and details to be worked out with the Staff and utilities. Exact details would be submitted to the Staff and utilities for thier approval, so no formal motion was made by the Technical Advisory Committee.

# L-14953 (continued)

(

On MOTION of KELEHER, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Avey, Eller, Holliday, Keleher, Kempe, Parmele, Petty "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Gardner, Inhofe, C. Young, T. Young, "absent") to approve the waivers to permit a 100' minimum front on the lots, with exact dimensions and details to be worked out with the Staff and utilities.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Date Approved

clater.

Vice Chairman

ATTEST:

Cherry



 $\bigcirc$ 

# Claims: 1979-1980

Account Number	Claim Number	Vendor	Amount
<b>92</b> 00	12957	Dan P. Scott and Sons	396.00
Claims: 198	0-1981		
<b>626</b> 0	12958	Governor's Energy Awareness Conference	10.00
8140	12959	Manpower	538.80
8140	<b>12</b> 960	Manpower	434.16
8140	12961	Manpower	542.07
<b>814</b> 0	12962	Manpower	589.19
7141	12963	Masoner's	16.60
<b>814</b> 0	12964	Mattoon Moving and Storage Company, Inc.	366.72
813	12965	Ridley Sound Company	24.00
<b>825</b> ()	<b>1296</b> 6	Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	20.90
825 G	12967	Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	1,932.43
<b>82</b> 50	12968	Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	30.96
<b>7.1.3</b> 0	<b>12</b> 969	Tulsa County General Fund - Board of County Commissioners	223.01

This is to certify that the above claims are true, just and correct to the best of our knowledge.

ukoto TMAPC Fiscal Officer

Darmer 00

TMAPC Director

PC: Agenda

October 1, 1980

Meeting No. 1329

# TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Claims: 1979-1980

Account Number	Claim Number	Vendor	Amount
9200	12957	Dan P. Scott and Sons	396.00
Claims: 1	1980-1981		
6260 8140 8140 8140 8140 7141 8140 8131 8250	12958 12959 12960 12961 12962 12963 12964 12965 12966	Governor's Energy Awareness Conference Manpower Manpower Manpower Masoner's Mattoon Moving and Storage Company, Inc. Ridley Sound Company Southwestern Bell Telephone Company	$10.00 \\ 538.80 \\ 434.16 \\ 542.07 \\ 589.19 \\ 16.60 \\ 366.72 \\ 24.00 \\ 20.90 $
8250 (2050 (2030)	12967 12968 12969	Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Tulsa County General Fund - Board of County Commissioners	1,932.43 30.96 223.01

This is to certify that the above claims are true, just and correct to the best of our knowledge.

). 1<u>skett</u>

TMAPC Fiscal Officer

un

TMAPC Director

October 1, 1980

Meeting No. 1329

	$H^{(1)}(x) \to 0$	
A	·	