TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES of Meeting No. 1406 Wednesday, May 12, 1982, 1:30 p.m. Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Hennage, 2nd Vice- Chairman Higgins Hinkle Kempe, 1st Vice- Chairman Parmele, Chairman Rice Young	Freeman Gardner Petty Inhofe	Chisum Compton Gardner Lasker	Linker, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, May 11, 1982, at 10:58 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG Offices.

Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

MINUTES:

The Chair, without objection, tabled this item.

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts and Deposits:

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Higgins, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the report of Receipts and Deposits for the month of April, 1982.

Comprehensive Plan Committee:

Commissioner Kempe stated the Comprehensive Plan Committee met at 12:00 p.m. this date and will present a report next Wednesday, May 19, before the scheduled public hearings concerning amendments to the District Plans.

Rules and Regulations Committee:

Chairman Parmele mentioned that the Rules and Regulations Committee met after the Planning Commission Meeting last Wednesday, May 5, and will present a report before the public hearing scheduled to be held on May 19, 1982, to consider changes to the County Zoning Code and additional fee charges.

Director's Report:

Jerry Lasker advised that INCOG will hold an open house tomorrow, May 13, 1982, from 4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. All Commissioners were invited to attend.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Z-5684 Springer (Eimer) NW corner of Victor Avenue and Queen Street RS-3 to IL

Mr. Gardner informed the Commission that the Health Department has inspected the site and has given the applicant two weeks in which to clean up the area. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a two-week continuance.

Instruments Submitted: Letter from the applicant requesting continuance (Exhibit "A-1")

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Higgins, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of Z-5684 to May 26, 1982, 1:30 p.m. in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. Z-5698 Present Zoning: RS-3 Applicant: Jones, Bishop Proposed Zonina: IL Location: NE corner of 100th East Avenue and 61st Street South

Date of Application: March 22, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 4 acres, plus

Presentation to TMAPC by: Ida Spradlin Address: 4125 South Sheridan Road

Phone: 252-2746

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District I--Industrial Development.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the IL District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located approximately 1/4 mile east of the northeast corner of East 61st Street South and Mingo Road. It is four acres in size, contains two dwelling units, is zoned RS-3, and the applicant is requesting IL zoning. The tract is abutted on the west and south by several single-family residences zoned RS-3, on the east by vacant land zoned IL, and on the north by vacant land also zoned IL.

Given the facts that the Plan calls for the subject area to transition to industrial uses and that the tract is abutted on two sides by industrially zoned land, the Matrix's "may be found" designation can be supported.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested IL zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Mrs. Spradlin represented the applicant and stated that industrial zoning seems to be the trend in this area. The subject tract is approximately $4\frac{1}{2}$ acres, which is too much for the owners to take care of, so they wish to sell. The best solution would be IL zoning.

Address: 10224 East 61st Street - 74133 Protestant: H. D. Surface

Instruments Submitted: Letter of Protest from H. D. Surface (Exhibit "B-1")

TMAPC Action: 7 members present. On MOTION of HENNAGE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned IL:

> The West 165' of the E/2 of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of the SW/4, of Section 31, Township 19 North, Range 14 East; AND

The East 120' of the W/2 of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of the SW/4, of Section 31, Township 19 North, Range 14 East, both in Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

5.12.82:1406(3)

Application No. Z-5699Present Zoning:Applicant:Freeman (Harnish)Proposed Zoning:Location:SE corner of 17th Street and Cincinnati Place

Date of Application: March 24, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 50' x 140'

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mike Freeman Address: 1612 South Cincinnati Avenue - 74119 Phone: 583-7501

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

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

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the RM-2 District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located on the southeast corner of East 17th Street South and Cincinnati Place. It is a 50' x 140' city lot, contains a duplex dwelling unit, is zoned RS-3, and the applicant is requesting RM-2 zoning. The tract is abutted on the northeast, east, and south by single-family residences zoned RS-3. It is abutted on the northwest and west by the Cincinnati Avenue exit from the Inner Dispersal Loop.

The surrounding neighborhood is strong, viable, and low density in nature. It is proposed to remain low density in the future making the applicant's request for RM-2 "spot zoning" inconsistent with the Plan both now and in the future.

Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of the requested RM-2 zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Mike Freeman represented the purchasers and property owner and had a copule of people present who are in favor of the rezoning. An exception was allowed in 1947 and Mr. Freeman presented a copy of the minutes from the May 14, 1947 Board of Adjustment meeting approving a duplex for this property (Exhibit "C-1"). A duplex has existed on the property since that time, which is a nonconforming use in that area. He presented 4 pictures (Exhibit "C-2") of the existing structure, which is a rental duplex with an absentee landlord. The structure is in a dilapidated condition and the owner cannot afford to remodel. There is no driveway or garage on the site and cars either park on the grass or in the street.

The tract is bounded on the north and west by the Cincinnati Overpass and CH zoning. There are several other duplexes in the area. The tract will only be bounded by adjacent homeowners on the east and south sides.

The architecture and use of the structures on this street differs from surrounding uses. This is a two-way street and because of the dilapidated condition of the existing structure and the fact this is the most exterior portion of the entire neighborhood, he feels this application should be approved. The lot will be screened and off-street parking will be provided

5.12.82:1406(4)

RS-3

RM-2

Z-5699 (continued)

for 8 cars serving five, one-bedroom units, each to be individually owned and approximately 1,200 square feet. The proper setbacks will be met - 22 feet on the front yard, 10 feet on the side and back yards. He presented two drawings of the proposed structure (Exhibit "C-3").

Commissioner Young asked the size of the lot and Mr. Gardner answered the lot is $50' \times 140'$ or 7,000 square feet.

Mr. Freeman commented that the price range for the units would be between \$80,000 and \$95,000. The structure would be masonry or brick on the exterior and a brick screening wall for the parking area.

The rezoning of this property would have minimal effect on the neighborhood because it is bounded by an expansive right-of-way on two sides. This use would increase the living units by only three, since the use now is a duplex.

Interested Party: Michael Hoffer

Address: 1719 South Cincinnati Ave.

Interested Party's Comments:

Mr. Michael Hoffer is purchasing a parcel at 1719 South Cincinnati, which is four houses to the south of the subject tract. He is supportive of the requested zoning change and agrees that the existing property is a distraction in the neighborhood. The proposed project will be an attraction to the neighborhood and will improve property values. He also pointed out additional properties which are multiple occupancy.

Protestants:	Mark Thurston	Addresses:	1720 South Detroit Ave.
	Grant Hall		1202 East 18th Street
	Robert Nott		1611 South Detroit Ave.
	Jim Owens		2301 South Boston Ave.
	Bob Paddock, District 6		2215 East 25th Street 74114

Protestant's Comments:

Mr. Mark Thurston was opposed to the zoning change, but is not opposed to the demolition of the existing structure and felt everyone would agree it is an eyesore. He felt approval of this zoning would open a floodgate for additional zoning changes in the future. Cincinnati Place is a twoway street, but it is narrow and most of the residents park in the street, making it difficult to pass. Mr. Thurston did not feel this amount of building could be built on so small a lot and provide off-street parking, also.

Mr. Grant Hall is a member of the Mapleridge Zoning Committee and stated the residents of the area have invested substantial sums of money to develop their property to make a down-graded area more attractive. He is opposed to the increase in density of the area.

Mr. Robert Nott opposed the rezoning because of the increase in traffic because there are a lot of children in the area. Since these proposed units are one-bedroom, the residents would not be raising children, there is a fine school in the area and the project would not help the school.

Mr. Jim Owens is also a member of the Mapleridge Zoning Committee and represents District 7 Planning Committee. Many homes in this area were converted into temporary multifamily dwellings to house defense workers

5.12.82:1406(5)

Z-5699 (continued)

during World War II. Many of the homes since then, have been bought and renovated back to a single-family use. There are problems in the area; however, he does not feel this is a solution to the problems. The present structure is not a highly-desirable one; however, if this zoning is approved, other absentee owners might be encouraged to let their property run down and seek this outlet. The residents are trying to get rid of the nonconforming, multiple occupancy uses in the area. He presented a petition containing 114 signatures in opposition to the rezoning (Exhibit "C-4"). Mapleridge does not automatically oppose all zoning requests, but requests this application be denied.

Mr. Bob Paddock, Chairman of District 6, stated that due to an error in mailing of this application, the District did not receive notice and was unable to take formal action. However, based on the past view of the Steering Committee for District 6, it is his opinion this application should be denied. This is not in accordance with the District 6 Plan and the applicant has shown no compelling reason why the District 6 Plan should be amended.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Freeman noted this property is in Maple Park Addition, which has been made a part of the Mapleridge Association. No one wants to keep this property as it is, but they have no solutions other than the proposed project. The objections to traffic and the comments about the school are not matters to enter into the zoning consideration. The owner's sole intent is to complete the purchase of this property and build a structure that is compatible to the neighborhood. This is the best use for this corner property. Mr. Freeman also lives in the area and private ownership in the downtown area is needed if the downtown neighborhoods are to be rejuvenated. Many of the people who signed the petition do not live in the immediate area of this property and are members of the Mapleridge Association, a separate addition from Maple Park. Every effort has been made to contact the residents and have had meetings with them, explaining the proposed project. There have been substantial changes in the neighborhood since the District 6 Plan was adopted and it was not envisioned at that time that the expressway would acquire such extensive right-of-way, leaving this one street to itself. The structures on this street are somewhat different than other streets in the area. The property is in close proximity to different types of zoning, it is bounded on the north and the west by the expressway right-of-way and the only place it touches the neighborhood is in the back yard of the property to the east and the side yard to the south. It would cause minimal, if any, disturbance or interruption to the use and enjoyment of the property owners.

Instruments Submitted:	Copy of Board of Adjustment Minutes	
		(Exhibit "C-1")
	4 Pictures of Existing Structures	(Exhibit "C-2")
	2 Drawings of Proposed Structure	(Exhibit "C-3")
	Protest Petition containing 114	
	Signatures	(Exhibit "C-4")
	5	•

Special Discussion for the Record:

Commissioner Kempe asked the Staff about the propriety of considering townhouse zoning on this property. Mr. Gardner replied RM-T would allow 3.8 units per acre, so it will not support the 5 units; RM-O would support 4.8 units but not the proposed 5 units; and RM-1 would support 6.2.

Z-5699 (continued)

Therefore, at least RM-1 zoning would be required to develop property as proposed. The densities would be the same with a PUD.

Commissioner Higgins asked if the Board of Adjustment could grant a variance for the 5 units under RM-T zoning in order to develop the 5 units and Mr. Gardner replied the applicant would have to show a hardship in order to get Board of Adjustment approval and this lot is the same size as other lots in the area.

Commissioner Young agreed with the Staff that this is spot zoning and the Plan says it is a low-intensity area. He cannot support anything more intense than RD, which would make it a conforming use. Another duplex could be built after demolishing the present structure.

Chairman Parmele was inclined to agree with RM-T zoning because the owners do have a problem with the location of the property and the fact it is a corner lot. This is a difficult area because it needs to be upgraded and he doubted anyone would want to build a new single-family home here. The RM-T would allow for a lesser density than the proposed project, but would upgrade the property.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 2-4-1 (Hinkle, Young, "aye"; Higgins, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, "nay"; Hennage, "abstaining"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to DENY this application.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 4-2-1 (Higgins, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, "aye"; Hinkle, Young, "nay"; Hennage, "abstaining"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RM-T:

Lot 12, Block 7, Maple Park Addition, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Application No. Z-5700Present Zoning:Applicant: Wallace (Tierra Vista)Proposed Zoning:Location: NW corner of 51st Street and 103rd East Avenue

Date of Application: March 30, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 1.5 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Merical Wallace Address: 2973 East 77th Street - 74136 Phone: 492-6952

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District I --Industrial Development encouraged.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the IL District <u>may be found</u> in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located at the northwest corner of East 51st Street South and 103rd East Avenue. It is 1.5 acres in size, vacant, zoned RS-3 and the applicant is requesting IL zoning. It is abutted on the north by a roofing supply company zoned IL, on the east by vacant land zoned IL, on the south by Oil Capitol Electronics zoned IL, and on the west by a park zoned RS-3.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan designation, existing land uses, and surrounding zoning patterns the requested IL zoning can be supported.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested IL zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was not present.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned IL:

Lots 5 through 24, Block 53, Alsuma Addition, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

RS-3

IL

Application No. Z-5701Present Zoning: OLApplicant: Richert (Bell, McDaniel)Proposed Zoning: CSLocation: SW corner of 46th Street North and North Lewis Avenue

Date of Application: March 22, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 20-foot strip

Presentation to TMAPC by: Doug Harney (Quik-Trip Corp.) Address: 1017 North Mingo Road Phone: 836-8551

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 25 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity --No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the CS District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract, a 20-foot strip of land, is located just west of the intersection of 46th Street North and Lewis Avenue. It is vacant, except for a small storage shed, zoned OL, and the applicant is requesting CS zoning. It is abutted on the north by single-family dwelling zoned RS-3 and a Quik-Trip zoned CS, on the east by a vacant commercial building zoned CS, on the south by a single-family dwelling zoned RS-3, and on the west by a landscape service zoned OL.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan designation and the existing physical factors, the Staff can support the small extension and does recommend APPROVAL of the requested CS zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant had no comment.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Higgins, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS:

<u>Parcel #1:</u> The West 20 feet of the below described parcels: Beginning at the Northeast corner of the East 7 acres of the N/2 of the N/2 of the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of Section 18, Township 20 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma: (The point of beginning being approximately the center of 46th Street North and Lewis Avenue.) Thence South 120 feet; thence West 195 feet; thence North 120 feet; thence East 195 feet to the point of beginning, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof; AND

Parcel #2: The North 45' of the following described property. Beginning at a point 120' South of the NE corner of the N/2 of the N/2 of the NE/4 of the NE/4 of Section 18, Township 20 North, Range 13 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma,

5.12.82:1406(9)

Z-5701 (continued)

according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof; thence South 100'; thence West 195'; thence North 100'; thence East 195' to the point of beginning.

Application No. Z-5702 Applicant: Moskowitz (Seigel) Location: SW corner of 66th Street and Peoria Avenue

Present Zoning: AG Proposed Zoning: RM-2

100

Date of Application: March 30, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 8 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Frank Moskowitz Address: P. O. Box 2875 - 74101

Phone: 743-7781

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity --Corridor -- No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to the Zoning Districts," the RM-2 District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is 8 acres in size and located at the southwest corner of 66th Street South and Peoria Avenue. It is mostly vacant, zoned AG, and the applicant is requesting RM-2 zoning.

The subject tract is abutted on the north by a medium-rise elderly housing structure zoned RM-2 and by vacant land zoned CS. To the east is mixed commercial and multifamily uses zoned CS and RM-2, to the south is an apartment complex and commercial structure zoned RM-2 and CS, and to the west is vacant land proposed for the extension of the Riverside Expressway.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding conditions, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested RM-2 zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant had no comments.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RM-2:

Part of Lot 7, Section 1, Township 18 North, Range 12 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof, more particularly described as beginning 1,945 feet North of the Southeast corner of Section 1, thence West 760 feet; thence North 460 feet; thence East 760 feet; thence South 460 feet to the point of beginning.

Application No. CZ-51Present Zoning: AGApplicant: Wayne McClainProposed Zoning: RSLocation: SW corner of 181st Street South and South Memorial Drive

Date of Application: March 29, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 40 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Wayne McClain Address: Route #1 - Bixby, 74008

Phone: 366-8482

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The Comprehensive Plan for the Bixby Area, designates the subject property Residential.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is located 500' south of the southwest corner of 181st Street South and Memorial Drive. It is 40 acres in size, vacant, zoned AG and the applicant is requesting RS zoning. It is abutted on all sides by mostly vacant land zoned AG. There are several single-family residences located approximately 500' to the northeast.

Given the facts that the Bixby Plan calls for residential in this area and that the surrounding conditions support residential development, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested RS zoning.

For the record, without sanitary sewer, sewage lagoon or some other form of acceptable treatment facilities, the minimum size lots will be 22,000 square feet, providing each lot will perc.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant had no comments.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RS, subject to conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation:

Lot 1, LESS the North 462', Section 2, Township 16 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Application No. Z-5703 Applicant: Terry Williams (Trust 80-1) Location: Denver Avenue at Riverside Drive

Date of Application: March 30, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 3.5 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Roy Johnsen Address: 324 Main Mall

Phone: 585-5641

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 7 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property High Density -- Area "D", approved for uses permitted in RM-3 and OMH Districts on the east side of the tract and Medium Intensity -- Residential on the west side of the tract.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the RM-3 District <u>may be found</u> in accordance with the Plan Map on the east side and <u>is not</u> in accordance with the Plan Map on the west side.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is 3.5 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of Riverside Drive and Denver Avenue. It contains an existing multifamily complex, is zoned RM-2, and the applicant is requesting RM-3 zoning. It is abutted on the southwest by Riverside Drive and surrounded on all other sides by a mixture of high density residential and office uses zoned RM-2, OH, and RM-3.

After reviewing the physical conditions surrounding the tract, existing zoning patterns, and the Comprehensive Plan designations, the Staff can support the requested RM-3 zoning on the east side of the tract, however, the west side presents a more difficult question. According to the Comprehensive Plan this portion of the tract could be zoned up to RM-2 intensity, but not RM-3, however, abutting the tract on the west is an existing multifamily complex zoned RM-3. If the east side of the tract is zoned RM-3, this would leave the small 1.2 acre west side tract isolated between two RM-3 properties.

Therefore, based upon these facts the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested RM-3 zoning for the total tract and that the District Plan be amended on the western portion of the tract.

Applicant's Comments:

Roy Johnsen represented the applicant. The key to this application is the existing zoning and its relationship to the Plan for this District. Immediately to the west of the subject property is an existing RM-3 District and to the east, across Denver Avenue, is an OH District, a high-intensity zoning.

The Plan for this area attempted to draw a line on the alley between Elwood and Denver between contemplated commercial use as well as residential use along Denver and some of the residential uses that existed to the west. This does not apply to the subject property because the alley has now been vacated, as well as Elwood Avenue to the west. He feels this application has fundamental merit, since approximately 60%

5.12.82:1406(13)

Z-5703 (continued)

(east portion of tract) is in conformance with the Plan and about 40% (west portion of tract) is supportative of RM-3, given the existing zoning pattern adjacent to the west.

Protestants:	John Eagleton, Attorney Robert G. Pischell	Addresses:	Sooner Federal Building 1646 S. Denver Ave
			TOTO DE DENVEL AVE.
			74119

Protestant's Comments:

Mr. John Eagleton stated that, under the present Zoning Code, one of the purposes is to prevent the overcrowding of land and to avoid the undue concentration of population. This requested rezoning would allow 87 units per acre, which is in excess of 348 units on the property. He represents the University Club Towers, to the east of the subject property. He did not want residents' view of the river to be blocked and felt that this might limit the use of the river.

Instruments Submitted: Letter of Protest from Mr. & Mrs. Robert G. Pischell (Exhibit "D-1")

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Johnsen stated the decision for extension of Elwood Avenue was made when it was vacated from 17th Street South. It is not available for opening to Riverside Drive. The University Club Tower is a 32-story structure presently existing and Mansion House is an 11-story structure. Both of these properties are zoned OH, which permits a high density floor area ratio, the same density for residential use that the proposed project would. He feels the objection is self-serving, since they have developed their property to a high density and it could be said that their building blocks others. He feels this project is appropriate for the tract and requested the Board approve the application.

Protestant's Comments:

Commissioner Young recognized Mr. Eagleton who stated residents in the University Club Towers do use the river and did not feel the river should be blocked off. He felt this is an improper use of the property.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RM-3:

Lots 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, & 9; and that vacated portion of Elwood Avenue abutting Lots 7, 8, & 9 to the west; and the vacated portion of West 17th Street abutting Lots 6 & 7 to the South; and the vacated alley between Lots 4 & 9; Lots 5 & 8; and Lots 6 & 7, ALL in Block 13, Stonebraker Heights Addition, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof; AND all of Block 3, together with the vacated portion of West 17th Street abutting Block 3 to the North; Buena Vista Park Resubdivision, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof, AND Lots 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, & 12, Block 13; and the vacated alley between said Lots; Stonebraker Heights Addition, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof Plat

5.12.82:1406(14)

thereof; AND that vacated portion of Elwood Avenue abutting Lots 10, 11, & 12, Block 13, Stonebraker Heights Addition.

Application No. Z-5704 Present Zoning: RM-2 Applicant: Earl Cherry (King & King) Proposed Zoning: CS North of the NE corner of Sheridan Road and Independence Street Location:

Date of Application: April 2, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 3 acres, more or less Size of Tract:

Presentation to TMAPC by: Earl Cherry - Cherry Real Estate Address: 5051 South Yale Avenue - 74135 Phone: 665-2060

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 16 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity --No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the CS District is in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is 3 acres in size and located just south of the southeast corner of King Street and North Sheridan Road. It is abutted on the east by a developed single-family subdivision zoned RS-3 and on all other sides by mixed commercial and industrial uses zoned IL, CS and CH.

Given the Comprehensive Plan designation and the existing land uses and zoning patterns, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested CS zoning.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant had no comments.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present. On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS:

> Lots 1 and 2, except the West 5 feet thereof for streets, of the Polston Second Subdivision, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

CZ-52 Laramie Development Company and 209th West Avenues AG to RMH

A letter was received from Tom Tannehill (Exhibit "E-1") requesting this application be continued. He has been retained as representative for the protestants, but has not had time to research the case. The applicant agreed to the continuance.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of CZ-52 until May 26, 1982, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center. Application No. Z-5705Present Zoning: RS-2Applicant: George GoswickProposed Zoning: CHLocation: West of the NW corner of 11th Street and 127th East Avenue

Date of Application: April 5, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 2.5 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: David Barnes Address: 3311 East 45th Street

Phone: 749-0178

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 17 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity --Corridor -- Special District 1, Medium Intensity uses which are compatible with adjacent existing activities.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the CH District <u>may be found</u> in accordance with the Plan Map for Special District and <u>is not</u> in accordance with the Plan Map for Low Intensity -- Corridor.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is 2.5 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of 127th Street East and 11th Street South. It is mostly vacant, zoned RS-2 and the applicant is requesting CH zoning. The tract is abutted on the north by large lot single-family residences zoned RS-2, on the east by vacant land zoned OL, on the south by vacant land zoned CS, and on the west by vacant land zoned RS-2.

The Comprehensive Plan designation would allow for some medium intensity development if it can be supported by the surrounding conditions, but not high intensity commercial. In the area surrounding the subject tract there are several properties zoned CS or OL and in order to maintain consistency with the Plan and surrounding properties, the Staff could support CS zoning.

Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of CH and APPROVAL of CS.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. David Barnes is participating in this project with the applicant, Mr. Goswick. The plans are for a warehouse, which would not even be permitted with special exception under CS. The property along 11th Street is zoned commercial, CS for the most part. He felt this warehouse project would be compatible with the area and the highest and best use of the land. This would be commercial-size warehousing.

Mr. Gardner advised this would be an industrial use and CH would allow some light industrial usage. Mr. Barnes remarked that CG by exception would allow warehouse construction and CH does by right.

Chairman Parmele stated IL would allow the use by right and Commissioner Young asked the Staff if they could recommend IL. Mr. Gardner replied their recommendation would be for denial because this street is limited to commercial shopping, commercial convenience-type zoning and land uses. The boat sales to the west was denied CG and approved CS, which will need special exception. This street has already been stripped and this is merely filling in the gaps.

5.12.82:1406(18)

Z-5705 (continued)

Mr. Barnes felt llth Street is a bad area because it is stripped commercial and it seems to him to be a folly to take it beyond I-44, continuing the same type of building. He feels a quality warehousing complex would bring employment and value to llth Street.

Protestants: Wallace Henry Address: 920 South 127th East Avenue

Protestant's Comments:

Mr. Wallace Henry has lived to the north of this property for 24½ years. He does not feel commercial property is right on this street because 127th is a narrow street. This project would lower the value of the surrounding property. The area is on septic system and he does not feel this rezoning is appropriate. He objects to the use intended.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Barnes personally felt this project would be more desirable than a commercial shopping center with the trash that accumulates to the back. There is existing CH zoning on the north side of 11th Street at the intersection of 129th.

Chairman Parmele stated he did not think Mr. Barnes understood the significance of CH zoning. Commissioner Young remarked there are no setback requirements with CH zoning and the entire tract could be filled. He felt the Commission should recommend CH zoning only when it is downtown or somewhere that the buildings could be built up to the sidewalks. Mr. Barnes explained this is not their intention. He understands that 11th Street will be widened. At this time, there is a 50' right-of-way and in anticipation of future widening, replatting would require an additional 50' right-of-way.

Special Discussion for the Record:

Chairman Parmele would like to consider IL and did not think it would be more detrimental than CS. Commissioner Young did not want to approve CS because neither applicant nor the protestant wanted CS zoning.

Mr. Barnes understood that under CS zoning trades-type, small-office warehouse would be a use by exception. Mr. Gardner agreed and this would be Use Unit 15. This has been done before. Mr. Barnes stated that, if this is the case, CS zoning would be acceptable. It is not the type of buildings he would like to build, but he would accept it. IL zoning would be amore difficult application than the one under consideration.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions": Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be denied CH rezoning and that CS zoning be approved, per Staff Recommendation:

The SE/4 of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 5, Township 19 North, Range 14 East, LESS 20 feet on the East side, Tulsa County, Oklahoma. Applications No. Z-5706 & PUD #286 Applicant: Charles Norman (20th Century Present Zoning: OM Proposed Zoning: CS,CG, or IL

Location: South side of East 47th Place South, 150' West of Mingo Road

Electric Co.)

Date of Applications: April 6, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 2.5 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Norman Address: 909 Kennedy Building, Suite 1100

Phone: 583-7571

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-5706

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity --Office Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the CS, CG and IL Districts are not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-5706

The subject tract is located 150' west of the southwest corner of East 47th Place South and Mingo Road. It is 2.53 acres in size, vacant, zoned OM and the applicant is requesting either CS, CG, or IL zoning to accommodate a trade center. It is abutted on the west by a single-family development zoned RS-3, on the south is vacant land zoned OM, on the east is an industrial use zoned IL and Rapid Lube service station zoned CS, and on the north by vacant land zoned IL.

The requested zoning districts are inconsistent with the Plan, however, the abutting IL tract on the east was also inconsistent with the Plan and required a Plan amendment. The Staff feels both of these tracts meet the intent of the Plan by not allowing the land between the Regency Park development and Mingo Road to go "strip-commercial." In addition, PUD #286, a companion PUD application, was filed on this tract, which the Staff feels will properly buffer the adjacent single-family. Also, the proposed development does not require the entire site to be rezoned in order to be accomplished, which will allow for an actual zoning buffer to be maintained.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of IL zoning on the east 175 ft. of the subject tract, DENIAL of the balance and, amend the Comprehensive Plan Map accordingly.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #286

Planned Unit Development No. 286 is located just west of the southwest corner of East 47th Place South and Mingo Road. It is 2.53 acres in size and vacant. This application has a companion Zoning Case (Z-5706) which the Staff had recommended the east 1/2 of the tract to be rezoned IL and the west 1/2 to remain OM. The applicant is requesting to tie these two zoning districts together under a PUD supplemental zoning district. The tract is abutted on the north by IL zoned land, on the east by two properties, one zoned CS and one zoned IL, on the south by OM zoned land, and on the west by a single-family development zoned RS-3.

PUD #286 Staff Recommendation: (continued)

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Development Plan and Text and find that PUD #286 is (a) in harmony with the existing and expected development of the surrounding area, and (b) consistent with the purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Tulsa Zoning Code. Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #286, subject to the following conditions:

(1) Development Standards:

ŀ	A)	Area ((Gross): Net) :			120,750 sq. ft. 110,250 sq. ft.
		•				·
Ē	B)	Zoning	(west-hall (east-hall			OM IL
(C)	Permitt	ted Uses:			
			providing	blishments prim business and ho cenance goods an	use-	_
			vices ordi	narily not foun tail districts	d in	
			cause of c	liffering market	and	
				rements as set t 15Other Tra ces.		
ſ))	Maximun	n Permitteo	I Floor Area:		45,000 sq. ft.
E	E)	Maximun	n Building	Height:		l-story not to exceed 20 feet.
F	F)	Minimun	n Building	Setbacks:		
			From the s From the e	vest property li outh property l east property li	ine: ne:	45 feet 45 feet 25 feet
				enterline of Ea ice South:		100 feet
G	G)		g Ratio Per Area:	• 1,000 Feet of		3
ŀ	+)	Minimun Space		Landscaped Open	8	3.3% 10,000 sq. ft.*
I	[)	Signs:				
		Gro	ound Signs:	Maximum Heigh Maximum Displ		20 feet
				Area:	ay .	200 feet
*Internal lands	- a n c			Shall not excee square-foot per foot of buildin to which sign i	linea g wal s aff	1
landscaped park	ving	jisland	ls, landsca	ped yards and p	lazas	, and pedestrian 106(21)

PUD #286 Staff Recommendation: (continued)

areas, but does not include any parking, building or driveway areas.

- (2) That the applicant's Development Plan and Text be conditions of approval as being representative of the design and character of the development.
- (3) That no building permits shall be issued until a Detailed Site Plan has been submitted to and approved by the TMAPC.
- (4) That a Detailed Landscape Plan including a solid screening fence not less than six (6) feet in height along the west boundary of the tract and a five (5) foot wide landscaped area adjacent to the screening fence prior to occupancy. It is not intended that the applicant be required to "double-screen" the tract, however, if properties become inadequately screened in the future it is the subject tract owner's responsibility to erect and maintain a screening fence.
- (5) That no building permit shall be issued until the property has been included within a subdivision plat (Lot 2, Block 1, Regency Plaza Amended per T.A.C. conditions from April 29, 1982) submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman stated this tract has been previously platted as a part of Regency Park Addition, subject to the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee which was for the grant of an additional easement on the north and east sides of the property. He has met with the Regency Park Homeowners Association and talked to several abutting residents to the west who are in the single-family area and believe their absence today is indicative of their lack of objection to this proposal. He asked that the Staff Recommendation be approved.

Mr. Gardner explained that the T.A.C. recommendations included filing amended covenants which would include all the conditions of the PUD and a tie contract for Lots 7, 8 and 9, regarding sewer service. Mr. Norman had no problems with the conditions.

Instruments Submitted: 6 Pictures of the Area (Exhibit "F-1")

Protestants: None.

Z-5706 - TMAPC Action: 7 members present. On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned IL on the east 175 feet, and that the balance be denied, based on the Staff and Technical Advisory Committee recommendations:

> The East 175 feet of Lot 2, Block 1, Amended Plat of Regency Plaza, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

PUD #286 & Z-5606 (continued)

PUD #286 - TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of RICE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for PUD, subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation and by the Technical Advisory Committee:

Lot 2, Block 1, Amended Plat of Regency Plaza, Tulsa County, Okla.

Application No. PUD 287 Applicant: Johnsen (Timbercrest) Location: North of 71st Street, West of Lewis Avenue

Date of Application: April 7, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 11.8 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Roy Johnsen Address: 324 Main Mall

Phone: 585-5641

Staff Recommendation:

Planned Unit Development No. 287 is located on both sides of Utica Avenue, just north of East 71st Street South. It is 11.8 acres in size, vacant, zoned OM, and the applicant is requesting a PUD supplemental district to develop an office park. The tract is abutted on the north and west by Joe Creek, on the south by an office complex zoned OM, and on the east by vacant land zoned RS-3.

The Staff reviewed the applicant's Development Text and Plans and find PUD #287 to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Tulsa Zoning Code. Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #287, subject to the following conditions:

- That the applicant's Development Plan and Text be conditions of approval as being representative of the design, character and intent of the development.
- 2) Development Standards:

Gross Area: Net Area:

Permitted Uses: As permitted within an OM District

Maximum Floor Area:

257,000 square feet

11.8 acres

10.7 acres

Allocation of Floor Area:*

Lot] 9,000 square feet Lot 2 9,000 square feet 10,500 square feet Lot 3 10,100 square feet Lot 4 10,100 square feet Lot 5 Lot 6 11,600 square feet Lots 7, 8 & 9 to be combined as one development parcel 170,000 square feet 10 stories Maximum Building Height 15% of the net Minimum Landscaped Open Space

Minimum Building Setbacks:

From Utica Avenue25 feetFrom Other Boundaries20 feet**

5.12.82:1406(24)

area

Parking Ratio

l space per 350 sq. ft. of floor area***

Other Bulk and Area Requirements

As required within an OM District

*The allocation of floor area may be modified or transferred or lots combined, but in such event, a site plan review requirement shall apply.

**Provide that any building exceeding 2 stories shall be set back from the north and east boundaries a minimum of 175 feet.

***Except buildings or portions of buildings devoted to medical uses shall require 1 space per 250 square feet of floor area.

- 3) That no building permit shall be issued for Lots 7, 8 & 9, or for any lots which are proposed to be combined as one development parcel until a detailed Site Plan has been submitted to and approved by the TMAPC.
- 4) That a detailed Landscape Plan be approved and in place prior to occupancy of any building.
- 5) Signs accessory to the office uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Ground Signs - shall be limited to one sign per lot not exceeding a display surface area of 32 square feet, provided that for the development parcel comprised of Lots 7, 8, & 9, two ground signs shall be permitted not exceeding 64 square feet in display surface area each.

Wall or Canopy Signs - shall be limited to one sign for each principal building and shall not exceed a display surface area of 32 square feet.

6) That no building permit shall be issued until the property has been included within a subdivision plat (South Utica Place, per T.A.C., April 29, 1982) submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Roy Johnsen represented the applicant and stated that this has recently been platted into lots under OM zoning. On the Lots 1-6, the floor areas allocated do not necessitate a Detailed Site Plan. He will do so if required, but felt it was an unnecessary burden on the Staff and Commission. The Detailed Landscape Plan would then be required only on Lots 8 & 9, or any other combined lots.

Mr. Gardner thought there should be some kind of overall landscape treatment showing standards for continuity meeting the required 15%. Mr. Johnsen stated there is a floor area allocation for the first 6 lots and a minimum landscaping requirement for same. These allocations are well

5.12.82:1406(25)

within the office zoning. Mr. Johnsen understood the requirements made by the Staff and agreed with the conditions.

Instruments Submitted: Letter of Support from LoMac Affiliates (Exhibit "G-1")

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for PUD:

South Utica Place, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

PUD #236-A Johnsen (Basta) 7500 Block of South Memorial Drive (RS-3 & OL)

A letter was received from Mr. Roy Johnsen requesting that consideration of this application be continued until June 2, 1982, in order to permit a review of the proposed development with neighborhood representatives (Exhibit "H-1").

Instruments Submitted: Letter requesting continuance from Roy Johnsen (Exhibit "H-1")

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 6 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Hennage, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Higgins, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to continue consideration of PUD #236-A until June 2, 1982, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center. Application No. Z-5620 SP-1Present Zoning: (CO)Applicant:Charles Norman (Webster-Jackson)Location:East side of South Memorial Drive, 1/4 mile South of East 91st St.

Date of Application: April 8, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 32.32 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Norman Address: 909 Kennedy Building - 74103

Phone: 583-7571

Staff Recommendation -- Site Plan Review: (Corridor)

The subject tract is located at South Memorial Drive and East 93rd Street South. It is 32.32 acres in size, vacant, zoned CO and the applicant is requesting approval of the overall Development Plan and Text and approval of the Development Area "I" Detail Site Plan.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Development Text and Plan and find it is consistent with the purposes outlined in the Tulsa Zoning Code for the Corridor District; and, therefore, recommends APPROVAL of the overall Development Concept, subject to the following conditions:

1) Development Standards:

DEVELOPMENT AREA I

Land Area	(Gross)	 13.13	acres		571,943	sq.	ft.
	(Net)	 11.78	acres	per des aut une see stat and	513,137	sq.	ft.

Permitted Uses:

Attached residential dwelling units, garden apartments and customary accessory uses, such as clubhouses, tennis courts, swimming pools, laundry rooms and similar recreational facilities.

Maximum Dwelling Units ----- 416 Maximum Building Height ----- 30 feet

Minimum Building Setbacks: From the centerline of South Memorial Dr. ----- 135 feet From the centerline of E. 93rd St. South ----- 55 feet From the north property line ----- 10 feet From the east property line ----- 70 feet Maximum Land Coverage of Buildings ----- 30% Minimum Livability Space per Dwelling Unit ----- 300 sq. ft. Minimum Off-Street Parking: As required for Use Unit No. 8

Signs: As permitted in the RM-1 District

5.12.82:1406(28)

DEVELOPMENT AREA II

DEVELOPMENT AREA II
Land Area (Gross) 9.78 acres 426,017 sq. ft. (Net) 8.42 acres 336,775 sq. ft.
Permitted Uses:
Attached residential dwelling units, garden apartments and customary accessory uses, such as clubhouses, tennis courts, swimming pools, laundry rooms and similar recrea- tional facilities.
Maximum Dwelling Units 296
Maximum Building Heights 30 feet
Minimum Building Setbacks:
From the centerline of South Memorial Drive 135 feet From the centerline of East 93rd Street South 55 feet From the East property line 70 feet From the South Boundary of Development Area II 10 feet
Maximum Land Coverage of Buildings 30%
Minimum Livability Space Per Dwelling Unit 300 sq. ft.
Minimum Off-Street Parking: As required for Use Unit No. 8
Signs: As permitted in the RM-1 District
DEVELOPMENT AREA III
Land Area (Gross) 9.41 acres 409,900 sq. ft. (Net) 9.00 acres 392,040 sq. ft.
Permitted Uses:
Attached residential dwelling units, garden apartments and customary accessory uses, such as clubhouses, tennis courts, swimming pools, laundry rooms and similar recrea- tional facilities.
Maximum Dwelling Units 344
Maximum Building Height 30 feet
Minimum Building Setbacks:
From the centerline of South Memorial Drive 135 feet From the North Boundary of Development Area III- 10 feet From the East property line 70 feet From the South Boundary of Development Area III- 10 feet

Z-5620 SP-1 (continued)

Maximum Land Coverage of Buildings ------ 30% Minimum Livability Space Per Dwelling Unit ----- 300 sq. ft. Minimum Off-Street Parking: As required for Use Unit No. 8 Signs: As permitted in the RM-1 District

- 2) That the applicant's Development Plans and Text be conditions of approval as being representative of the design, character and intent of the development.
- 3) That no Building Permits shall be issued until a Detailed Site Plan, by development area, is submitted to and approved by the TMAPC.
- 4) That a Detailed Landscape Plan be submitted and approved prior to occupancy of any buildings.
- 5) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the property has been included within a subdivision plat submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

In addition, the Staff reviewed the Detailed Site Plan for Development Area "I" and find that it is consistent with the Corridor District purposes and the Development Text and Plans. Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

SITE PLAN REVIEW:

1) Development Standards:

Item	Development Text	Detail Site Plan
Land Area (Gross): (Net) :	571,943 sq. ft. 513,132 sq. ft.	571,943 sq. ft. 513,137 sq. ft.
Permitted Uses: Attached residen ments and customary acces courts, swimming pools, l tional facilities.	sory uses such as cl	ubhouses, tennis
Maximum Dwelling Units:	416 units	416 units
Maximum Building Height:	30 feet	30 feet
Minimum Building Setbacks:		dag).
From centerline of S. Mem Drive From centerline of E. 93r South	135 feet d St. 355 feet	140 feet 55 feet
From the North Property L From the East Property Li		15 feet 70 feet
Maximum Land Coverage of Building	JS: 30%	30%
Minimum Livability Space per D.U.	: 300 sq. ft.	300 sq. ft.

5.12.82:1406(30)

Minimum Off-Street Parking	672 spaces	680 spaces
Signs:	RM-1 Standards	RM-1 Standards

- That the Applicant's Site Plan and Design Concept be made conditions of approval.
- 3) That the "in-the-ground" landscaping meet, as a minimum, what is graphically shown on the Site Plan.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Charles Norman had no objections to the conditions set out by the Staff. This is perhaps the first Corridor District Site Plan Review that is not for hotel or motel. Because of the size of the tract, Mr. Norman is asking for a two-phased approval; one of the overall development concept of the 32 acres, and detail approval on Phase one. When the second and third phases are ready for development, they will be processed in virtually an identical manner to the Planned Unit Development procedure and would require submission to further Detailed Site Plans. Drainage Plans and concepts have been submitted to the T.A.C. and all have been adequately reviewed and are recommended for approval.

A Detail Site Plan for Phase I has been submitted and will be the control document for issuance of building permits in the first Phase. There is an existing, single-family plat that has been requested for vacation. There are only about 12 homes that have been constructed under the subdivision plat. The vacation has been held up pending the resubmission of a new plat, and the location of utility facilities and the collector street. The right-of-way previously dedicated for the improvement of Memorial will be rededicated or accepted from the vacation.

Mr. Gardner commented that the Staff had to have a conceptual plan of where the collector street will be on Phases 1, 2 and 3. It will continue east when the other portion of the plat is vacated, then the routing will be determined on the remainder. All of the street will have to be improved in order to service the first Phase. Mr. Norman explained the overall density on this Site Plan is approximately 36 units per acre, which is in the limits of an RM-2 District and about 15% lower than the maximum permitted in a Corridor District. The livability space is also in excess of requirements.

Protestants: None.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of KEMPE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the submitted overall Development Plan and Text and the Detail Site Plan for Phase I be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the Staff Recommendation, on the following described property:

Part of the W/2 of the NW/4 of Section 24, Township 18 North, Range 13 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government Survey thereof, being more particularly described as follows, to wit:

Commencing at a point on the West line of said NW/4, 960.00' South of the Northwest corner thereof; thence North $89^{\circ}-37'-44''$ East a

5.12.82:1406(31)

Z-5620 SP-1 (continued)

distance of 60.00' to the point of beginning; thence North 89⁰-37'-44" East a distance of 1,178.03'; thence due South a distance of 1,243.26'; thence North 86[°]-39'-33" West a distance of 138.26'; thence North 79[°]-03'-11" West a distance of 1,069.43' to a point lying 50.00' East of the West line of said NW/4; thence due North and parallel to said West line, a distance of 920.07'; thence South 88[°]-52'-58" East a distance of 10.00'; thence due North and parallel to said West line, a distance of 104.61' to the point of beginning, containing 31.09 acres. Application No. CZ-53Present Zoning: AGApplicant:Cousins (Beeline Furniture)Proposed Zoning: CSLocation:West of the NW corner of 111th Street South & Okmulgee Beeline

Date of Application: April 8, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 11.8 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: Charles Cousins Address: 111th Street South & Beeline Road - Jenks, Ok. - 74037 Phone: 299-5094

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The Comprehensive Plan for the Jenks Area, designates the subject property Suburban -- Medium Intensity.

Staff Recommendation:

The subject tract is 3 acres in size and located just west of the northwest corner of U. S. Highway #75 and 111th Street South. It contains one single-family dwelling, is zoned AG and the applicant is requesting CS zoning.

The subject tract is abutted on the north by vacant land zoned RS and CG, on the east by Beeline Furniture zoned CS, on the south by vacant land zoned AG and on the west by sparse single-family dwelling zoned AG. Based on the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding conditions the Staff can support and does recommend APPROVAL of the requested CS zoning.

For the record, the subject application completes the east-west limit of the node allocation; therefore, the next property to the west is restricted to a maximum of multifamily residential or possibly light office, or additional off-street parking for the node.

Applicant's Comments:

The applicant was not present. Chairman Parmele read a letter submitted by the City of Jenks recommending approval (Exhibit "I-1").

Protestants: None.

<u>Instruments Submitted:</u> Letter recommending approval from the City of Jenks (Exhibit "I-1")

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned CS:

The Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 27, Township 18 North, Range 12 East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Survey thereof, LESS the West 50 feet thereof for road. Application No. Z-5708 Applicant: McDaniel (Deem, Gill) Location: South side of 61st Street, West of Joe Creek

Date of Application: April 16, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 1.3 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Robert Franden Address: 816 Enterprise Building

Phone: 583-7129

Present Zoning:

Proposed Zoning: RM-1

RS-2

Application No. PUD 283

Present Zoning: (RM-1, RS-2 and OL)

Applicant: Rouse (Christensen, Deem, Gill) Location: 61st Street and Yorktown Avenue

Date of Application: March 4, 1982 Date of Hearing: May 12, 1982 Size of Tract: 4 acres, more or less

Presentation to TMAPC by: Robert Franden Address: 816 Enterprise Building

Phone: 583-7129

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan: Z-5708

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity --No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the RM-1 District <u>may be found</u> in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation: Z-5708

The subject tract is 1.3 acres in size, located west of Lewis Avenue at the southwest corner of the intersection of Joe Creek and 61st Street South. It is vacant, zoned RS-2, and the applicant is requesting RM-1 zoning. The tract is abutted on the north by a multifamily neighborhood zoned RM-1, on the east and southeast, across Joe Creek, is a developing office zoned OM, on the southwest is an apartment complex zoned RM-1, and on the northwest is a single-family structure zoned OL.

The Staff can support RM-1 zoning, based on the existing zoning patterns of RM-1, RD, OL and RM-T which are buffer Districts between the higher intensity zoning districts fronting onto Lewis Avenue and the interior single-family developments. The tract is surrounded by zoning districts which have equal or greater zoning intensity than the RM-1 zoning the applicant is requesting.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the requested RM-1 zoning.

Staff Recommendation: PUD #283

Planned Unit Development No. 283 is located west of South Lewis Avenue at the southwest corner of Joe Creek and South 61st Street. It is 4.72 acres, contains one single-family structure used as an office and two single-family residences, is zoned a combination of RM-1 and OL, and the applicant is requesting PUD supplemental zoning to construct a light intensity office park. This application was submitted with a companion zoning application, Z-5708, requesting RM-1 zoning. The Staff has recommended APPROVAL of the zoning application and will review this application based on the RM-1 zoning being approved.

The Staff has reviewed the applicant's Development Plan and Text and find PUD #283;

- 1) is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan,
- 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 the PUD Chapter of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #283, subject to the following conditions:

1) Development Standards:

Area (Gross):	(4.72 acres)	205,603 square feet
(Net):	(3.917 acres)	170,625 square feet
Permitted Uses:	is intended to p	hin an OL District and ermit parceling for in- ip of buildings, having

shared access and parking.

Maximum Floor Area:

65,000 square feet

Maximum Building Height: 1-story buildings paralleling 61st Street.

> 2 stories (26 feet to top plate) on buildings located interior.

Minimum Building Setbacks:

From North Property Line	50 feet
From Northwest Property Line	25 feet
From South Property Line	12 feet
From West Property Line	12 feet
From East Property Line	12 feet

Parking Ratio: 1 space per 350 square feet of floor area for non-medical uses. 1 space per 250 square feet of floor area for any medical use.

Minimum Interior Landscaped Open Space, including Walks: 29% o

29% of net area

Other Bulk and Area Requirements: As required within an OL District.

PUD #283 Staff Recommendation (continued)

- 2) That the applicant's Development Plan and Text be made conditions of approval.
- 3) That access shall be restricted to two points, one on East 61st Street and one within 150 feet from the centerline of East61st Street on South Yorktown Avenue.
- 4) That no building permit shall be issued until a Detail Site Plan of the proposed development has been submitted to and approved by the TMAPC, including the square-footage contained in each structure and the phases for development.
- 5) That a Detailed Landscape Plan be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy of a building, including a solid screening fence to be constructed along the west and south property lines to be compatible with the new existing fence along the southwest property line. A decorative and partially open screening fence to be constructed along the north property line (against 61st Street), along the northwest property line (against Yorktown Avenue), and along the north 120 feet of the east property line (against Joe Creek).
- 6) Sign Standards -- Signs accessory to the office uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions:

Project/Development Signs

Project signs shall be limited to one (1) monument sign identifying the project at the 61st Street entrance. The sign shall not exceed 8 feet in height and not exceed a display surface area of 192 square feet.

Building Identification/Directory Signs

Identification signs shall be limited to one (1) sign for each of the office buildings within the project, not exceeding a display surface area of 32 square feet for each sign.

- 7) That an Owner's Association be created to maintain all common areas including private drives, if structures are sold now or in the future.
- 8) That no building permit shall be issued until the property has been included within a subdivision plat, submitted to and approved by the TMAPC, and filed of record in the County Clerk's Office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Bob Franden represented the applicants on the zoning and Planned Unit Development. It was his intention that both of these applications be heard at the same time. OL zoning was approved at the Planning Commission meeting three weeks ago, to line up with the OL zoning immediately to the west. OM zoning is in existence across Joe Creek and lines up with the subject tract.

Z-5708 & PUD #283 (continued)

The proposed project is an office-condominium, garden-type project and the individual buildings will be owner-occupied or partially so. There will be party walls dividing units. It is intended to be a high-quality project and would be consistent with the Development Guidelines for OL zoning. The zoning is really not a question. RM-1 zoning would be appropriate. The question is if the PUD would be appropriate for this area overlying the RM-1 zoning. He feels an office project is appropriate due to the existing project to the east and the approval of OL zoning on the front of this tract. The applicant is asking that the project reach to the southernmost tip of the project. It has previously been the practice to keep residential structures away from the Creek. He agrees with the Staff Recommendations and conditions.

Protestants: R. C. Brown David Cameron Glen R. Davis Addresses: 2132 East 59th Place 201 West 5th Street, Suite 400 2129 East 60th Street

Protestant's Comments:

Mr. R. C. Brown lives in the Garden Park Addition immediately adjacent to the subject property. The residents of Garden Park Addition oppose this rezoning and PUD because the increase in density would also increase traffic. He presented a petition containing 95 signatures (Exhibit "J-1") objecting to both the rezoning and the PUD. The traffic along 61st Street will be a hazard because it is not wide enough to handle it. He was concerned about the type of business that could be put in this project. Chairman Parmele advised only offices would be permitted and no commercial uses could be permitted. Mr. Gardner further explained that a PUD requires covenants naming the City of Tulsa as beneficiary; therefore, the City would handle the lawsuits if commercial ventures were permitted.

Mr. Glen Davis also lives in the Garden Park Addition and was also concerned about the business that would be permitted in this project, as well as the added traffic. Mr. Gardner stated that the use could be limited to general office space as permitted in the OL District.

Mr. David Cameron represented three owners of condominiums in Pecan Creek. Their concern is for the two-story developments on the interior of this lot which will overlook their units. This will result in a loss of privacy.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Franden understands the protestants' concerns about uses other than offices being permitted and why they would be objectionable. The applicant has no objection to limiting this project to general office use, since this is the intended use for the tract. This is a mixed project, stepping from 1, l_2^1 to 2-story buildings. There will be one, 2-story building, but this is needed because of the required open space.

Instruments Submitted: Petition of Protest, containing 95 signatures (Exhibit "J-1")

Z-5708 - TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned RM-1:

Lot 3, Block 1, Pecan Acres, an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa, County, Oklahoma. 5.12.82:1406(37)

Z-5708 & PUD #283 (continued)

PUD #283 - TMAPC Action: 7 members present. On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be approved for PUD with the permitted use being limited to general office use only:

> Lots 3 and 4, Block 1, Pecan Acres, an Addition to the City of Tulsa and Lot 1, Block 1, Sherwood Park Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

SUBDIVISIONS:

Professional Office Park (794) SW corner of 15th Street and 101st East Ave. (CS & RS-2)

The Staff advised that the plat was complete, release letters have been received, and further recommended final approval and release.

On MOTION of YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Hennage, Higgins, Hinkle, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Freeman, Gardner, Petty, Inhofe, "absent") to approve the final plat of Professional Office Park Addition and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Date of Approval 6-2-82

Chairman

ATTEST:

Secr

TMAPC RECEIPTS MONTH OF APRIL, 1982

ZONING

Zoning Fees Fee Waived	(20) (0)	\$1,770.00	\$1,770.00
LAND DIVISION			
Subdivision Preliminary Plats Subdivision Final Plats Lot-Splits Fee Waived	(6) (4) (27) (0)	\$ 300.00 399.50 200.00	\$ 899.50
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT			
Board of Adjustment Fees Fee Waived	(62) (0)	\$3,025.00	\$3,025.00 \$5,694.50
DEPOSITORY TICKET	CITY RECEIP	T	
798 799 800 801	018800 019211 019571 019893	\$2,013.50 1,546.00 510.00 1,625.00	0 0
CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT			\$2,325.00
COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT			\$ 700.00
CITY SHARE			\$1,334.75
COUNTY SHARE			\$1,334.75

į