# TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES of Meeting No. 1506 Wednesday, May 16, 1984, 1:30 p.m. Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall Tulsa Civic Center 
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The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, City Hall, on Tuesday, May 15, 1984, at 11:05 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Young called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

MINUTES:
On MOTION of DRAUGHON, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, T. Young, "absent") to approve the Minutes of May 2, 1984, (No. 1504).

REPORTS:
Report of Receipts and Deposits:
The Commission was advised this report is in order.
On MOTION of DRAUGHON, the Planning Commission voted 6-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, T. Young, "absent") to approve the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the month ending April 31, 1984.

## Chairman's Report:

Chairman C. Young advised the Commission of a letter received from the League of Women Voters of Oklahoma City who is sponsoring a two day National Symposium on Affordable Housing June 21st and 22nd in Oklahoma City (Exhibit "A-1"): He encouraged the Planning Commission members and Staff members to attend.

Director's Report:
Mr. Lasker informed the Commission that the City Commission, County Commission and INCOG has directed the Staff to make the Staff Recommendations on zoning and PUD applications available to the public one week in advance of the public hearing. This new system will be monitored to determine what affect availability of these recommendations will have in terms of continuances or segregation of the Staff time. This information will then be reported to the Commission and if problems are created by this procedure it will be discussed at that time.

## Director's Report: (continued)

Mr. Lasker stated that preparing the Staff Recommendations one week in advance is something that the Staff can and will do.

Mr. Lasker also advised that there will be a study session for the City Commission, County Commission and the TMAPC on May 30, 1984, at 1:30 p.m., in Room 1116, City Hall to discuss zoning and planning policies.

Jim Biffle and District 8 Planning Team request amendment to the District 8 Comprehensive Plan to accommodate New Town/In Town Concept.

Mrs. Dan Matthews of the INCOG Staff stated that District 8 has an overall concept that they wish to develop which includes realigning some streets and creating nodes. The concept is a mixed use concept, and one thing which they wish to encourage is not selling the land off piecemeal but rather developing it as a whole. They feel this will be a real asset to the City of Tulsa. The Staff needs a directive by the Planning Commission to study this concept and come back with a recommendation.

Mayor Young advised that this area is being reviewed at this time primarily because there are some emerging plans for some development in the area. It needs to be remembered that the City began the process of acquiring Turkey Mountain Land in 1977 to preserve it as open space. There are 150 acres held by the River Parks Authority and being preserved in a natural state. The goal was to acquire the rest of the property. He stated that once you lose urban open space you don't get it back, therefore, he asked the Staff to remember the original concept in whatever recommendations come about. Mrs. Matthews advised that how much of the land will be preserved is one factor they will be looking at very closely. There has also been discussion on the possibility of trading some of the land which the developers own that they might not be able to develop to the City or County or River Parks Authority for a part of their 150 acres of park.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodward, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to direct the Staff to study this question of amending the District 8 Comprehensive Plan with respect to the New Town/In Town Concept.

Mrs. Matthews stated they would set June 27, 1984, as a tentative target date to try to report back to the Commission on this question.

## Final Approval and Release:

## Yale Center II (PUD \#340) (2293) East side of South Yale Avenue at East 35th Street <br> (RM-1, and RD) <br> Interchange Business Park (3104) East Marshall Street and North Barnett

The Staff advised the Commission that all release letters have been received and that final approval and release were recommended.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the Final Plats of Yale Center II and Interchange Business Park and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

Change of Access Review:
Compton Addition (182) 6610 South Peoria Avenue
The purpose of this request is to move one access $50^{\prime}$ south for better access to parking and drives. A total of one access to the lot remains the same. The Traffic Engineer and Staff have approved the request.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the requested change of access for Compton Addition.

Request to Waive Plat:
Z-4158 $0^{\prime}$ Connor Park (1293) 8821 East 21st Street
This is a request to waive plat on the East $158.5^{\prime}$ of the South $350^{\prime}$ of Block 10 in the above named plat. The applicant is planning a retirement center, and has Board of Adjustment approval. (12036 and 12461). Since the land is already platted the applicant is requesting waiver. The Staff notes that an additional 10 of right-of-way will be needed on 21st Street to meet the Major Street Plan requirement of $60^{\prime}$ from the centerline. A small triangle at the corner is presently being considered for acquisition. The additional $10^{\prime}$ dedication on 21st Street will necessitate moving the parking lot back 10 to the north to stay off City right-of-way. Other requirements would be grading and drainage approval by the City Engineer, any utility easements and/or extensions needed, and access control agreements if required by the Traffic Engineer.

The applicant was represented by Verlean Smith.
The Traffic Engineer advised that access from 21st Street will be "right-turn only". Water and Sewer Department required the sewer to be located, and a minimum of $7 \frac{1}{2}$ ' clearance provided.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of the waiver of plat on Z-4158, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of HIGGINS, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the request to waive plat for $Z-4158$, subject to the following conditions:
(a) Additional right-of-way dedication,
(b) move parking lot $10^{\prime}$ north to stay off right-of-way,
(c) grading and drainage plan approval by the City Engineer (P.F.P.I.),
(d) access control agreement, and
(e) locate existing sewer and provide a $7 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime}$ minimum clearance.

LOT SPLITS:
Lot Splits for Ratification:
L-15627 Amended (793) Wallace Geiger
*L-16128 (3591) Doy Sisney
L-16140 (392) William Sexton
L-16180 ( 784) Dan Fulps
Mr. Wilmoth advised that L-15627 was an old lot split application which was amended and now meets all of the regulations. He submitted a handout concerning L-16128 and discussed the number of side yards on this lot as was brought before the Commission at the last hearing. This particular lot is zoned RS which requires 60 ' width, and this lot has 99' on one and 100' on the other and does have more than 3 side yards. The Staff has no problems with either lot being created and they meet all the conditions. The Staff wanted to bring this split before the Commission for discussion because of the new policy that the Planning Commission see all lot splits with more than 3 side yards.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") that the approved lot splits listed above be ratified.

Lot Splits for Waiver:

L-16157 Dale Rothhammer (2783)

East of the SE corner of 101st Street and Lakewood Avenue

This is a request to split a $127.5^{\prime} \times 462^{\prime}$ tract into a $113.5^{\prime} \times 217^{\prime}$, (. 65 acre) and a .70 acre tract with a $14^{\prime}$ handle to 101 st Street. The zoning is $A G$ which requires a two-acre minimum and a 200 lot width minimum. The applicant has applied to the Board of Adjustment for a variance of these requirements. In 1978 the TMAPC and the Board of Adjustment granted a lot split that is similar to the above mentioned request which created a .64 acre tract with a $12.5^{\prime}$ handle to 101st Street. The applicant has also agreed to dedicate the 50 ' of right-of-way for 101 st Street. The Staff recommended approval,
subject to the Board of Adjustment, the Water and Sewer Department, Health Department and subject to any required easements that may be necessary. (The Staff was advised that the remaining tract to the south which was previously split retained access to 101st Street. The remainder contained in this split does not have access to Lakewood, but must also access to 101 st Street.)

The applicant was represented by Dale Rothhammer.
There was discussion regarding access to Lakewood, a private street. Since utilities are contained in an easement on Lakewood, it was recommended that the $14^{\prime}$ "access handle" also be a utility easement, as well as the existing $12 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime}$ "handle". This will provide access to utilities on Lakewood Avenue.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-16157, subject to the conditions.

Mayor Young was concerned about the $50^{\prime}$ mutual access easement, and Mr. Wilmoth advised that it is a $50^{\prime}$ utility easement with $30^{\prime}$ of it reserved for ingress and egress for the property owners in Steeplechase Addition. Mayor Young asked what the necessity was for the flags on the lots, and Mr. Wilmoth advised that is a private roadway and not a public street. There is an existing driveway on the property at present. Mr. Wilmoth advised that had all of these things come in at once it could have been required the private street to provide access for those other two lots. Mayor Young asked Mr. Rothhammer what divides the driveway from the private road and the applicant stated there is a wooden fence.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the request to waive the lot split requirements for L-16157, subject to the following conditions:
(a) Board of Adjustment approval,
(b) Health Department approval of septic systems, and
(c) mutual access and utility easements on the west 14' and the $12 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime}$ adjacent "handle".

L-16158 Arnold Due (2873) West of the SW corner of 161st Street and Yale Ave.
(AG)

This is a This is a request to split a $\times{ }^{\prime}$. lots with frontage on 161st Street. The zoning is $A G$ which requires a two-acre minimum and a 200' of lot width. The applicant has applied to the Board of Adjustment for a variance of these requirements. The applicant has agreed to dedicate $50^{\prime}$ for right-of-way on 161 st Street. The County Board of Adjustment in its April 13, 1984, meeting approved a request to allow two dwellings on the subject tract, and continued the application for thirty days in order to readvertise the Board case for a variance of the Bulk and Area Requirements in order to permit a lot split. The Staff recommended approval, subject to the approval of the County Board of Adjustment, Health Department, and any easements that may be needed. This is in an area that was subdivided without platting and there are many lots that do not conform to the required ?nn' width. This snlit would create lots that are still compatible
with the neighborhood. The applicant was not represented.
The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-16158, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Conmission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the request to waive the lot split requirements for L-16158, subject to the following conditions:
(a) Board of Adjustment approval, and
(b) Health Department approval.

L-16160 South Trenton Partners (693) SE corner of 8th Street and Trenton Ave. (RM-2)
This is a request to split a $50^{\prime} \times 140^{\prime}$ tract into two $50^{\prime} \times 70^{\prime}$ lots. The subject tract is zoned RM-2. In order to permit this split, a variance from the Board of Adjustment would be required because of the creation of substandard size lots. The Staff recommended approval, subject to the approval of the Board of Adjustment, Water and Sewer Department and any utility easements that may be required to service the above mentioned tracts. The Staff further noted that ordinarily an approval would NOT be recommended on such a small lot. However, many lots in this area have already been subdivided into very small lots similar to the ones requested. Most contain duplexes, singlefamily or multifamily dwellings that were constructed and split prior to Planning Commission jurisdiction. The original platted lots were only $25^{\prime} \times 140^{\prime}$ or 3,500 square feet each. The net result of this split is still 2 lots. The applicant was not represented at the T.A.C. meeting but was present at the Planning Commission meeting.

L-16176 South Trenton Partners (693) NE corner of 10 th Street and Trenton Ave.
(RM-2)
This is a similar split to L-16160 at the northerly end of Block 7, in Park Dale Addition. Since it was nearly identical except for the location of the split line, it is also included with the previous split, which is under the same ownership. The split line in this application separates a single-family house and a duplex into the east $52 \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}^{\prime}$ and the west $87 \frac{1_{2}^{\prime}}{\prime}$. It is included with this review since all the research and requirements would be the same for both applications. Approval is recommended, subject to Board of Adjustment approval and a maintenance agreement for any common sewer and/or utilities.

The Technical Advisory Committee and Staff recommended approval of L-16176, subject to the conditions.

On MOTION of T. YOUNG, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the request to waive the lot split requirements for L-16160 and $L-16176$, subject to the following conditions:
(a) Board of Adjustment approval, and maintenance acreoment for anv common sewer lines.

## PUD \#360 Poe \& Associates (Tri-Angle) NW corner of 91st Street and Memorial Drive <br> (CS and RM-0)

The Staff advised that consideration of PUD \#360 needs to be continued for a period of one week.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to continue consideration of PUD \#360 until Wednesday, May 23, 1984, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

OTHER BUSINESS:
PUD \#357 -- Minor Amendment
Staff Recommendation:
The subject tract is located south and east of the southeast corner of 71 st Street and South Quincy Avenue. It is irregular shaped, 8.5 acres in size and has an underlying zoning of $C S$ and $R M-1$. It has been recommended for approval of a Shopping/Office complex. The applicant is now requesting a minor amendment to rearrange the buildings within the complex.

The Staff has reviewed the recommended PUD and the proposed revised Development Plan and find no major changes in Development Standards or land use relationships. Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the minor amendment to PUD \#357, subject to the following conditions:
(1) That the applicant's Amended Outline Development Plan be made a condition of approval.
(2) Development Standards:

Development Area "A"
$\begin{array}{cl}\text { Land Area (Gross): } & 5.43 \text { acres } \\ \text { (Net): } & 4.89 \text { acres }\end{array}$
Permitted Uses: As permitted by right within a CS District
Maximum Floor Area: 44,619 square feet
Maximum Building Height: 1-story
Minimum Landscape Open Space: $\quad 15 \%$ of net area
Minimum Building Setback:
From 71st Street Centerline: 125 feet
From Quincy Centerline: 60 feet
From Area "B" Boundary: 20 feet
Minimum Off-Street Parking:
CS Uses:
1 space per 225 sq. ft. of floor area*
Other Bulk \& Area Requirements: As required within a CS District
*Restaurants and bars require 1 space per 100 square feet.

Development Area "B"

| Land Area (Gross): <br> (Net): | 3.05 acres <br> 2.91 acres |
| :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Uses: As permitted by right within an OL District |  |
| Maximum Floor Area: | 58,000 square feet |
| Maximum Building Height: | 2 stories/35 feet |
| Minimum Landscaped Open Space: | 20\% of net area |
| Minimum Building Setbacks: |  |
| From Quincy Centerline: | 80 feet |
| From South Boundary: | 50 feet |
| From East Boundary: | 30 feet |
| From Area "A" Boundary: | 10 feet |
| Minimum Off-Street Parking: | 1 space per 300 sq . ft. of floor area |
| Other Bulk and Area Requirements: | As required within an OL District |

(3) Sign Standards:

Signs accessory to the Development Area "A" uses shall comply with the restrictions of the Planned Unit Development Ordinance and the following additional restrictions.

Ground Signs:
Ground signs shall be limited to one ground sign identifying the project or tenants therein located at the 71st Street entrance to the project not exceeding 20 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 120 square feet, and one monument sign identifying the project at Quincy entrance not exceeding 6 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 64 square feet.

Wall or Canopy Signs:
Wall or Canopy signs shall be limited to $11 / 2$
square feet of display surface area per lineal foot of the building wall to which affixed.

Sign accessory to the Development Area "B" uses shall be limited to one monument sign identifying the project at the Quincy entrance not exceeding 4 feet in height and not exceeding a display surface area of 32 square feet.
(4) That a Detail Site Plan approved by the TMAPC prior to the issuance of a building permit.
(5) That the southern two access points from Quincy Avenue to Development Area "A" and Area "B" not be constructed until Area "B" is developed.
(6) That the architectural character of the east side of Buildings 2, 3 , and 6 be consistent with the fronts of said buildings.
(7) That a Detail Landscape Plan be approved by the TMAPC prior to occupancy, including a screening fence shall be constructed along the exterior boundaries of the project where they abut any "R" District and along the Quincy frontage and required screening shall be a combination of screening fence, berms, and landscaping.
(8) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260:of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the restrictive covenants and PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said covenants.

Mr. Roy Johnsen represented Mr. Goble, the property owner. He stated that the conditions which the Staff has recommended is acceptable to the owner.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.
On MOTION of HIGGINS, the PTanning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the requested Minor Amendment to PUD \#357, subject to the conditions stated above.

## PUD \#243 (Lot 37, Block 1, Glenoak Addition)

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment - Detail Site Plan Review
The subject lot is located in Glenoak Subdivision which is just north of the northeast corner of 61 st Street and South Harvard Avenue. It was approved for a duplex development with one single-family dwelling and 25 duplexes ( 51 dwellings total). The applicant has changed his original proposal to include more single-family detached dwellings than approved. Therefore, he is required to receive TMAPC approval of a new Detail Site Plan or Plans.

The Staff reviewed the Plans submitted for Lot 37 and find the following:

| Item | Approved | Submitted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Uses: Single-Family detached | attached or | Detached SingleFamily |
| Minimum Lot Size: | 7,000 sq. ft. | 8,184 sq. ft. |
| Maximum Building Height: | 26 feet to top of top plate | Same |
| Minimum Livability Space: | $6,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. | 5,700 sq. ft.* |
| Minimum Setbacks: Front: |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Garage: | 20 feet | 36 feet |
| Front entry: | 20 feet | 25 feet |
| Side entry: | 10 feet | NA |
| Side: Between Buildings: | 15 feet or 7.5 feet each side | ```9.5 feet or }7.1 feet**``` |
|  |  | $51684 \cdot 1506(9)$ |


| Rear: | 20 feet | 12.5 feet** |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Parking: | 2 enclosed | 2 enclosed |
|  | spaces | spaces |

*The PUD conditions required an average of $6,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. of open space per dwelling unit be provided even though the underlying zoning (RS-2) requires only $5,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.

Since this is a voluntary requirement and since the lot in question is one of the smallest in the project and the larger lots will provide greater amounts of open space, the Staff can support the livability space provided as being minor.
**One side yard is 4 inches short of the required 7.50 feet, and the rear yard is 7.43 feet short of the required 20 feet. Since the lot backs up to 100 feet of common open space and the side yard encroachment is only 4 inches, the Staff considers both of these encroachments minor.

Based upon the above review, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the minor amendments and the Detail Site Plan for Lot 37, Block 1, Glenoak Addition, subject to the plans submitted.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.
On MOTION of HINKLE, the PTanning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan and Minor Amendment of the rear yard, subject to the plan submitted.

PUD \#268 (Lot 3, Block 1, Woodland Glen Extended)
Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment:
The subject tract is located within a single-family area of the PUD. The approved rear yard setback is 20 feet and the applicant is requesting to be allowed to encroach a corner of the proposed home two feet into that setback.

The corner that will be encroaching is a covered patio and the request falls within the policy for minor amendment consideration.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of an 18-foot rear yard setback on Lot 3, Block 1, Woodland Glen Extended, subject to the plans submitted.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.
On MOTION of HIGGINS, the PTanning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the requested Minor Amendment to PUD \#268 for an 18-foot rear yard setback on Lot 3, Block 1, Woodland Glen Extended, subject to the plans submitted.

Staff Recommendation
The subject tract is approximately 850 feet east of the northeast corner of 91st Street and South Yale Avenue. The total tract is 17.78 acres in size and zoned a combination of RM-1, RM-T and RS-3. The applicant has received approval of a 3-acre office area and a 13.45 acre small lot single-family area. The applicant is now requesting to reduce the density of the residential area (14.78)
from 114 lots to 100 lots. He is requesting to increase the minimum lot size from $3,750 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. to $4,000 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. and decrease the minimum lot width from 45 feet to 38 feet.

The Staff has reviewed the submitted amended Development Plan and Development Standards and find that the request is minor in nature and meets the policy for minor amendments.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Amended Site Plan, subject to the submitted plan and the following Development Standards:

Maximum Number of Lots:
Minimum Lot Size:
Minimum Lot Width:

```
100 lots
4,000 sq. ft.
38 feet*
```

*Subject to the Development Plan submitted which shows the majority of the lots to be 40 feet or greater in width.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.
On MOTION of HIGGINS, the PTanning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the Amended Site Plan, subject to the submitted plan and the above stated Development Standards.

PUD \#320 Weiss Southwood Condominiums 81st Street and Delaware Avenue
Detail Site Plan Review:
The Staff advised that consideration of this item needs to be continued to the May 23rd, 1984, meeting.

On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to continue consideration of the Detail Site Plan Review of PUD \#320 until Wednesday, May 23, 1984, at 1:30 p.m., in Langenheim Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

PUD \#274 (Development Area "B" and part of Development Area "A")
Staff Recommendation - Detail Site Plan Review
The subject PUD is located $1 / 2 \mathrm{mile}$ north of the northeast corner of 61st Street and South Lewis Avenue. Development Area "B" is 5.69 net acres in size and approved for a multi-story office building. Development Area "A" is 1.13 acres in size and approved for a 40-foot wide landscape buffer strip along the north property line.

The Staff has reviewed the submitted Detail Site Plan and find the following:
Land Area (Net): 5.69 acres 5.69 acres

Permitted Uses: As permitted within an OM District
Minimum Building Setback:
From Centerline of Lewis: 140 feet 170 feet
From North Property Line: 250 feet 250 feet
From South Property Line: 250 feet 250 feet
From East Boundary of
Development Area "B": 80 feet 120 feet
Maximum Floor Area: 132,000 sq. ft. 132,000 sq. ft.
Maximum Building Height:
8 stories
8 stories
Minimum Off-Street Parking: 377 spaces 422 spaces
Minimum Landscaped Open Space: $24 \% /$ Net Area
27.9\%/Net Area

The Plan also shows the proper location and size of the sign and screening fence.

In addition, the applicant has shown the landscaped buffer area along the north property (Development Area "A") that meets the intent of the approved Development PTan.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Detail Site Plan for Development Area "B" and the west part of Development Area "A", subject to the screening fence being erected along the entire north boundary prior to occupancy of Area "B" and that a Detailed Landscape Plan for Area "A", portion opposite Area "B", be approved and in place prior to occupancy of Development Area "B". The remaining portion of the 40 -foot buffer strip is not required to be landscaped until the other development phases are constructed.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.
On MOTION of HIGGINS, the PTanning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the Detail Site Plan for Development Area "B" and the west part of Development Area "A", subject to the screening fence being erected along the entire north boundary prior to occupancy of Area "B" and that a Detailed Landscape Plan for Area "A", portion opposite Area "B", be approved and in place prior to occupancy of Development Area "B".

Staff Recommendation - Minor Amendment:
The subject lot is part of a single-family development area that required 15 -foot rear yards. The applicant is proposing to build a home on the lot that will have a bay window that encroaches 2 feet into the rear yard. The Staff considers this encroachment to be minor in nature and recommends APPROVAL of the requested 2-foot encroachment into the rear yard of Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows, subject to the plan submitted.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.
On MOTION of HINKLE, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Beckstrom, Draughon, Higgins, Hinkle, Woodard, C. Young, T. Young, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Connery, Flick, Kempe, Rice, "absent") to approve the requested Minor Amendment to allow a 2 -foot encroachment into the rear yard of Lot 8, Block 14, Whispering Meadows, subject to the plan submitted.

There being no further business, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 2:04 pom.

Date Approved


ATTEST:


