

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting No. 1958

Wednesday, January 5, 1994, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present

Carnes, 2nd Vice
Chairman
Doherty, Chairman
Harris
Horner
Midget, Mayor's
Designee
Pace
Parmele, 1st Vice
Chairman
Wilson

Members Absent

Ballard
Broussard
Neely

Staff Present

Davis
Gardner
Jones
Stump

Others Present

Linker, Legal
Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Tuesday, January 4, 1994 at 1:00 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Doherty called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of December 15, 1993, Meeting No. 1956:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Midget, Neely "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of December 15, 1993 Meeting No. 1956.

Approval of the minutes of December 22, 1993, Meeting No. 1957:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Midget, Neely "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of December 22, 1993 Meeting No. 1957.

REPORTS:

Committee Reports:

Budget and Work Program Committee

Ms. Wilson announced that the Budget and Work Program Committee will meet Wednesday, January 12, 1994 at 11:30 a.m. in the INCOG large conference room to discuss budget items for the 1994-1995 fiscal year. Ms. Wilson asked that any ideas the Planning Commissioners may wish to have considered be submitted before the end of January.

Director's Report:

Mr. Gardner announced details for the annual reception of Oklahoma State Legislators.

SUBDIVISIONS:

WAIVER REQUEST: SECTION 213:

Z-6418 Unplatted (3293) (PD-18) (CD-9)

5304 South Harvard Avenue.

Jones presented the application with no representative in attendance at the TAC meeting.

The plat waiver request is a result of a rezoning application to rezone the west portion of the subject tract to OL (Office Light) to provide additional parking for an existing dentist office. The rezoning application is scheduled to be heard by the TMAPC on October 13, 1993 and approximately one month later by the City Council. As the Site Plan shows, no new construction other than parking and landscape areas are planned.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** to waive the platting requirements subject to the following conditions:

1. Grading and/or drainage plan approval by the Department of Public Works in the permit process.
2. Access control agreement if required by the Department of Public Works (Traffic Engineering).
3. Utility extensions and/or easements if needed.

French recommenced that additional right-of-way be dedicated along South Harvard Avenue in order to meet the Major Street and Highway Plan.

On Motion of Miller, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to **APPROVE** the waiver of plat for Z-6418 subject to the conditions above

There were no interested parties in attendance.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; Midget "abstaining"; Ballard, Broussard, Neely "absent") to **APPROVE** the Waiver of Plat for Z-6418 as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

LOT-SPLITS FOR RATIFICATION OF PRIOR APPROVAL:

- L-17774 J.C. Miller (392) (PD-10) (CD-4)
2523-2525 W. Cameron RS-3
- L-17809 Oneita Roland (874) (PD-19) (County)
12802 E. 138th St. S. RS
- L-17814 Denny West (2693) (PD-18) (CD-7)
6812 E. 44th St. S. IL
- L-17825 Leonard Kragel (3392) (PD-9) (County)
4337 W. 59th St. RS
- L-17827 R.A. Clark Family Trust (893) (PD-6) (CD-4)

2507 E. 15th St.

Staff Comments

Mr. Jones announced that Staff has found the above-listed lot-splits to be in conformance with the lot-split requirements.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Midget, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Neely "absent") to **RATIFY** the above-listed lot-splits having received prior approval.

* * * * *

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

PUD 505 Northeast corner of 11th Street South and Allegheny Avenue.

The applicant originally proposed a commercial PUD on three lots, one of which fronts 11th Street and is zoned CH. The other two lots front Allegheny Avenue and are zoned RS-2. The proposal was then amended to include only the two lots closest to 11th Street. There are existing commercial buildings on the CH-zoned lot and a house on the RS-2-zoned lot, with the entire front, side and rear yards illegally paved for parking.

The PUD proposed to use the existing commercial buildings for any use allowed by right in a CH district except Use Units 12a and 23. The other lot would allow a 1,500 SF building and Use Unit 10, 11, 6, or uses accessory to uses on the commercial lot. No business signs would be permitted. After review of the proposal, Staff cannot recommend approval for a number of reasons. First, it is a commercial encroachment into a residential area. Two single-family homes face directly into the residential lot proposed for parking and office use. Commercial traffic would be drawn into the neighborhood and parking would be allowed in

the front yard where it is prohibited if not in a PUD. In addition, the following BOA variances would be required to approve this PUD:

1. Variance of the required landscaped open space from 3,500 SF to 700 SF if a commercial use is put on the first lot and an office use on the second lot. (The variance would need to be even greater if both lots were used for office use.)
2. Variance of off-street parking from as much as 151 to 32 spaces.
3. Variance of livability space from 5,000 SF to 600 SF if the house on the second lot is used as a dwelling.

With these major deficiencies in the PUD and no protection or buffering offered for the residences across the street, Staff recommends **DENIAL** of PUD 505.

Staff might be able to support a PUD which limits the entire PUD to Use Unit 11 uses, removes the house on the residential lot and provides a 25' landscaped buffer area on the front of the residential lot with parking screened from view on the remainder of the lot.

Applicant's Comments

Michael Hackett 1820 South Boulder Place

Mr. Hackett, attorney representing the applicant, distributed photographs of the subject property and surrounding area. He gave a history of the subject property and explained the proposed use of the property. Mr. Hackett explained that the applicants currently operate two beauty colleges in the southeastern portion of the state and were approached to take over the operation of the Tulsa Academy of Hairstyling at this location. He advised that his clients are currently operating under a lease agreement at this location as CC's Cosmetology College. There is a contract for his clients to purchase the property and one of the conditions of contract is that the zoning be rectified, illegal parking use on lot 4 be addressed and for the mixture of uses to be approved. Mr. Hackett advised that his clients would like to relocate their administrative offices for the two beauty colleges in the southeastern portion of the state into this building. He acknowledged that parking along Allegheny Avenue is of major concern among area residents. Mr. Hackett advised that approximately 100 students attended classes and 100 to 150 customers are served daily, customers are requested to park along the front of the building and there is an informal arrangement with Circle K for limited parking. Mr. Hackett informed that there has been a substantial problem with parking in this area since the inception of the beauty college operation. He explained attempts to obtain additional parking.

Stephen Carr 1516 South Boston Avenue

Mr. Carr explained areas reviewed during design consideration. He noted that under this proposal, parking standards would be met except for the possibility of a restaurant continuing as a potential use within Lot 5. Mr. Carr informed that for all other commercial operations, exclusive of a restaurant, the 48 parking spaces being proposed for the site would meet standards.

Mr. Carr answered questions from the Planning Commission regarding the commercial operation and parking for the proposed office use. Mr. Carr advised that the office

operations being proposed would be located in the existing single-family dwelling unit. This would allow for a residential-appearing office fronting residential structures across the street from Allegheny. He noted that the 10% landscaping requirement could not be met on Lot 5 because the site is built out and the 15% office space landscaping requirement for Lot 4 could be met if four or five additional parking spaces were to be deleted in front of the residential building, which would then bring required parking below recommended standards. Mr. Carr proposed deleting two parking spaces in front of the existing residential structure, providing landscaping space at the southwest and southeast corners of Lot 4, and providing landscaping as indicated in the site plan.

Ms. Wilson noted that Staff might be able to support the PUD if the PUD was limited to Use Unit 11 uses, the house on the residential lot were removed and a 25' landscape buffer was provided. She asked if the applicant could make use of the property with those conditions. Mr. Carr replied that too much parking would be lost.

Mr. Hackett advised that by limiting Use Units, the applicants were concerned over resale value.

No other parties wished to speak in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Midget made a motion for denial, with Mr. Carnes seconding the motion.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that this application is not compatible with the neighborhood.

Interested Parties Opposed to the Application.

Terry Wilson	7728 East 30th Street	74129
G.A. Lamb	540 South Allegheny	74112
Joe McCruick	111 East 1st Street	74103
Jimmy Singer	935 South Darlington	74112
Kenneth Logue	936 South Darlington	74112
Michael Lodes	916 South Braden	74112
Jeannine Sims	907 South Erie	74112
Anna Levi	2174 South Sandusky	74114

Mr. Parmele agreed with the motion for denial, but suggested parking requirements in areas such as this, where heavy commercial abuts residential, needs to be reviewed to alleviate the burden to the neighborhoods and assist existing businesses. He noted that making provision for parking was accomplished in the Brookside area to act as a transition to neighborhoods.

Chairman Doherty announced receipt of a letter from Terry Wilson, Planning District 5 Chair, opposing the PUD and requesting denial.

Ms. Pace declared that residents of the mid-town area need to work with their Planning District Chairs in an attempt to devise an agreeable solution to provide parking for commercial entities and protect adjacent neighborhoods.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; Horner "abstaining"; Ballard, Broussard, Neely "absent") to **DENY** PUD 505 as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING

Application No.: **Z-6420** Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: Roy Johnsen Proposed Zoning: CS & RM-1

Location: 8900 East 71st Street South.
Date of Hearing: January 5, 1994

Chairman Doherty announced receipt of a request for continuance of this item to January 12, 1994.

There were no interested parties in attendance.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Midget, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Neely "absent") to **CONTINUE** Z-6420 to January 12, 1994.

* * * * *

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING

Application No.: **Z-6427** Present Zoning: RM-1/RS-3
Applicant: TMAPC Proposed Zoning: RM-1/RS-3/HP

Location: 15th Street to 21st Street & Peoria to Utica.
Date of Hearing: January 5, 1994
Presentation to TMAPC:

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 6 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the major portion of the subject property as Low Intensity Residential with the exception of an area in the southeast corner of 17th Street and S. Peoria Avenue, that lies 800' east of Peoria Avenue and 600' south of East 17th Street, which is designated by the Comprehensive Plan as Medium Intensity Residential.

Staff Comments:

Site Analysis: The subject property is approximately 45 acres in size and is bounded on the north by E. 15th Street, on the south by E. 21st Street, to the west by S. Peoria Avenue and on the east by S. Utica Avenue. It is nonwooded, gently sloping, and has many single-family and multifamily residential dwellings zoned RM-2, RS-3 or RD.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by E. 15th Street with OL, CS and CH zoning and includes restaurants, retail shops and a school; to the east are offices and a bank which is located in the southeast corner, with OL, OM and CH zoning. The property is abutted on the south by single-family homes and a public park, zoned RS-2; and to the west by single-family homes and a small area in the northwest corner which includes restaurants and offices and is zoned OL, OM, and CS.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: The history of zoning actions in this area indicates that there have been relatively no changes within the subject area and only a very few zoning cases that have occurred on property surrounding the subject property. These have been for OL uses, with the exception of the OH zoning that was granted for St. John's Hospital and related facilities on the northeast corner of 21st Street and Utica Avenue.

Staff recommends that the Swan Lake area be designated HP and that the Design Guidelines proposed by the Preservation Commission be **APPROVED**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION ADDENDUM

Z-6427: Swan Lake Historic Preservation District

Staff has evaluated the appropriateness of HP zoning on portions of Block 27 Park Place Addition. It is staff opinion that the portion of the block which, 1) fronts 19th Street, 2) is zoned RS-3 and 3) has not been approved for off-street parking by the Board of Adjustment should be included in the district. This area should be at least 130.5' in depth (north-south) to include the three existing residences which face 19th Street. Staff feels this area's inclusion in the HP District will produce a logical boundary along 19th Street, which will protect the historic dwellings on both sides of the street.

Another area of Block 27 Park Place Addition that should not be excluded from the HP District would be the west 75.5' of Lots 6 and 7 and all of Lot 8. This area would include all of the frontage on the east side of St. Louis Avenue and would contain one single-family dwelling and one duplex, both over 50 years old. Most of the remainder of Block 27 that was proposed for the HP designation has been previously approved for off-street parking by the board of Adjustment.

Commissioner Harris and Mr. Carnes both voiced concern over including properties in the HP overlay when property owners are opposed to being included, which is evident from letters received attesting to that fact.

Chairman Doherty noted that it appears to be the sense of some of the Planning Commissioners to remove Block 27 from consideration for HP overlay. He recognized those in attendance who voiced support of HP overlay at the December 1, 1993 meeting and asked for comments from individuals who had not addressed the Planning Commission at that time. Chairman Doherty informed that the Planning Commission is disposed to establish an HP overlay from comments received at the December 1 meeting.

Interested Parties

Bryan Whitehurst 316 East 18th Street 74120

Mr. Whitehurst expressed objection to the proposed HP overlay because he feels it was not properly publicized from the date it was first heard, December 1, 1993, for continuance to today's public hearing. He feels that additional notice should have been given for today's meeting, adding that there was no legal notice in the newspaper and signs were not up advertising the hearing.

Mr. Linker advised that the public hearing of December 1, 1993 was continued in order to give additional legal notice.

Mr. Stump advised that proper notice was mailed out to those who did not initially receive notice informing them of the new hearing date, but additional signs were not posted as has been the practice for other continuances.

Sherry Barnett 1428 East 17th Place 74120

Ms. Barnett advised that she did not receive notice of the public hearing for December 1, 1993; however, she advised of receiving subsequent notice. She informed of one other individual who wished to voice opposition to the proposed HP overlay and only found out about the meeting today. In response to Chairman Doherty's inquiry if the individual received notice of the December 1, 1993, Ms. Barnett replied yes.

Ms. Barnett informed that it was her understanding that the December 1, 1993 meeting would not be held because proper notice had not been given.

Chairman Doherty advised that input was received, but no action could be taken to ensure that all parties were properly notified.

Ms. Barnett explained that she chose to live in this area because of its unique homes. She expressed concern that the decision of the Historic Preservation Commission will make the final determination of what property owners must do. Ms. Barnett was also concerned that HP overlay establishes the Historic Preservation Commission as arbiters of esthetics in the neighborhood. She disclosed that one of the criteria for HP overlay is that it must meet the guidelines for listing in the National Register. Ms. Barnett questioned whether or not this neighborhood meets those guidelines, since it has never been submitted. She reviewed differences between obtaining HP overlay and obtaining registry on the National Register. Ms. Barnett declared that she is not opposed to historic preservation, or any restriction her neighbors may wish to place on themselves; however, she does object to the additional burden it would place on her. She noted that the Planning Commission is considering excluding the block owned by Helmerich & Payne, Inc., and those expecting to sell to them. She pointed out that there is no one to protect the individual not wanting to be included in the HP overlay. She requested that her property be excluded from the HP overlay, that being the north 162' E. 50' of lot 10, Block 26, Park Place Addition.

Ms. Wilson explained how a Certificate of Appropriateness and the appeal process works.

Chairman Doherty explained that the Preservation Commission's guidelines are intended to preserve the character of the neighborhood. He commented that regarding Block 27, the

Planning Commission's concern is not who owns it, but the character of what has already developed there, noting the majority of that block is not historic in character.

Ms. Barnett voiced concern over lengthy delays of home maintenance due to the approval process required.

Greg Warren

Staff for the Preservation Commission

Mr. Warren advised that routine maintenance does not require a permit and any work approved by a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) requires implementation within one year. He noted that a COA must be acted upon within 30 days or is automatically approved, and stated that most are acted upon within two weeks. Mr. Warren explained the procedure should an individual make a subjective judgment and be found in error.

Mr. Whitehurst advised that the ordinance states that a COA has a time limit of two years for completion. He declared that this misinformation is evidence that individuals making these judgments are not familiar enough with the ordinance to make these determinations.

Chairman Doherty asked for input from those who did not speak at the December 1, 1993 meeting. There were no others wishing to address the Planning Commission. He recognized letters of opposition which had been received.

Mr. Carnes made a motion to move the HP overlay line to exempt Block 27.

Mr. Parmele explained that if this item were a zoning change, he would be opposed to including Ms. Barnett's property without her permission. However, he believes the HP overlay will not be as much of a burden as she believes. Mr. Parmele declared that the Design Guidelines will ensure the greatest flexibility possible to the homeowner.

Ms. Pace does not believe Block 27 to be the same as other excluded commercial property along 15th Street and Utica Avenue. She feels individual property owners who wish to be excluded should receive the same consideration as developers requesting exclusion. Ms. Pace remarked that one of reasons for the HP overlay is concern over Block 27 complementing the area. She declared that Block 27 is a greater threat than the few scattered property owners within the neighborhood expressing opposition. Ms. Pace believes that commercial interests are better equipped than an individual homeowner to handle hindrances caused by HP overlay to development or sale of property.

Chairman Doherty explained that the Planning Commission has always been hesitant to zone past the half-block level. To spot-zone creates an enforcement problem. He advised that to be effective, overlay zoning must be uniform across the area it applies to.

Commissioner Harris declared that this type of district imposed by government is too much government.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **6-1-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; Harris "nay"; Pace "abstaining"; Ballard, Broussard,

Neely "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of the Swan Lake area (Z-6427) to be designated HP and that the Design Guidelines proposed by the Preservation Commission be **APPROVED**, excluding Block 27 Park Place Addition.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

All of Blocks 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, & 23, Orcutt Addition;

All of Block 2, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 1 through 8 and Lots 12 through 16 thereof;

All of Block 3, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 1 through 5 and 14, 15, & 16, thereof;

All of Block 4, Orcutt Addition less Lots 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, & 16 thereof;

All of Block 5, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, & 16 thereof;

All of Block 9, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 9 through 16;

All of Block 11, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 14 through 16 and Lots 1 through 3 thereof;

All of Block 15, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 1 through 8;

All of Block 18, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 1 through 6;

All of Block 24, Orcutt Addition, less Lots 15 and 16;

All of Blocks 1, 2, & 3, Sanger-Douglass Sub-Div.;

All of Blocks 25, 26, & 28, Park Place Addition;

All of Block 1, Swan Park Addition;

All of Block 2, Swan Park Addition, less Lots 3 through 8;

All of Block 1, Lewkowitz Subdivision;

All of Block 1, Biddisons Subdivision;

All of Block 1, Houston Subdivision;

All of Block 1, Russell & Sill's Re-Subdivision;

All of Block 1, Bragassa Subdivision of Lot 10, Block 28, Park Place;

All of Block 1, Mary E. Kennedy Subdivision;

All of Block 1, ASA Rose Subdivision;

All of Block 1, Burns Subdivision;

All of Block 1, Block 2, and Block 3, Halsey's Subdivision;

All of Block 1, Block 2, Dent Subdivision;

The above described property being located between East 21st Street on the south, Peoria Avenue to the west, East 15th Street on the north and S. Utica Avenue on the east in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

* * * * *

PUD-316-5: Minor Amendment to reduce required rear yard - 9323 South 85th East Avenue.

The applicant is requesting a reduction in the required rear yard from 20' to 12' to allow a covered patio. Staff can see nothing unique about this lot in depth from other lots in the subdivision. This is the same request which the TMAPC denied on December 1, 1993. Staff recommends **DENIAL** again.

Applicant's Comments

Roy Johnsen, attorney for the applicant, presented photographs of the patio and noted that it is an extension of the roof extending into the required rear yard, encroaching approximately 5' more than allowed. He explained that until the last year, building inspectors allowed unenclosed patios to encroach. Mr. Johnsen informed that building inspectors, other than the one who cited his client, are still permitting patios such as this one. He noted that historically, a covered patio added to an already-filed building permit has not been revised. Mr. Johnsen pointed out that this roof was on at the time of the framing inspection and was approved. He explained that the cost of removing the cover would be substantial since it is built into the roof. Mr. Johnsen advised of receiving letters of support from property owners to the north, south, and east of the subject property. He advised that the Planning Commission could impose a condition that no storage buildings or other obstructions of this rear yard be allowed.

Ms. Wilson suggested that a condition be imposed that the patio never be enclosed.

Mr. Johnsen agreed to the condition.

There was discussion over the need of consistency by building inspections and informing developers of revised procedures.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Horner, Midget, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Neely "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 316-5 with the condition that the patio never be enclosed and that there be no other obstructions to the rear yard.

* * * * *

Z-5659-SP-1-C: Minor Amendment to permit a ground sign - located at 6508 South 106th East Avenue.

The subject tract is part of Lot 1, Block 1, The Bedford, contains an existing apartment complex and has an underlying zoning of CO (corridor). The applicant is requesting a Minor Amendment to the original Site Plan to permit a 10' x 9' identification sign. After field investigation, Staff found the following existing signage:

- 1 small identification sign on East 61st (appears to be on City right-of-way)
- 4 small identification and amenity signs on South 107th (appears to be on City right-of-way)
- 1 approximately 2 1/2' x 3' leasing sign (appears to be on City right-of-way)
- 1 identification sign on planter
- 1 two-story identification wall sign (on north side of building)

Staff could find no previous approval for the existing signage.

Staff is supportive of the proposed sign but only with the condition that all other signs not previously approved be removed. In addition, Staff would point out that the proposed sign location will have restricted line of sight due to two existing trees. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan subject to removal of all not previously approved signs.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Harris, Horner, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Carnes, Midget, Neely "absent") to **APPROVE** Z-5659-SP-1-C Detail Sign Plan subject to removal of all previously unapproved signs as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD-166-F: Detail Landscape Plan - Development Area 2.1 - 9221 South Sheridan Road.

Development Area 2.1 of PUD-166-F was given Detail Site Plan approval for a car wash on October 13, 1993. The applicant is now requesting Detail Landscape Plan approval as required in the PUD. The submitted plan meets both the new landscape ordinance and PUD requirements for the number of trees and amount of landscape area. Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Landscape Plan for Area 2.1 as submitted.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Harris, Horner, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Carnes, Midget, Neely "absent") to **APPROVE** PUD 166-F Detail Landscape Plan as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Z-6344-SP-2: Revised wall signage for Tulsa Dog Training Club - south of the southeast corner of East 61st Street South & South 107th East Avenue.

The new wall sign will be on the west face of the building and will be composed of 1' tall letters. The sign will contain approximately 20 SF of display surface area. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the revised sign.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **PARMELE**, the TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Doherty, Harris, Horner, Pace, Parmele, Wilson "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Ballard, Broussard, Carnes, Midget, Neely "absent") to **APPROVE** Z-6344-SP-2 Revised Sign Plan as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

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

Date Approved: _____

Chairman

ATTEST:

Secretary