# City of Broken Arrow <br> Meeting Agenda <br> Planning Commission 

City of Broken Arrow Council Chambers
220 S 1st Street
Broken Arrow OK
74012
Chairperson Ricky Jones
Vice Chair Lee Whelpley
Member Fred Dorrell
Member Mark Jones
Member Pablo Aguirre
Thursday, June 13, 2019
5:00 PM
Council Chambers

1. Call To Order
2. Roll Call
3. Old Business
A. 19-763 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding the proposed modifications to Table 3.1-1; Section 3.2.C and 3.3.D; Table 5.4.1; and Section 10.3.D.11.a of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance

Attachments: $\quad$ B\&B Zoning Ordinance Update 5-2-2019
4. Consideration of Consent Agenda
A. 19-643 Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of May 09, 2019

Attachments: 05092019 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
B. 19-723 Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of May 23, 2019

Attachments: 05232019 Planning Commission Minutes
C. 19-705 Approval of PT19-109, Preliminary Plat, Highland 55 at Mission Hills, 19.63 acres, 1 Lot, PUD-189 (Planned Unit Development)/RM
(Residential Multifamily) to PUD-189C/RM, north of Albany Street (61st
Street), one-third mile west of 9th Street (Lynn Lane)
Attachments: 2-CHECKLIST.HIGHLAND 55 AT MISSION HILLS
3-PRELIMINARY PLAT AND COVENANTS.HIGHLAND 55 AT MISSION ]
4-CONCEPTUAL UTILITIES
5-CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN.05-28-2019
D. 19-644 Approval of PT19-107, Conditional Final Plat, Creek Center, a replat of a part of Possum Run Addition, 1.05 acres, 1 Lot, A-1 (Agricultural) to CG (Commercial General), west of the southwest corner of Kenosha Street (71st Street) and 51st Street (Evans Road)

## Attachments: 2-SUBDIVISION CHECKLIST

3-CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT AND COVENANTS PT19-107
E. 19-710 Approval of request to deviate from masonry exterior building materials, ST19-111 (Site Plan), Tulsa Urology, 0.87 acres, PUD (Planned Unit Development)-130B/CH (Commercial Heavy) and RM (Residential Multi-family), 850 W . Mission Street (one-quarter mile north of Albany Street, west of Elm Place)

Attachments: 2-AERIAL
3-SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE PLAN, ELEVATIONS AND RENDERINGS
4-PUD130B ELM CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
5-STONE RIDGE TOWNE CENTER PLAT
6-LOT SPLIT EXHIBIT
5. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

## 6. Public Hearings

A. 19-650 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-2029, Doyle Rezoning, 5.10 acres, A-RE to RE, one-third mile north of New Orleans Street (101st Street), one-quarter mile west of 23rd Street (193rd E. Avenue/County Line Road)

Attachments: 2-CASE MAP
3-AERIAL
4-EXHIBIT-EXISTING LOTS
7. Appeals
8. General Commission Business
9. Remarks, Inquiries and Comments by Planning Commission and Staff (No Action)
10. Adjournment

## NOTICE:

1. ALL MATTERS UNDER "CONSENT" ARE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO BE ROUTINE AND WILL BE ENACTED BY ONE MOTION. HOWEVER, ANY CONSENT ITEM CAN BE REMOVED FOR DISCUSSION, UPON REQUEST.
2. IF YOU HAVE A DISABILITY AND NEED ACCOMMODATION IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING,
PLEASE CONTACT THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT AT 918-259-8412, TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS.
3. EXHIBITS, PETITIONS, PICTURES, ETC. PRESENTED TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY BE RECEIVED
AND DEPOSITED IN CASE FILES TO BE MAINTAINED AT BROKEN ARROW CITY HALL.
4. RINGING/SOUND ON ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS MUST BE TURNED OFF DURING THE PLANNING

COMMISSION MEETING.
POSTED on $\qquad$ , $\qquad$ at $\qquad$ am/pm.

City Clerk

# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 19-763, Version: 1

# Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 06-13-2019 

To:
From:
Title:

Chairman and Board Members
Development Services Department
Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding the proposed modifications to Table 3.1-1; Section 3.2.C and 3.3.D; Table 5.4.1; and Section 10.3.D.11.a of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance

Modifications to the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance are being proposed in regards to Bed \& Breakfast facilities. The proposed modifications are to Table 3.1-1; Section 3.2.C and 3.3.D; Table 5.4.1; and Section 10.3.D.11.a.

The reason for the modifications are to bring the zoning ordinance more inline with

| Item | Proposed Modification |
| :--- | :--- |
| Section 3.1.F <br> (Table 3.1-1) | The modification of Bed and Breakfast to Bed and Breakfast Type 3 and the <br> addition of Bed \& Breakfast Type 1 and Type 2. |
| Section 3.2.C | The modification and addition of standards and requirements Bed and <br> Breakfast Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3. |
| Section 3.3.D | The remove of prohibition of Bed and Breakfasts as Home Occupations |
| Section 5.4.D <br> (Table 5.4.1) | The modification and addition of parking standards for Bed and Breakfast <br> Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3. |
| Section 10.3.D.11.a | The modification of Bed and Breakfast to Bed and Breakfast Type 3 and the <br> addition of Bed \& Breakfast Type 1 and Type 2 definition. |

Attachments: Modifications to Table 3.1-1; Section 3.2.C and 3.3.D; Table 5.4.1; and Section 10.3.D.11.a.

## Recommendation:

Recommend approval of proposed modifications to Table 3.1-1; Section 3.2.C and 3.3.D; Table 5.4.1; and Section 10.3.D.11.a of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance, as presented, and an Ordinance be drafted for City Council approval.

Prepared and Approved By:
Larry R. Curtis

File \#: 19-763, Version: 1

## LRC

## ORDINANCE NO. XXXX

An ordinance amending Section 3.1.F (Table 3.1-1) Table of Allowed Uses, Section 3.2.C, Commercial Uses, Section 3.3.D, Additional Standards for Specific Accessory Uses, Section 5.4.D (Table 5.4.1), Off-Street Parking Schedule A, and Section 10.3.D.11a, Definitions of the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance; repealing all ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith; and declaring an emergency.

## BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BROKEN ARROW:

SECTION I. Section 3.1.F (Table 3.1-1), Table of Allowed Uses, of the Broken Arrow Zoning Code (No. 2931) is hereby amended to read as follows:
F. Table of Allowed Uses

| TABLE 3.1-1 TABLE OF ALLOWED USESP= Permitted; S=Specific Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USE CATEGORY | USE TYPE | AG | RESIDENTIAL |  |  |  |  | DROD AREAS*** |  |  |  |  |  |  | MIXED USE |  |  |  | COMMERCIAL/ OFFICE |  |  |  | IND'L | SPECIFIC USE PERMIT STANDARDS |
|  |  | A1 | RE | $\begin{gathered} \text { RS1 / R1 } \\ \text { RS2 / R2 } \\ \text { RS3 / } \\ \text { R3/RS4 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathrm{D} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{M} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  |  | D F | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{C} \\ & \mathbf{N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{I} \\ \mathrm{~L} & \mathrm{H} \end{array}$ |  |
|  | RESIDENTIAL USES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household Living | Dwelling, duplex |  |  |  | P | P |  | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, multifamily |  |  |  |  | P |  | P |  |  |  | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, singlefamily attached |  |  |  | P | P |  | P | P |  |  |  |  |  | P | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, singlefamily detached | P | P | P | P |  | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |  |  |  |  | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Dwelling, mobile home | S |  |  |  |  | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.2.A.1. |
|  | Dwelling, zero lot line |  |  |  | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | P |  |  | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mobile home park |  |  |  |  |  | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mobile home subdivision |  |  |  |  |  | P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




| USE CATEGORY | USE TYPE | TABLE 3.1-1 TABLE OF ALLOWED USES P= Permitted; S=Specific Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AG RESIDENTIAL |  |  |  |  |  | DROD AREAS*** |  |  |  |  |  |  | MIXED USE |  |  |  | COMMERCIAL/ OFFICE |  |  |  | IND'L |  | SPECIFIC USE PERMIT STANDARDS |
|  |  | A1 | RE | RS1 / R1 RS2 / R2 RS3 / R3/RS4 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{D} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{M} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{D} \\ \mathrm{~F} \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{H} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | terminal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Heliport | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | S |  |
| Utility | Utility facility, major | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S | S | S | P |  |
|  | Utility facility, minor | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |






| TABLE 3.1-1 TABLE OF ALLOWED USES P= Permitted; S=Specific Use |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USE CATEGORY | USE TYPE | AG | RESIDENTIAL |  |  |  |  | DROD AREAS*** |  |  |  |  |  |  | MIXED USE |  |  |  | COMMERCIAL/ OFFICE |  |  |  |  |  | SPECIFIC USE PERMIT STANDARDS |
|  |  | A1 | RE | RS1 / R1 RS2 / R2 RS3/ R3/RS4 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{D} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{M} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R} \\ & \mathbf{M} \\ & \mathbf{H} \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{D} \\ & \mathrm{~F} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{G} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{C} \\ & \mathrm{H} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Waste and Salvage | Auto salvage yard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S | 3.2.D.4. |
|  | Scrap operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S |  |
|  | Recycling center (outdoor or indoor) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S | P | P |  |
|  | Solid waste disposal | S |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S | 3.2.D.2. |

*Ordinance No. 3436, Adopted 06-06-2016
**Ordinance No. 3465, Adopted 12-20-2016
***Ordinance No. 3506, Adopted 01-02-2018

SECTION II. Section 3.2.C, Commercial Uses, of the Broken Arrow Zoning Code (No. 2931) is hereby amended to read as follows:

## C. Commercial Uses

1. Animal Hospitals, Animal Training School, Kennel, and Veterinary Clinic All such uses shall have their principal entrance and exit on an arterial street and if serving large animals shall be located on land no less than five (5) acres.
2. Micro Food and Beverage Production

Applications for micro food and beverage production shall provide information regarding building square footage, site development, hours of operation, odor expectations, truck deliveries and pick ups, production quantities, distribution expectations, and number of employee projections. (Ord. No. 3436, Adopted 06-062016)
3. Recreational Vehicle Campground/Park

Applications for recreational vehicle campgrounds/parks shall comply with and show the method of complying with the following standards:
a. No trailer, RV, or other similar vehicle shall be allowed for more than fourteen (14) days.
b. No trailer, RV, or other similar vehicle will be parked for sale or display.
c. Only hard-surfaced roads shall be used throughout the grounds
d. Each campground shall provide facilities for the appropriate disposal of waste water, trash, and related items.
e. The following items shall be graphically shown on the application:
i. All RV pad locations.
ii. Pathways,
iii. Provisions for utility hookups.
iv. Parking facilities.
v. Restroom facilities
vi. Water/wastewater treatment facilities.
vii. Dumpster locations and provisions for other trash receptacles.
viii. Playground facilities.
ix. Compliance with ADA guidelines.
x. Landscaping.
xi. Lighting.
xii. Signage.
xiii. Storm water detention.

## 4. Recreation and Entertainment, Outdoor

All uses of this type requiring a specific use permit shall abut an arterial or collector street.
5. Vehicle Sales and Rental

Applications for vehicle sales and rental shall comply with the following standards:
a. The minimum lot size shall be 2.5 acres, and the site shall have a minimum of 200 feet street frontage.
b. Landscaping shall meet or be upgraded to meet the landscape requirements of Section 5.2. Particular attention shall be given to installing landscape material that does not attract birds. No parking of vehicles shall be allowed within landscape areas.
c. Such uses shall be located a minimum of 200 feet from any residential district, school, hospital, park, government office, or place of public assembly.
d. No outdoor speakers shall be allowed within 500 feet of a residential area.
e. Colored metal or wrought iron gates designed to enhance the appearance of the facility are encouraged. The use of chain link or barbed wire within 200 feet of a public street right-of-way is prohibited.
f. Vehicle sales and rental are discouraged in multi-tenant commercial areas.
g. The exterior of all buildings shall meet the requirements of Section 5.8.G.
6. Visitor Accommodations

Applications for Bed \& Breakfast and other such transient lodging (excluding hotels or motels) shall comply with the following standards:
a. Type 1: permitted in AG/A-1, RE, RS-1, R1, RS-2, R-2, RS-3, R-3, or RS4 Zoning Districts and permitted in in the Downtown Residential Overlay District in Areas 1,2,3,4, and 5.
i. The owner shall reside on premise within the primary structure.
ii. Up to two individuals or (One (1) Family) persons are permissible to stay up to thirty (30) days.
iii. No more than two guest bedrooms and must be located within the primary residential structure.
iv. No individual cooking facilities may be installed in any guest room.
v. Meal service is limited to residential guests only. Sale of food and beverage to other than overnight guests is strictly prohibited.
vi. Parking: See Table 5.4.1
vii. Any proposed additions must be compatible with the architectural style and building materials for the dwelling and compliant with city codes.
viii. No lighting or signage may be installed for the business.
ix. A permit shall be required each year of operation.
b. Type 2: permitted by specific use permit in A-1, RE, RS-1, R-1, RD, and RM Zoning Districts and by specific use permit in the Downtown Residential Overlay District in Areas 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. It is permitted in the Downtown Residential Overlay District in Areas 6.
i. Allows three to six individuals or up to Two (2) Families are permissible to stay up to thirty (30) days.
ii. One guest room may be permitted for each 3,000 feet of lot area, up to a maximum of four guest rooms.
iii. No individual cooking facilities may be installed in any guest room.
iv. Meal service is limited to residential guests only. Sale of food and beverage to other than overnight guests is strictly prohibited.
v. Parking: See Table 5.4.1
vi. Any proposed additions must be compatible with the architectural style and building materials for the dwelling and compliant with city codes.
vii. No lighting or signage may be installed for the business.
viii. A permit is required each year of operation.
c. Type 3: permitted by specific use permit in NM, CM, and DF Zoning Districts and permitted in AG / A-1, DM, CG, and CH zoning districts. It is permitted in the Downtown Residential Overlay District in Areas 6.
i. Up to eight (8) sleeping rooms.
ii. Persons are permissible to stay up to thirty (30) days.
iii. No individual cooking facilities may be installed in any guest room.
iv. Parking: See Table 5.4.1
v. Must collect hotel/motel tax and remit to the City of Broken Arrow.

SECTION III. Section 3.3.D, Additional Standards for Specific Accessory Uses and Structures, of the Broken Arrow Zoning Code (No. 2931) is hereby amended to read as follows:

## D. Additional Standards for Specific Accessory Uses and Structures

## 1. Home Occupations

A home occupation may be permitted as an accessory use to a principal dwelling unit in any of the residential districts, provided that:
a. Size/Area

The business or service is located within the dwelling or an associated accessory building, and does not exceed twenty percent (20\%) of the combined floor area of the structures or five hundred square feet ( 500 sq.ft.), whichever is less.
b. Employees and Residency

The principal person or persons providing the business or service shall reside in the dwelling on the premises. The home occupation shall employ no more than one (1) person who does not reside on the premises.

## c. Neighborhood Compatibility

i. All vehicles used in connection with the home occupation shall be of a size, and located on the premises in such a manner, so as to not disrupt the quiet nature and visual quality of the neighborhood, and there shall be no more than two (2) vehicles per home occupation.
ii. There shall be sufficient off-street parking for patrons of the home occupation, with the number of off-street parking spaces required for the home occupation to be provided and maintained in addition to the space or spaces required for the dwelling itself pursuant to Section 5.5, Off-Street Parking and Loading.
iii. No additional parking areas other than driveways shall be located in the required front setback.
iv. There shall be no advertising devices on the property, or other signs of the home occupation, which are visible from outside the dwelling or accessory building.
v. The property shall contain no outdoor display or storage of goods or services that are associated with the home occupation.
vi. Wholesale or retail sales of goods shall not occur on the premises.
vii. The home occupation shall not create traffic or parking congestion, noise, vibration, odor, glare, fumes, or electrical or communications interference that can be detected by the normal senses off the premises, including visual or audible interference with radio or television reception.

## d. Prohibited Home Occupations

The following uses, because of their impacts on the surrounding residential area, shall not be permitted as home occupations: auto repair or motorized implement repair; dance, music or other types of instruction (if more than four students are being instructed at one time); dental offices; medical offices; the painting of vehicles, trailers or boats; private schools with organized classes; motor vehicle towing operation; barber shops having more than one chair, beauty shops having more than one chair; welding shops; and nursing homes.; bed and breakfast and other such transient todging.

SECTION IV. Section 5.4.D (Table 5.4.1), Off-Street Parking Schedule A, of the Broken Arrow Zoning Code (No. 2931) is hereby amended to read as follows:

TABLE 5.4.1: OFF-STREET PARKING SCHEDULE A

| Use Category | Use Type | Minimum Parking Spaces Required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIDENTIAL USES |  |  |
| Household Living | Dwelling, duplex | 2 per unit |
|  | Dwelling, multi-family | 2 per unit |
|  | Dwelling, single-family attached | 2 per unit |
|  | Dwelling, single-family detached | 2 per unit |
|  | Dwelling, mobile home | 2 per unit |
|  | Dwelling, zero lot line | 2 per unit |
|  | Mobile home park | 2 per unit (include visitor parking - 2 spaces per 3 mobile homes) |
|  | Mobile home subdivision | 2 per unit (include visitor parking - 2 spaces per 3 mobile homes) |
| Group Living | Boarding, dormitory, and rooming house | 1 per bed |
|  | Group home | 1 per 2 beds, plus 1 per 100 square feet of assembly area |
|  | Convalescent home, nursing home, or assisted living facility | 1 per 2 beds/rooms (whichever is greater), plus 1 space per 2 employees on largest shift |
| PUBLICINSTITUTIONAL USES |  |  |
| Community Service | Cemetery | See Schedule C |
|  | Crematorium, without funeral parlor or public area | 1 space per 400 square feet of office area |
|  | Government administration and civic buildings | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Municipal or community recreation center | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Place of assembly | 1 per 4 seats in meeting area or 1 per 100 square feet in meeting area without seats |
|  | Public safety facility | 1 per 300 square feet |
| Cultural Facility | Art gallery or museum, public | 1 per 400 square feet |
|  | Library, public | 1 per 300 square feet |
| Child Care Facility | Child care center | 1 per 400 square feet plus 1 additional space for pick-up and delivery of children |
|  | Day care center / nursery school | 1 per 400 square feet plus 1 additional space for pick-up and delivery of children |
|  | Home day care | 2 per dwelling unit plus 1 space for day care patrons |
| Education | College or university | 1 per 400 square feet |
|  | Elementary school | 1 per 800 square feet |
|  | Middle school or high school | 1 per 400 square feet |
|  | Trade school | 1 per each 2 students, based on design capacity |
| Health Care Facility | Medical office or clinic | 1 per 250 square feet |
|  | Hospital | 1 per 2 beds plus 1 space per 300 square feet of office area |
| Parks and Open Space | Arboretum or botanical garden | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Campground | 1 per tent site plus 1 per employee on largest shift |
|  | Community playfields and parks | See Schedule C |
| Telecommunication Facility | Tower (including any facility with tower) | No parking requirement |
|  | Broadcasting or recording studio (no tower) | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Transmitting station (no tower) | 1 per 200 square feet |
| Transportation Facility | Airport | See Schedule C |
|  | Bus and passenger train terminal | See Schedule C |
|  | Heliport | See Schedule C |
| Utility | Utility facility, major | See Schedule C |
|  | Utility facility, minor | See Schedule C |

TABLE 5.4.1: OFF-STREET PARKING SCHEDULE A

| Use Category | Use Type | Minimum Parking Spaces Required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COMMERCIAL USES |  |  |
| Agriculture | Agriculture | See Schedule C |
| Animal Sales and Services | Animal pet shop, retail | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Animal training school | See Schedule C |
|  | Kennel | 1 per 200 square feet |
|  | Veterinary clinic/animal hospital | 1 per 200 square feet |
|  | Veterinary clinic, large animal | 1 per 200 square feet |
| Financial Service | Financial institution, with drive-thru | 1 per 300 square feet, plus stacking spaces per Section 5.4.E. (Ord No. 3057, adopted 10-06-09) |
|  | Financial institution, without drivethru | 1 per 300 square feet |
| Food and Beverage Service | Bar/Nightclub | 1 per 100 square feet (including outdoor serving/seating areas) |
|  | Catering service | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Fruit and vegetable market | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Restaurant, drive-in | 1 per 100 square feet (including outdoor serving/seating areas) |
|  | Restaurant, without drive-thru | 1 per 100 square feet (including outdoor serving/seating areas) |
|  | Restaurant, with drive-thru | 1 per 100 square feet (including outdoor serving/seating areas) plus stacking requirements per Section 5.4.E (Ord No. 3057, adopted 10-0609) |
|  | Micro food and beverage production | See Schedule B |
| Office | Office, business or professional | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Research laboratory | 1 per 500 square feet |
| Recreation and Entertainment, Outdoor | General outdoor recreation | See Schedule C |
|  | Golf course or driving range, unlighted or lighted | Golf course: 6 per hole <br> Driving range: 1.5 spaces per tee <br> Buildings: Additional 1 per 400 square feet |
|  | Major entertainment facility | 1 per each four seats provided in the main seating area(s) |
|  | Race track (auto, dog, or horse) | 1 per each four seats provided in the main seating area(s) |
|  | RV campground/park | See Schedule C |
|  | Shooting range | 1 per bay |
|  | Zoo | See Schedule C |
| Recreation And Entertainment Indoor | Art gallery or museum, private | 1 per 400 square feet |
|  | Fitness and recreational sports center | 1 per 250 square feet |
|  | General indoor recreation, | 1 per 250 square feet |
|  | Major entertainment facility | See Schedule C |
|  | Movie theatre | 1 per each 4 seats provided |
| Retail (Personal Service) | Dry cleaning and laundry service | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Funeral services | 1 per 4 seats of main assembly room |
|  | General personal services | Under 2,000 square feet (gross floor area): 1 per 250 square feet <br> 2,000 square feet or more (gross floor area): 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Instructional services | See Schedule C |
| Retail (Sales) | Alcoholic beverages, retail sale | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Convenience store with gas sales | 1 per dispensing station plus 1 space per 200 square feet of retail space |
|  | Horticulture nursery sales | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Open-air market or flea market | See Schedule B |
|  | Retail, general | 1 per 300 square feet |
|  | Retail, large | 1 space per 300 square feet |
|  | Sexually oriented business | Bar, restaurant, or entertainment space: 1 space per 100 square feet; Retail sales/rental space: 1 space per 300 square feet |

TABLE 5.4.1: OFF-STREET PARKING SCHEDULE A

| Use Category | Use Type | Minimum Parking Spaces Required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicles and Equipment | Boat and/or RV storage | 1 per 50 vehicles stored |
|  | Car wash | 1 per 500 square feet of building area |
|  | Gasoline sales | 1 per dispensing station plus 1 space per 200 square feet of retail space |
|  | Parking structure | No requirement |
|  | Vehicle sales and rental | 1 per 400 square feet of office sales area, plus 1 space per 1,000 square feet outdoor display area |
|  | Vehicle service and repair, major | 1 per 400 square feet |
|  | Vehicle service and repair, minor | 1 per 400 square feet |
| Visitor Accommodation | Bed and breakfast Type 1 | One parking space shall be provided for the owneroperator, plus one space for each room (calculation can include garage parking space) |
|  | Bed and breakfast Type 2 | One parking space shall be provided for the owneroperator, plus one space for each room (calculation can include garage parking space) |
|  | Bed and breakfast Type 3 | One parking space shall be provided for the owneroperator, plus one space for each room (calculation can include garage parking space) |
|  | Hotel or motel | 1 per room, plus 1 space per employee on largest shift, plus 1 space per 300 square feet of meeting or restaurant and bar area |
| INDUSTRIAL USES |  |  |
| Industrial Service | Fossil fuel storage | 1 per employee on largest shift |
|  | General industrial service | See Schedule C |
| Manufacturing and Production | Assembly, light | 1 per 1,500 square feet |
|  | Manufacturing, light | 1 per 1,500 square feet |
|  | Manufacturing, heavy | 1 per 1,500 square feet |
| Mining and Processing | Minerals and raw materials | See Schedule C |
|  | Oil and gas | See Schedule C |
| Warehouse and Freight Movement | Mini-storage | 1 per 3,000 square feet |
|  | Motor freight terminal | See Schedule B |
|  | Office warehouse | See Schedule B |
|  | Storage yard | See Schedule B |
|  | Warehouse | See Schedule B |
|  | Wholesale establishment | See Schedule B |
| Waste and Salvage | Auto Salvage Yard | See Schedule C |
|  | Scrap Operations | See Schedule C |
|  | Recycling center (outdoor or indoor) | See Schedule C |
|  | Solid waste disposal | See Schedule C |

SECTION V. Section 10.3.D.11.a, Definitions, of the Broken Arrow Zoning Code (No. 2931) is hereby amended to read as follows:

## 11. Visitor Accommodation

For-profit facilities where lodging is provided to transient visitors and guests for a defined period. Specific use types include, but are not limited to:
a. Bed and Breakfast:

Type 1: One building containing in the aggregate no more than two (2) sleeping rooms that are occupied or intended or designed to be occupied as the temporary abiding place of person who are lodged within or without meals, for compensation per Section 3.2.C requirements.

Type 2: One building containing in the aggregate no more than four (4) sleeping rooms that are occupied or intended or designed to be occupied as the temporary abiding place of person who are lodged within or without meals, for compensation per Section 3.2.C requirements.

Type 3: One or more buildings containing in the aggregate no more than eight (8) sleeping rooms that are occupied or intended or designed to be occupied as the temporary abiding place of persons who are lodged with or without meals, for compensation per Section 3.2.C requirements.

SECTION VI. Any ordinance or parts of ordinances found to be in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

SECTION VII. An emergency exists for the preservation of the public health, peace, and safety, and therefore this ordinance shall become effective from and after the time of its passage and approval.

PASSED AND APPROVED and the emergency clause ruled upon separately this $\qquad$ ${ }^{\text {th }}$ day
of $\qquad$ , 2019.

## ATTEST:

(Seal) CITY CLERK
APPROVED:

CITY ATTORNEY

# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action
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## Broken Arrow Planning Commission <br> 06-13-2019

To: Chairman and Commission Members

From:
Title:
Background: Minutes recorded for the Broken Arrow Planning Commission meeting.
Attachments: 05092019 Planning Commission Minutes
Recommendation: Approve minutes of Planning Commission meeting held May 09, 2019.
Reviewed and Approved By: Larry R. Curtis

City of Broken Arrow
City Hall
220 S 1st Street
Minutes
Broken Arrow OK
Planning Commission

Chairman Ricky Jones<br>Vice Chair Lee Whelpley<br>Member Pablo Aguirre<br>Member Fred Dorrell<br>Member Mark Jones

Thursday, May 09, 2019
Time 5:00 p.m.
Council Chambers

1. Call to Order

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Ricky Jones at 5:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call

Present: 5- Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
3. Old Business

Staff Planner Amanda Yamaguchi presented the background for Old Business Item 3A.
Chairman Ricky Jones announced his firm prepared the PUD for Item 3A so he would have to recuse himself from the discussion and vote. Mr. Jones left the Council Chambers.
A. 19-520 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-288 (Planned Unit Development) and BAZ-2024 (Rezoning), Village at 1Eleven, 28.95 acres, A-1 to CM and RS4/PUD-288, located at the northwest corner of Florence Street (111th Street) and Aspen Avenue (145th E Avenue)

Applicant Derek McCall, of Tanner Consulting, stated that when the Commission last met on April 11, after hearing public comments, he realized there was confusion among residents from the three adjacent neighborhoods about the PUD and the rezoning. A meeting was held on April 23, 2019, at Aspen Park Baptist Church. He stated the meeting was well attended and valuable input was received which helped them modify the PUD with the help of City staff.

He commented that, as stated by the City staff, their plan conforms to the Comprehensive Plan. He emphasized that the site was selected and the client purchased the site based on the Comprehensive Plan. The east part of the site between the hard corner and Aspen Park Baptist Church falls under the Comprehensive Plan land use intensity level for commercial employment nodes which allows NM, neighborhood mixed use, CM, community mixed use, ON, office neighborhood district, CN, commercial neighborhood district, and CG, commercial general district. Had they gone with the allowed CG zoning classification, the allowed uses could have included large, big-box retail buildings and had no restriction on building height or coverage on the site. He commented they felt that CM with additional self-imposed PUD restrictions would be more suitable for the area.

He stated that the west side of the property that is adjacent to the Aspen Park neighborhood to the north and Gray Oaks neighborhood to the south is currently listed at Level-4 transitional area under the Comprehensive Plan. Level-3 uses allow for RS4 single-family residential district, RD residential duplex district, RM residential multifamily district, RMH residential mobile home district, and NM neighborhood mixed use. They believe that RS4 single family housing will be the least intensive and the most compatible allowed use within the Level-3 zoning district.

He expressed that while they have set a maximum of 75 lots within this area of the PUD, the current conceptual site plan is only showing 62 lots, and all of the proposed lots meet the minimum lot area of RS3 and the majority of the lots actually meet the minimum lot area of R2, which is the same zoning as the adjacent Aspen Park neighborhood to the north. They are seeking RS4 because this is the least dense allowed use based on the Comprehensive Plan and because the architecture of the proposed homes requires a narrower lot width than what is allowed under RS2 and RS3.

He stated that this planned unit development and the rezoning are a good fit for the area and is in line with the City of Broken Arrow Comprehensive Plan.

Lee Whelpley asked Mr. McCall if he agreed with the Staff recommendations and Mr. McCall answered in the affirmative.

Mark Smith, 4805 S Chestnut Avenue, handed out a presentation packet to the Commissioners. He stated that he was one of the four houses in Gray Oaks that received a letter announcing the rezoning proposal meeting on April 11, 2019. He noted he was taken by surprise on what was being proposed. He researched how he could prevent this high-density complex from being built across from his peaceful neighborhood. In the rules for approval criteria published in the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance Book Review and Approval Procedures, Section 6.4, concerning planned unit developments, it states "The Broken Arrow Planning Commission has a responsibility to approve rezoning only if the rezoning meets all criteria." He presented:

- Criteria Part A states the rezoning will promote the public health, safety, and general welfare. Relevant to public health are the statistics that show high density urban developments are at risk for increased amounts of crime. In regards to public safety, the developer's design outline illustrates that it will create a large amount of additional traffic on the corner of $111^{\text {th }}$ and Aspen. The Village at 1Eleven design outline shows two opposite facing exit/entrances. This congestion point will most certainly impose an impossible way to make a left turn out of either neighborhood. He suspects his general welfare will drop significantly like depreciated property value of his home. He sees that there is no compliance to Part A:
- Criteria Part B states the rezoning is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the purposes of this ordinance. A PUD in this area of town is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This unusual post-modern, metro style of the PUD design leans more towards being located near downtown and not built in the middle of existing urban residential neighborhoods. Surrounding property value is at risk because a highdensity gated urban village with a commercial business component is very odd in being located right in the center of established scenic neighborhoods. The Village at 1Eleven is a strange design for this area of town, and a much better development fit for this transition area is RS2. There is no compliance to Part B.
- Criteria Part C states the rezoning is consistent with the stated purposes of the proposed zoning district. Meeting the requirement of Criteria Part C will depend on who you talk to. The area homeowners' answer proposes the consistent way to develop this beautiful wildlife-filled wooded area is by rezoning to urban residential, which is allowed under LUIS Level 3 rules as this transition zone is adjacent to Aspen Park. The developer's view is not consistent with this area. It instead pursues ripping out the trees, making more money than a conventional development would allow, and cramming as many dwellings, rental spaces, and business rental storefronts it can into this proposed PUD area. There is no compliance to Part C.
- Criteria Part D states the rezoning is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts upon other property in the vicinity of the subject tract. There are indeed significant adverse impacts and they are more than just "likely." In order to prove significant adverse impacts on this area, one must perform impact study, impact data analyses, or studies, as it pertains to potential crime in adjacent neighborhoods, impact on property values, impact on traffic, impact on water draining, possibility of being EPA noncompliant. All the above, for some reason, are not allowed. He found that the developer's written reply was, "Impact studies are not performed for common developments such as this." The developer twisted the interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan in their favor. They bend their unusual Village at 1Eleven design into the status of a common development, an obvious attempt to avoid or disguise multiple conflicts with the City's approval criteria for rezoning. The developer uses the description "experimental" when needing an excuse to not provide statistical performance data for this type of PUD design. The developer then uses the description "common" when needing to avoid an Impact Study. The impact studies should be performed and include a Casey General Store business in the impact research as that company is eyeing this vote on PUD 288 before it proceeds with its plans to build on the opposite corner. There is no compliance to Part D.
- Criteria Part E states future uses on the subject tract will be compatible in scale with uses on other properties in the Vicinity of the subject tract. The Village at 1Eleven is not compatible in scale to this area and so it is not compliant to Part E.

He explained that the proposed area of town is historically very important; that before there was Broken Arrow there was Elam. When the citizens of Elam could not convince the railroad to lay tracks nearby, they pulled their buildings on skids with steam tractors to where the railroad tracks were eventually built. Those homes on skids next to the tracks became downtown Broken Arrow. He suggested that the City keep this area green, protect the wildlife from being killed, keep this area of town less dense in development, and research the availability of federal and state funds and grants that could be utilized for the construction of a opposition are being heard and petitions have been signed and submitted.

Mike Leatherland, 2309 W Austin Street, commented that he was not speaking for the homeowners of Aspen Park, but as a concerned citizen of Broken Arrow. He stated he respected the development of South Broken Arrow but wished that that development be more of a disciplined approach to that growth. He noted that purchase of real estate is to maximize the return on an investment. He commented Broken Arrow is littered with RS2 and RS3 developments which are expected given the demographics and economic makeup of Broken Arrow. If this proposal was for RS2, his efforts would stand little chance of being successful since this rezoning would be comparable to Aspen Park.

He remarked that Broken Arrow residents are conservative in nature when it comes to construction style, and that a combination of modern construction and dense lots both pose lot absorption risk for the development, and that price points and market conditions are well in excess of market conditions in the area, which poses a serious risk to access to financing that appraised values do not support.

He noted two open civil judgment cases in Tulsa which named Rural Construction as the defendant, and that with the RS4 development already being considered high risk in nature, to allow a developer with a history of failing to correct matters in a non-judicial setting is concerning and adds a potential credibility issue.

He surmised that, should the Commission approve and pass this item along to the City Council, it sets a precedent for future development within the entire footprint of Broken Arrow by stating that the development layout of Broken Arrow is undisciplined since a high-density development was allowed in a lower density area of the City. He pled for the Commission to consider the zoning change to RS4 as an undisciplined growth strategy for Broken Arrow since there is a lack of directional consistency regarding the development layout in this area.

Lori Pettus, 5005 S Chestnut Avenue, thanked the commissioners for serving. She commented that she purchased her lot because she appreciated the space. She stated that the developers at the Village at 1Eleven state in their proposal, "The flat buildings mimic the feel of a city block street grid." She noted that that was not what the residents bought into when they purchased their homes; that that was not what they wanted. She commented that without question, this kind of housing will diminish the property values of homes, and that 100 percent of the homeowners on the immediate perimeter (and large numbers of homeowners who do not currently live in that area) have signed a petition objecting to this zoning change.

She commented on how traffic would be impacted in the area and that it would be a danger to the children in the nearby schools. She requested that the zoning be changed from agricultural to RS2, which is in keeping with the conformity and compatibility of the existing neighborhood and will assist with the traffic safety going forward

Sam Crenshaw, 2313 W Austin Street, stated that first-time homeowners tended to shy away from trendy neighborhoods. He commented that he moved to the area because of the openness and the opportunity to raise a family in a safe, quiet location. He stated he has been a police officer in Tulsa for four years and asked if the Commission was familiar with $41^{\text {st }}$ and $129^{\text {th }}$ in Tulsa, an area zoned CS. He stated that that is an area where he sees a lot of crime and that the PUD is very similar to the plans of Village at 1Eleven. He stated that as of January of this year, that area has seen over 414 reported criminal acts, minimum 3 crimes a day, which includes vandalism, rape, robbery, assaults, burglary, larceny, auto theft, and four reported homicides. He concluded that he is in favor of a continuation of a neighborhood like Aspen Park or Gray Oaks.

Jerry Agee, 5208 S Chestnut Avenue, stated that Gray Oaks, Aspen Park, Watford, plus residences on South 140th Street, are all opposed to the rezoning development of the parcel just immediately north of the Gray Oaks subdivision for the following reasons:

- Development is not compatible with the surrounding subdivision
- There will be an increase of crime.
- Increase in traffic of approximately 300 cars a day entering and leaving the area will increase the flow of traffic now moving east and west on $111^{\text {th }}$ Street.
- The proposed five lanes of $111^{\text {th }}$ will not improve the egress of Gray Oaks residents or any other resident departing south of $111^{\text {th }}$ trying to go westbound.
- All residents who live within 300 feet of the proposed development received a letter by the City signed a petition in opposition.
- Residents who live outside the 300 feet of Gray Oaks, Aspen Park, Watford and South $140^{\text {th }}$ Street have also signed opposing development and rezoning.

He requested that the Commission deny the proposed rezoning request because there is a majority that feels opposition should carry a positive response to their request by the City of

Kay Guardy, 4801 S Chestnut Avenue, Gray Oaks, stated that she is an original homeowner in Gray Oaks, south of the proposed development and she is the first home on the east side as you enter the neighborhood. She believes there is common ground that all can be happy with but will require a compromise. She stated that rather than a PUD zone approval, to elect to zone what is now the northwest corner transition zone to RS2, which would allow the developers to build a better fit than high density apartments and is a better choice for the City and the neighborhoods.

She commented on the traffic situation currently in the area and said that the proposed street changes will make it nearly impossible to navigate and will be a negative impact to any prospective homeowner or renter. She commented about a recent article regarding the 20 best cities to live for first time homeowners and noted that the number one town was Broken Arrow.

Debbie Ziggler, 4800 S Chestnut Avenue, commented that as Broken Arrow citizens, they put their trust in the decisions the Planning Commission makes. She said she is thankful they are there to make sound decisions. She noted that the developer does not live in the community and she wants to see that the Commission makes decisions that benefit the community and not the developer.

Derek McCall reiterated that the PUD and the rezoning request are in line with the Comprehensive Plan and used the definitions in the Comprehensive Plan to determine what this development looked like and what the PUD ended up being. He stated that while the developer may not be from Broken Arrow, he lives in the area and has had family in the area for 35 years. He thanked the Commission for considering the PUD and the rezoning and stated that they made their decisions based on the documents that they as developers and consultants use to make decisions daily.

Justin Morgan, civil engineer of Tanner Consulting, 5323 South Lewis, stated that Florence is being widened, but also being fixed as far as grades. He noted that as far as entrances to Gray Oaks lining up, it is a code requirement to line up entrances so people are turning left and not running into each other. He stated that based on the dimensions of the land, lining them up was the appropriate and preferred way to do it.

Lee Whelpley thanked everybody who spoke and was impressed that the Planning Commission was a recommending body to the City Council, and that the decision one way or another is not the final decision.

Mark Jones stated that property value is subjective and really cannot be taken consideration. He believes something is currently in place with the City that will address these issues as the City grows. He commented that a lot of the issues mentioned are growing pains to the City and since being on the Commission for three years, he has seen projects like this come across the Commission numerous times. He stated he will not stop economic growth to the City and will consider the best use of this piece of property for development. He stated that he does, however, have concerns about what the project represents but a lot of those are the same as the residents'.

Fred Dorrell commented he has the same concerns as the homeowners, but also has faith in the Staff and their ability as the people that we rely on.

MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 3A, 19-520, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Fred Dorrell. The motion carried the following vote:

| Aye: | $2-$ | Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nay: | $2-$ | Pablo Aguirre, Lee Whelpley |
| Recused: | $1-$ | Ricky Jones |

Ricky Jones returned to Council Chambers.

## 4. Consideration of Consent Agenda

## Staff Planner Amanda Yamaguchi presented the background for the Consent Agenda Items.

Ricky Jones explained the Consent Agenda and asked if anyone wished to remove any items. No one responded. He stated his firm prepared the revised plat for Item 4C and would need to remove the Item from the Consent Agenda.

| A. | 19-555 | Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of April 11, 2019. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 4A, 19-555, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Fred Dorrell. The motion carried the following vote: |
| Aye: | 5 - | Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones |
| B. | 19-561 | Approval of Planning Commission meeting minutes of April 25, 2019 |
|  |  | MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 4B, 19-561, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Fred Dorrell. The motion carried the following vote: |
| Aye: | 5 - | Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones |
| D. | 19-514 | Approval of PT19-106, Preliminary Plat, Fire Station No. 3, 3.03 acres, 1 Lot, A-1 to PUD286/CG, one-half mile south of Florence Street (111th Street), west of 23rd Street (County Line Rd), north of the Creek Turnpike |
|  |  | MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 4D, 19-514, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Fred Dorrell. The motion carried the following vote: |
| Aye: | 5 - | Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones |
| E. | 19-527 | Approval of PT19-107, Preliminary Plat, Creek Center, a replat of a part of Possum Run Addition, 1.05 acres, 1 Lot, A-1 to CG, south of Kenosha Street (71st Street) and west 225th East Avenue (Evans Road) |
|  |  | MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 4E, 19-427, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Fred Dorrell. The motion carried the following vote: |
| Aye: | 5 - | Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones |
| F. | 19-541 | Approval of PT19-108, Preliminary Plat, Harvest Center, 75.03 acres, 2 Lots, A- 1 to PUD289/IL, one-half mile north of Houston Street (81st Street), west of 23rd Street (County Line Road) |
|  |  | MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 4F, 19-541, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Fred Dorrell. The motion carried the following vote: |
| Aye: | 5 - | Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones |
|  |  | Amanda Yamaguchi, Staff Planner presented Item 4G. |
| G. | 19-525 | Approval of PT17-114, Conditional Final Plat, The Villas at Turnberry, a replat of Lot 1, Block 1, Turnberry Commercial, 9.77 acres, 24 Lots, CG to CG and RS 4, southwest corner of 37th Street (209th East Avenue) and Dearborn Street (41st Street) |
|  |  | MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 4G, 19-525, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Fred Dorrell. The motion carried the following vote: |
| Aye: | 5 - | Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones |

Ricky Jones left the Council Chambers.

## 5. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

4C. 19-526 Approval of PT17-115A, Revised Preliminary Plat, Creek 51 Business Park, 97.21 acres, 8 Lots, A-1 to CG and IL/PUD-204A, one-half mile south of Houston Street (81st Street), west of Highway 51

MOTION made by Mark Jones to approve Agenda Item 4C, 19-526, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Pablo Aguirre The motion carried the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley<br>Recused: 1- Ricky Jones

Ricky Jones returned to Council Chambers.

## 6. Public Hearings

A. 19-499 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-290 (Planned Unit Development), Riverbrook Apartments, 14.56 acres, RM to PUD-290/RM, one-half mile south of Jasper Street (131st Street), east of Aspen Avenue (145th East Avenue)

Larry Curtis, Acting Development Services Director, presented this item, saying that the property was rezoned RM by the City Council on January 17, 1972, as part of BAZ-308, which was part of four rezoning applications in the area. On January 20, 1972, Ordinance 416 was approved by City Council that changed the rezoning on the property from R-1 to R-5. On February 1, 2008, the Zoning Ordinance was updated and R-5 zoning district was changed to RM.

Applicant is interested in developing the apartment project on the property. The development is proposed to be completed in two phases. The first phase consists of 6.7 acres within 72 -acre units. There are 29 one-bedroom units, 22 two-bedroom units, and 22 three-bedroom units. According to the design statement submitted with the PUD, the property has been developed in accordance with the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance and Development with regulation associated with the RM zoning district, except as summarized in their staff report.

The surrounding properties in the area are zoned RM, R2, and R3 and RD zoning. Property associated with PUD-290 was designated as greenway flood plain in the Comprehensive Plan in 1997, when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted. The property was shown in the 1984 FEMA flood maps to be located entirely within the 100-year flood plain.

The 1999 flood plain maps continued to show the property within the 100 -year flood plain. However, in 2009 this changed and the maps showing the property below to be in the 500 -year flood plain associated with the project area. While no development can occur in the 100 -year flood plain, development is permitted within the 500 -year flood plain. FEMA maps prepared in 2012 and 2016 continue to show most of the property in the 500 -year flood plain with just the area along the northeast section of the property, along the property located within the creek area to be in the 100 -year flood plain.

With the existing RM zoning, the area located outside the 100 -year flood plain should have been designated as Level 3 in the Comprehensive Plan. With that, RM zoning is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan L3 with PUD-290 applicant proposing to develop the property in accordance with RM zoning district, except for the following:

- Restrict the number of units in Phase 1 to 72 units instead of 133 that is allowed through straight zoning
- Limit the height of structures to 45 feet for three-story units, and 25 feet for two-story units, as compared to the height limits allowed in the RM zoning district. In addition, the neighborhood to the northeast that is zoned R2, the heights of the structures are limited to 50 feet.
- Reduce the parking requirement for one-bedroom units from two parking spaces to 1.5 parking unit spaces

In Phase 2 there will be four units located on the same building plain along the south boundary instead of three. Property abuts a large AEPPSO power line. According to Section 6.4 of the Zoning Ordinance, the PUD provisions are established for one or more of the following purposes:

- To permit and encourage innovative land development while maintaining appropriate limitation on the character of the use and ensuring compatibility with the adjoining properties.
- To permit greater flexibility within development to best utilize the physical features of the site and encourage for greater public benefits than would otherwise be achieved through development under this ordinance.
- To encourage the provision and to preserve the meaningful open space to encourage integrated and unified design and function of the various uses.

In Staff's opinion, PUD-290 satisfies 1, 2, and 3 of Section 6.4a of the Zoning Ordinance. Applicant is limited to the number of units in Phase 1 to 72 units, which is $46 \%$ less than what is allowed in the RM Zoning District. Building height is limited to 45 feet for three-story units. Applicant is requesting relief from the landscaping and building setbacks required from the inner property lines being created.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan, the existing zoning, the design statement, and conceptual site plan submitted with PUD-290, the location of the property and the surrounding land use, the Staff recommends that the PUD be approved, subject to the property being platted and the following changes being made to the design statement: Page 3, Item 5, screening 5.2 E2B, revised as follows: A security fence of at least six feet in height shall be outside the 100 flood plain along the northeast boundary. The revised design statement incorporating the changes shall be submitted to Staff no later than May 14, 2019.

He stated that a protest from the surrounding property owners was received, and is being evaluated as with the previous item by INCOG. Should this be moved to City Council, that evaluation will be provided to the Council and noted to see if it meets the requirements of state statutes.

Applicant Patrick Rooney, 2034 E 38th Street, Tulsa, stated he is seeking to build a 72 -unit apartment project and not seeking any zoning changes with this proposed PUD. He stated that the reason he's seeking a PUD is to allow the project to be developed more appropriate to the unique characteristics of the site. It would result in a lower unit density than that allowed under the existing in-place RM zoning.

When asked by Fred Dorrell if he agreed with Staff recommendations, Mr. Rooney confirmed that he was.

Ricky Jones opened the public hearing for PUD-290 and BAZ-1997, Item 6A and asked if anyone wished to speak on the item.

William Kok, 1008 W Pensacola Court, stated he collected two petitions and submitted them to the City. One was against the complex, and he stated homeowners did not want the apartments in their backyard, even though the zoning allowed for it. He stated the second petition was against the variance; the screening fence on the northeast side is a concern because it allows for the increase of trespasses. He stated he does not agree with the reduction in parking spaces, believing it would lead to overcrowding of the parking lot and traffic hazards. He remarked that this is not the best use for the property; that the homeowners believed this was a sports complex for the neighborhood. He stated he does not see how, from looking at the site plan, that crowding buildings together would create more livable space. He also stated that the traffic on Aspen is horrendous and more people turning in and out of Aspen would create problems.

Ricky Jones reiterated that the property is currently zoned multifamily; if the City denied the PUD, developers could build multifamily now without asking because it is a use permitted by the zoning. Mr. Kok confirmed he understood but wanted the commission to know that the residents are not in favor of the apartment complex, and that the developer did not ask for resident input.

LaNita Phillips, 1301 W Ocala Street, stated she lives less than one mile diagonally from the apartments. Since living at her residence, she received letters that she is now in the flood plain, and that the Corps of Engineers suggested she purchase flood insurance. She explained that she does not understand that the property is in a 500 -year flood plain. She commented that during spring through late fall, the traffic is very heavy near Aspen and $131^{\text {st }}$. She then indicated that she concurs with earlier speakers that there are already many apartments in the City and does not understand why the area needs another apartment complex.

Ian Keserich, 1405 W Quinton Street, indicated his property backs up to the creek where the planned apartments would be built. He stated that he is concerned about the environmental impacts to the creek. Ricky Jones interjected by explaining that this meeting is not for discussing drainage and it would be addressed later in the platting process if the PUD is approved. Mr. Keserich noted that he understood. He stated that he personally objects to the land being used in the proposed manner; that there is a huge amount of congestion in the area because there is only one exit out of that area and he does not believe that adding more people to that area, especially on the weekends, would be beneficial to the community. He commented that since there are vacancies in neighboring apartment complexes, he does not understand what the purpose of building another apartment complex would be.

Ricky Jones closed the public hearing.
Cory Farmer, 222 E Main Street, Oklahoma City, who represents the consultant for the applicant, stated that both phases of the development are combined into one PUD. He explained
that Phase 2 is a potential development because they currently do not have financing or plan for this phase, other than it will confirm with the PUD as presented. He explained that the result of a market study they conducted showed a strong market for this development. He reiterated that Phase 2 will not be developed if they fail to fill Phase 1, but they do not see that being a potential issue.

Ricky Jones asked if Mr. Farmer was aware that if the PUD is approved the property is subject to geological review and testing. Mr. Farmer affirmed that he is aware.

Mr. Farmer mentioned for the record that the they agreed with Staff recommendations that the fence along the northeast side of the property not be built.

Mark Jones commented that he has experienced the traffic issues near the sports complex that residents are expressing and asked if there was a plan for relief from those issues.

Larry Curtis replied that there currently is no plan for traffic issues. He stated that the applicant requested additional curb cuts associated with this project, but responded they are restricted to one curb cut to cross traffic and are limited to an in-out only on the north side of the development.

Pablo Aguirre asked if there was an item on the most recent bond for that part of town.
Ricky Jones indicated $14^{\text {th }}$ is designated as a secondary arterial street so at some point, it will be a 100 -foot ultimate right of way with probably a minimum of 50 feet of paving and five lanes.

Travis Small, Transportation Manager for the City of Broken Arrow, confirmed he believes there is something in the 2018 bond issue for Aspen to increase the lanes and widen $145^{\text {th }}$, but he would have to confirm it.

Ricky Jones reiterated that the Planning Commission is a recommending body and this item will be forwarded to the City Council at the June 3, 2019 meeting.

MOTION made by Fred Dorrell to approve Agenda Item 6A, 19-499, per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mark Jones. The motion carried the following vote:

Aye: $\quad 5$ - Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
B. 19-560 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding the proposed modifications to Sections 5.7 (Signs) of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance

Larry Curtis presented this item. He noted that this item has been in the works for the past nine months. He explained that there was recent case law challenging sign ordinances, most notably a case in Arizona regarding sign verbiage that was challenged to the Supreme Court and was lost because the court ruled that that was unconstitutional. He stated that municipalities, including Broken Arrow, are now updating their sign codes. He stated that the sign code was not updated in 2008 when the Zoning Ordinance was updated and was a carryover of the original sign code that was in place since the 1990s. He requested more time to ponder modifications to the sign code and asked that Agenda Item 19-560 be moved to the next Planning Commission meeting.

Lee Whelpley asked if the existing larger sign sizes would be grandfathered.
Larry Curtis answered that they would be grandfathered; however, if the physical nature of the existing signs change, they would need to be brought up to code. He also stated that there is a caveat in the code for signs that are pole signs; that if they are changed, the exterior would need to be brought up to code by wrapping it around the pole to make it look nicer for the community. He explained that the area of the sign could continue, the height could continue, but the nature of the exterior of the material would need to comply with the code.

MOTION made by Fred Dorrell to postpone Agenda Item 6B, 19-560 until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Pablo Aguirre. The motion carried the following vote:

Aye: $\quad 5$ - Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
C. 19-562 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding the proposed modifications to Table 3.1-1; Section 3.2.C and 3.3.D; Table 5.4.1; and Section 10.3.D.11.a of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance

Ricky Jones stated Staff would like this Agenda Item postponed until the June 27, 2019

Larry Curtis stated that this item is an update to the code in regards to bed and breakfasts, notably an Airbnb of any type. It is currently illegal in City of Broken Arrow to have an Airbnb, so the codes need to be brought up to date to facilitate these types of accommodations within the community. He explained that there would be three types of bed and breakfasts.

- Allow for two rooms, or up to two sets of guests, with a permit from the Development Services Department without getting a specific use permit. The permit would require annual renewal, and there would be an associated fee.
- Allow for up to four rooms, require a specific use permit, and would allow for homes that are not currently occupied but are rented out. A notification would be sent to neighbors within 300 feet of the property.
- Allow for standard B\&Bs, up to eight units, in certain zoning districts and would require a specific use permit.

Larry Curtis asked for time to vet this item to the public so there could be more community input and discussion.

MOTION made by Mark Jones to continue Agenda Item 6C, 19-562, until the June 27, 2019, Planning Commission meeting per Staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Lee Whelpley. The motion carried the following vote:

Aye: 5- Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
7. Appeals

None.
8. General Commission Business

Ricky Jones recognized Officer Pall and thanked him for attending the meeting.
9. Remarks, Inquiries, and Comments by Planning Commission and Staff (No Action)

Larry Curtis requested to put an item on the agenda for the Commission to formalize how to proceed with public input.

Ricky Jones commented that there is a requirement to limit to three minutes any input for interested parties.

Larry Curtis stated he would provide a copy of the form to the Commission.
Mark Jones stated that he does not want the forum to be a platform for grandstanding, but rather to glean public input.

Larry Curtis stated the importance of discussing the matter and deciding on how to proceed.
Lee Whelpley asked if the time limit can be altered.
Larry Curtis responded he believes the language that has been provided by the City Council allows for modification.

Tammy Ewing responded that she has yet to find the actual action taken by the Council, and that she cannot yet answer that question.

## 10. Adjournment

MOTION: by Fred Dorrell to adjourn at 7:02 p.m. The motion was seconded by Lee Whelpley. The motion carried the following vote:

Aye: $\quad 5$ - Pablo Aguirre, Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
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## 1. Call to Order

Chairperson Ricky Jones called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m.
2. Roll Call

Present: 4- Pablo Aguirre, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
Absent: 1- Mark Jones

## 3. Old Business

A. 19-631 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding the proposed modifications to Sections 5.7 (Signs) of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance
Planner II Jane Wyrick reported Section 5.7 of the Zoning Ordinance was proposed to be modified to update sign code requirements. She noted the existing sign code was approved by City Council in January of 2008 and had been in effect since February 2008 with modifications and updates in preceding years. She reported in 2015 the Supreme Court ruled Gilbert, Arizona town sign regulations were content based and were an unconstitutional regulation of speech as the town sign regulations included different rules for different categories of signs. She explained if a sign code included content based language it was subject to strict scrutiny by the courts and a municipality must be able to demonstrate the language was included to further a compelling government interest. She noted a section outlining the purpose and intent of Broken Arrow sign ordinance was expanded in Section 5.7. She explained Broken Arrow was amending Section 5.7 of the Zoning Ordinance in response to the Supreme Court ruling. She explained other language was being adjusted to accommodate newer technology signage, included a new definitions section, and addressed signage within Area 7 of the DROD. She stated Staff recommended approval of the proposed modifications to Section 5.7 of the Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance as presented and an Ordinance be drafted for City Council approval.

Chairperson Jones asked if signs which advertised a product not sold on location and were considered off premise advertising signs were included as content based signage. He asked if such signage would be prohibited. Acting Development Services Director Larry Curtis responded in the negative; for example, a billboard advertising pest control placed on property which was utilized to sell fast food was permitted.

Chairperson Jones opened the Public Hearing for Item 6A. He asked if any present wished to speak regarding Item 6A; hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing

MOTION: A motion was made by Pablo Aguirre, seconded by Lee Whelpley.
Move to approve Item 3A, 19-631, per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye:
4 - Pablo Aguirre, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
Chairperson Jones stated Item 3A would go before City Council on June 17, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. He explained if any individual desired to speak regarding this Item, said individual was required to fill out a Request to Appear before City Council form in advance.
4. Consideration of Consent Agenda

Planner II Jane Wyrick presented the Consent Agenda.
A. 19-576 Approval of PT19-100, Conditional Final Plat, Independent School District No. 3 (Broken Arrow Public Schools, Elementary 16), 38.734 acres, 1 Lot, A-1, one-half mile north of New Orleans Street (101st Street), one-half mile west of Evans Road (225th E. Avenue)
Ms. Wyrick indicated the applicant and Staff agreed to remove Checklist Items 13 and 15 for this Item and she recommended the Planning Commission's motion reflect this adjustment.

Chairperson Jones explained the Consent Agenda consisted of routine items, minor in nature, and was approved in its entirety with a single motion and a single vote, unless an item was removed for discussion. He asked if there were any items to be removed from the Consent Agenda; there were none.

MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Mark Jones.
Move to approve Consent Agenda Item 4A including removal of Checklist Items 13 and 15 per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 4 - Mark Jones, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
Chairperson Jones stated Item 4A would go before City Council on June 17, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. He explained if any individual desired to speak regarding this Item, said individual was required to fill out a Request to Appear before City Council form in advance.

## 5. Consideration of Items Removed from Consent Agenda

No Items were removed from the Consent Agenda. No action was taken or required.


#### Abstract

6. Public Hearings A. 19-547 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-2027, Callaway Project, 7.03 acres, A-1 to RD, one eighth mile south of Jasper Street (131st Street), east of Olive Avenue (129th E. Avenue) Acting Development Services Manager Larry Curtis reported BAZ-2027 was a zoning request change from A-1 (agricultural) to RD (residential duplex). He explained the applicant proposed to sell the property associated with BAZ-2027 to residents who wished to build a 5,500 square foot detached single family home on the property. He explained the couple wished to split the property into two lots and sell the remaining parcel to an individual with the intent to build a single family detached home. He noted the property was currently zoned A-1 with a minimum lot size of 5 acres and a minimum frontage of 330 feet. He noted the property was designated as Level 3 in the Comprehensive Plan and RD zoning was in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 3. He explained whereas R-2 and R-3 zoning were also in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, due to the limitation of lot size and the distance from other zoning districts with R-2 or R-3 classification, it was determined RD zoning was more appropriate in this area. He stated on April 26, 2019 the applicant mailed a letter to all property owners on the radius report list informing the property owners of his intent to divide the property into 3.5 acre lot estates with each lot containing a single family home. He reported the applicant indicated positive response. He stated based on the Comprehensive Plan, location of the property and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended BAZ-2027 be approved subject to the property being platted. He explained Staff recommended platting be waived if the property was developed for single family homes, but platting be required if developed for a residential duplex type home. He noted the warranty deeds associated with the lot split would specify each property could only be used for a single family detached residence.


Chairperson Jones stated while platting was waived if the property was developed for a single family home, if RD zoning was approved development of the property into residential duplex type homes would be permitted. Mr. Curtis explained a self-imposed restriction would be placed on the lot split which indicated the property could only be used for single family development. He indicated to develop the property for multifamily purposes an applicant would be required to come before the Planning Commission and request to revoke the restriction prior to platting the property for duplex purposes.

The applicant, Mr. Cody Callaway, stated his address was 300 N. Main Street, Suite A, Broken Arrow, OK 74012. He stated he was in agreement with Staff recommendations. He explained the reasoning behind the request for RD zoning rather than $\mathrm{R}-1$ or $\mathrm{R}-2$ zoning, as $\mathrm{R}-1$ or $\mathrm{R}-2$ zoning would require a Comprehensive Plan change.

Commissioner Pablo Aguirre asked about the restriction clause. Mr. Curtis explained the language within the Deed Document stated "no additional split would be permissible without approval of the Planning Commission" and "only a single family home may be permissible on this lot" and "this use cannot be modified without approval of the Planning Commission."

Chairperson Jones opened the Public Hearing for Item 6A. He asked if any present wished to speak regarding Item 6A; hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: A motion was made by Pablo Aguirre, seconded by Lee Whelpley.
Move to approve Item 6A, 19-547, per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 4 - Pablo Aguirre, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
Chairperson Jones stated Item 6A would go before City Council on June 17, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. He recommended the applicant attend this City Council Meeting. He explained if any individual desired to speak regarding this Item, said individual was required to fill out a Request to Appear before City Council form in advance.
B. 19-569 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-2028, Callaway

Parking Lot, 0.72 acres, DROD Area 5 (Downtown Residential Overlay)/R-3 (Single

Family Residential), ON (Office Neighborhood), and PUD-242 (Planned Unit Development) to DROD Area 5 (Downtown Residential Overlay)/ON (Office Neighborhood), on the northeast corner of Detroit Street and First Street Mr. Larry Curtis reported BAZ-2028 was a zoning change request from DROD Area 5/R-3 (single family residential) to DROD Area 5/ON (office neighborhood). He stated the property was platted as Lot 17 through Lot 15 of Block 17 in the original town of Broken Arrow. He noted Milestone a 4 story building with 31,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor and 3 levels of apartments containing 90 units was under construction immediately west of this property. He reported the applicant proposed to develop a covered parking lot with fencing and landscaping to be used by Milestone. He explained while a parking structure was not permitted in the R-3 Zoning District it was identified as a permitted use in Area 5 of the DROD; therefore, the applicant requested to keep DROD Area 5, but change the underlying zoning district from R-3 and ON/PUD-242 to ON which would revoke the underlying PUD242. He stated the Comprehensive Plan showed this area designated as Level 5, and ON was identified as possible in the Comprehensive Plan in Level 5. He noted there was no height impact. He stated based on the Comprehensive Plan, location of the property and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended approval of BAZ-2028. He stated Staff recommended platting be waived as the property was previously platted. He noted a site plan for the parking lot would be submitted and approved by staff prior to development. He noted the parking lot would be screened and landscaped in accordance with the Broken Arrow zoning code.

The Applicant Cody Callaway stated his address was 300 N. Main Street, Suite A, Broken Arrow, OK 74012. He stated he was in agreement with Staff recommendations. He stated he originally intended to develop an office building on this property, but once Milestone was underway he realized a parking lot would be more appropriate. He thanked Staff for being helpful during the process.

Chairperson Jones opened the Public Hearing for Item 6B. He asked if any present wished to speak regarding Item 6B.

Mr. Don Linley stated his address was 22629 E. $81^{\text {st }}$ Street, Broken Arrow, OK. He stated he had lived at this address for 46 years and owned the property at 233 E. Elgin near the proposed zoning change. He stated he had no concerns with the zoning change. He asked if it was normal for a zoning change to be requested after development had begun as he noted the Milestone building was currently under construction. He stated he wondered whether he should proceed with his intended property improvements or if his property value might increase and be worth selling to a developer in the near future. He asked if his property would require a zoning change for this purpose. Mr. Curtis explained the Milestone property was unrelated to the property which was requesting a zoning change currently; therefore, the request was not being made after development had begun. He explained the zoning change would not affect Mr. Linley's property. He noted Staff would be happy to speak with Mr. Linley following the Planning Commission Meeting regarding whether his property would require a zoning change to be sold for the purpose of office building development.

Chairperson Jones stated the Milestone project had caused some concern to a church located south of the property regarding parking on church property by Milestone visitors. He noted this proposed parking development potentially could alleviate this concern.

Chairperson Jones asked if any others present wished to speak regarding Item 6B; hearing none he closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Lee Whelpley.
Move to approve Item 6B, 19-569, per Staff recommendation
The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 4- Pablo Aguirre, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
Chairperson Jones stated Item 6B would go before City Council on June 17, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. He recommended the applicant attend this City Council Meeting. He explained if any individual desired to speak regarding this Item, said individual was required to fill out a Request to Appear before City Council form in advance.
C. 19-578 Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding PUD-161H, a request for a major amendment to Planned Unit Development 161, Savvy Swimmers, 0.87 acres, PUD-161/CG, located one eighth mile west of Olive Avenue (129th E. Avenue), north of Kenosha Street (71st Street)
Ms. Jane Wyrick reported PUD-161H was a major amendment request to PUD-161. She reported the Design Statement indicated this project was planned as a scuba diving and swim instruction facility called Savvy Swimmers. She explained when PUD-161 was approved in 2005 the property was zoned C-2 (planned shopping center) which did not include commercial swimming pool as a permitted use. She noted the Zoning Ordinance was updated and C-2 zoning was converted to CG (commercial general) which did not include a designation for
commercial swimming pool, but included general indoor recreation use. She stated the applicant proposed to include general indoor recreation as a permitted use. She reported other requested amendments included a reduction of the rear setback from 50 feet to 25 feet, allowed a deviation in exterior building materials to include metal, glass and masonry, and amended the parking ratio to 1 space per 300 square feet. She reported in October of 2016 City Council approved PUD-161G on this property to reduce the rear setback from 50 feet to 23 feet, with a single story building, 8 foot high screening fence along the east boundary, installation of irrigation, and restaurant use prohibition with all other PUD-161 regulations remaining in effect. She noted PUD-161G was not vested; therefore, it never took effect. She noted the adjacent property to the south was included in PUD-143A, approved by the Planning Commission as a minor amendment in May of 2007, which allowed the rear setback to be reduced from 50 feet to 23 feet with several restrictions. She reported the renderings for the project showed two driveways and a drive isle which circled the back of the building. She noted the applicant indicated access was needed to the rear of the building for pickup and drop off of heavy scuba equipment; however, the drive isle would limit the width of the landscape buffer adjacent to the east property boundary. She stated Staff recommended a minimum 10 foot wide landscape buffer in this location. She explained the various zoning ordinance requirements regarding parking and noted the applicant requested modifying the parking requirement due to this being a pool facility; Staff agreed. She reviewed other PUD requirements which were in accordance with PUD-161. She noted a patio area was planned; Staff suggested hours of operation be applied to the project and amplified sound not be permitted in the patio area. She stated Staff recommended no second floor windows facing residential uses, along with a 35 foot height limit. She reported there was no flood plain on the property. She reported staff received four phones calls regarding this project: two asked about the nature of the project, one had a concern regarding noise, and one was opposed to the project. She stated based on the Comprehensive Plan, location of the property and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommended PUD-161H be approved with the included conditions.

Chairperson Jones asked if the individual who was opposed to the project indicated a reason. Ms. Wyrick responded in the negative; the individual only stated "that won't work."

Chairperson Jones asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Wyrick responded in the negative; the applicant's wife, the architect, instructor and realtor were present.

The applicant's wife, Mrs. Heidi Bailey, stated her address was 107 E. Main Street, Jenks, OK 74037. She stated she was mostly in agreement with Staff recommendations. She asked if it would be possible to play light coffee shop style background music on the patio as it was intended as a waiting place for parents during lessons. Chairperson Jones asked if Ms. Bailey would be in agreement with days and hours for music permission. He explained "light music" was a nebulous term and hard to enforce; therefore, unless Ms. Bailey could set decibel limitations, as well as hours of operation, residents would be concerned. He stated he was willing to permit Ms. Bailey or the architect to work with staff to determine an enforceable decibel level and operating hours for music. Ms. Bailey stated she understood and agreed. Ms. Wyrick noted the building could be moved forward 5 feet to provide an additional buffer in back of the property. Chairperson Jones stated he believed an accommodation could be reached, but he was unwilling to allow "light music" without establishing ground rules through Staff.

Commissioner Aguirre asked how many exceptions were being requested through the PUD. Ms. Wyrick responded essentially three exceptions and listed said exceptions.

Chairperson Jones asked if the applicant agreed with the remaining staff recommendations, such as the window restriction. Ms. Bailey responded in the affirmative. Chairperson Jones asked about Ms. Bailey's current facility which operated in Jenks. Ms. Bailey explained the facility in Jenks was a scuba school and had been in operation for three years. Mr. Curtis asked if Ms. Bailey intended to operate two schools or move the school to Broken Arrow. Ms. Bailey responded the school would be moving to Broken Arrow.

Vice Chairperson Whelpley asked if the patio would include surrounding materials to mute sound. Ms. Bailey stated her architect could better answer this question. The applicant's architect, Mr. Scott White, stated his address was 10410 E. $112^{\text {th }}$ Place South. He stated there would be shrubbery, a privacy fence, and a 10 foot buffer zone with trees. He noted the back side of the patio would include a 5 foot wall, as well as shrubbery surrounding the patio. Chairperson Jones noted there were noise ordinances in place as well.

Commissioner Aguirre asked why the building had been moved back on the property. Mr. White responded there was an issue with the irregularly shaped lot, front setback, building size, and sidewalk requirements. He noted the building was now setback 35 feet from the rear of the property. Chairperson Jones noted parking would be along the side of the building. Mr. White concurred.

Chairperson Jones opened the Public Hearing for Item 6C. He asked if any present wished to
speak regarding Item 6 C .
Ms. Cindy Mayner stated her address was 1109 N. Kalanchoe Avenue, Broken Arrow, OK. She stated she owned the building next door to this proposed project. She stated she was thrilled with the proposed project and had no concerns regarding the patio. She stated she was concerned about potential overflow parking onto her property, as well as from her property onto Savvy Swimming property. She stated she wished to contact the Baileys regarding parking and the possibility of partnering with Savvy Swimming for parking space. Chairperson Jones noted a large portion of the building would be pool space which Staff felt would not need the same parking requirements as normal floor space parking requirements. He suggested Ms. Mayner contact Ms. Bailey following the meeting to discuss parking. Ms. Mayner agreed.

Chairperson Jones asked if any others present wished to speak regarding Item 6C; hearing none, he closed the Public Hearing.

Chairperson Jones stated Broken Arrow did not currently have a scuba/swim lesson facility and he approved of the project.

MOTION: A motion was made by Fred Dorrell, seconded by Lee Whelpley.
Move to approve Item 6C, 19-578, per Staff recommendation with the caveat the applicant can discuss with Staff a modification regarding patio music decibel level, and if an amenable compromise is reached the recommendation is to go on to City Council as noted.

Aye:
The motion carried by the following vote:
4 - Pablo Aguirre, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
Chairperson Jones stated Item 6C would go before City Council on June 17, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. He recommended the applicant attend this City Council Meeting. He explained if any individual desired to speak regarding this Item, said individual was required to fill out a Request to Appear before City Council form in advance.

## 7. Appeals

There were no Appeals.

## 8. General Commission Business

A. 19-633 Consideration, discussion, and possible approval of modified Request to Appear forms and Guidelines for Planning Commission meetings
Mr. Larry Curtis reported City Council recommended the Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment consider regulations regarding speaking time limits, as well as Request to Appear forms, similar to City Council regulations. He stated the City Clerk's office created a Request to Appear before the Planning Commission form and provided guidance as directed by City Council. He stated the Planning Commission should consider speaking time limits for applicants, as well as citizens. He explained these regulations allowed for orderly meetings, as well as provided documentation of individuals who appeared before the Planning Commission.

Chairperson Jones asked if there was a directive from City Council to implement this system. Assistant City Attorney Tammy Ewing responded in the negative. Chairperson Jones stated he felt the Planning Commission had operated successfully in the 16 years he had served without assigning time limits. He stated he believed the Planning Commission was cognizant enough to curb individual tangents which were unrelated to topic while allowing citizens to vent freely, especially as this was not permitted during City Council Meetings. He noted he appreciated the freedom to permit speakers as much time as needed when there were few speakers, while possibly implementing time limits when many were present to speak. Ms. Ewing stated asking citizens to sign up to speak was helpful for documentation purposes, improved accuracy of Meeting Minutes, became public record, and also enabled meeting attendees to indicate an "in support of" or "in opposition to" position without necessarily speaking. Discussion ensued regarding problems with these forms in the past, filing the forms with the City Clerk's Office, online signup, forms being available during the meeting, and concerns with time limits.

Commissioner Aguirre commented City Council had success with time limits and noted the forms would be beneficial as a means for data collection. Assistant City Attorney Ewing explained there were two separate issues: the form and the time limit. Commissioner Aguirre stated the future of the Planning Commission should be considered; while Chairperson Jones did an excellent job controlling the Planning Commission Meetings, he may not always be present. Discussion ensued regarding the current method of operation working smoothly, citizens getting angry with time restrictions, and City Council appreciating the Planning Commission allowing citizens to freely express opinions.

Vice Chairperson Whelpley stated he agreed the form which collected information would be beneficial; but he agreed Chairperson Jones did an excellent job steering speakers in the proper direction. Assistant City Attorney Ewing stated a lack of consistency of rules and regulations could lead to capricious arguments, especially if citizens felt unable to express themselves
simply because others had previously expressed similar opinions. Discussion ensued regarding Broken Arrow doing an excellent job running public hearings, neighboring municipalities, Planning Commissions versus City Councils, rules preventing chaos, and Planning Commission subject matter being less inflammatory than City Council subject matter.

Commissioner Fred Dorrell agreed with both Chairperson Jones and Commissioner Aguirre. He stated forms would be helpful, but were not necessary. He stated "grandstanding" was not an issue during Planning Commission Meetings and time limits could be both beneficial and problematic. Assistant City Attorney Ewing stated an agreement could be made to allow time limit extensions when desired via Planning Commission vote. Commissioner Dorrell stated he worried a time limit would promote filibustering to fill said time limit.

Discussion ensued regarding informing citizens the Planning Commission did not take property values into consideration, the narrow scope the Planning Commission was allowed to consider regarding recommendations, the possibility of including this type of information on the form, the possibility of standardized instructions for public hearings regarding speaker behavior, a blanket statement regarding the Planning Commission not considering property values possibly causing debate, being careful about phrasing of instructions and Planning Commission limitations, as well as Planning Commission Members being required to approve or deny requests regardless of personal feelings and opinions.

Chairperson Jones asked Staff for an opinion. Mr. Curtis stated Staff would like the form to help with record keeping. He stated Staff would like a time limit; however, he understood the Planning Commission acted as a sounding board regarding items which went before City Council. He indicated Staff was present to serve the Planning Commission; ultimately Staff would support whatever decision the Planning Commission made in this regard.

Commissioner Aguirre stated he approved of the form as it clarified who was permitted to speak and for how long. He noted he felt the suggested 5 minutes per public speaker, 10 minutes per applicant with an additional 5 minutes for a rebuttal was reasonable. He stated he believed the form should include a statement which clearly indicated the Planning Commission was not permitted to take property values into consideration in decision making, but in a nonabrasive manner.

Mr. Curtis suggested Staff was amenable to tabling this Item to allow the Planning Commission Members to consider this further individually and discuss again at a future Meeting. Planning Commission agreed to table Item 8A. Mr. Curtis indicated Staff would contact each Planning Commission Member individually to discussion opinions during the next two weeks. Assistant City Attorney Ewing asked Item 8A not be tabled or continued, but be put on a future Agenda as three separate Items, one being use of a sign-up form, two being guidelines and three being time limits. Mr. Curtis concurred. Commissioner Dorrell concurred.

Assistant City Attorney Ewing stated Chairperson Jones, as well as the other Planning Commission Members, did an excellent job running the Planning Commission Meetings. She stated she wanted him to understand the suggestion for new rules and regulations was not a negative reflection upon Chairperson Jones in any way. Chairperson Jones indicated he understood and commented the chairmanship was rotated regularly.

Discussion ensued regarding the benefits of requiring residents to fill out a form prior to the Meeting requesting to speak.

MOTION: A motion was made by Pablo Aguirre, seconded by Fred Dorrell.
Move to take no action regarding Item 8A
Aye: 4 - Pablo Aguirre, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones
Commissioner Dorrell asked if this item would be placed back on the Agenda. Mr. Curtis responded in the affirmative.

## 9. Remarks, Inquiries and Comments by Planning Commission and Staff (No Action)

Mr. Curtis asked for all present to be aware of the flooding conditions in south Broken Arrow and to be cautious.

Chairperson Jones stated he saw Mr. Norm Stephens while in Las Vegas at ICSC. He commended Mr. Stephens for an outstanding job representing and promoting the City of Broken Arrow.

Assistant City Attorney Ewing stated collectively the Planning Commission had more experience regarding the above discussed Item (Item 8A). She asked the Planning Commission Members to be creative and feel free to express any new ideas.

Special Projects Manager Farhad Daroga announced a joint work session with the Planning

Commission and City Council regarding the next Comprehensive Plan would be held on June 20, 2019 in the City Hall Main Conference Room at 5:00 p.m. He stated the Nazarene Meeting was rescheduled for Tuesday, June 18, 2019 at the Church of the Nazarene to review the Elm and New Orleans plan.

Assistant City Attorney Ewing reminded the Planning Commission of the Open Meetings Act requirement not to have discussions outside of Meetings regarding issues which might come before the Planning Commission.

## 10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:20 p.m.

MOTION: A motion was made by Pablo Aguirre, seconded by Fred Dorrell.

## Move to adjourn

The motion carried by the following vote:
Aye: 4 - Pablo Aguirre, Fred Dorrell, Lee Whelpley, Ricky Jones

# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 19-705, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>06-13-2019

To:
Chairman and Commission Members
Development Services Department
Title:

> Approval of PT19-109, Preliminary Plat, Highland 55 at Mission Hills, 19.63 acres, 1 Lot, PUD-189 (Planned Unit Development)/RM (Residential Multifamily) to PUD-189C/RM, north of Albany Street (61 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Street), one-third mile west of $9^{\text {th }}$ Street (Lynn Lane)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Location:
Size of Tract
Number of Lots:
Present Zoning:
Comp Plan:

Alan Betchan, AAB Engineering, LLC
White Earth, LLC
Tallgrass Capital LLC
AAB Engineering, LLC
North of Albany Street (61st Street), one-third mile west of 9th Street (Lynn Lane) 19.63 acres

1
PUD-189/RM (PUD-189C/RM approved subject to platting)
Level 3

PT19-109, the preliminary plat for Highland 55 at Mission Hills, contains 19.63 acres on one proposed lot. This property, which is located north of Albany Street ( 61 st Street), one-third mile west of 9th Street (Lynn Lane), is presently zoned PUD-189/RM. On November 6, 2018, the City Council conditionally approved PUD-189C. PUD-189C was approved subject to the property being platted.

As part of PUD-189C, there will be 98 duplex dwelling units on one lot. According to the developer, development of the property will be designed and oriented towards active adults. A unique feature related to PUD-189C is that all 98 units, associated landscaping, fencing, and streets will be owned and maintained by one property owner. All of the units will be one story with a maximum building height of 35 feet. In lieu of sidewalks, there will be a 5 -foot wide trail system paved with asphalt or concrete. The trail will be maintained by the property owner.

According to PUD-189C, Highland 55 at Mission Hills will be a private gated neighborhood. As part of PUD189C, it was specifically recognized that access to Fargo Street to the north will be restricted to emergence access only. The main vehicular access to this development will be from the south through an access easement that will connect with Albany Street and align with 3rd Street. While all the streets inside PUD-189C will be private streets maintained by the property owner, the streets will be at least 26 feet in width and constructed to

File \#: 19-705, Version: 1
City of Broken Arrow standards. At the Planning Commission meeting associated with PUD-189C, the developer acknowledged that all construction traffic would access the property from Albany Street and that no construction traffic would be allowed through the Lynn Lane Village and Country Lane neighborhoods to the north.

None of the property is located in a 100 -year floodplain area. There are high-pressure pipeline easements approximately 80 feet in width along the north boundary. As per the City of Broken Arrow Subdivision Code, all structures will have to setback at least 50 feet from any and all high-pressure pipelines. An overhead power line and associated easement is located along the west boundary.

Water and sanitary sewer service will be provided by the City of Broken Arrow. According to the conceptual utility plan, the sanitary sewer lines will be located in the front yard next to the street.

Attachments: Checklist
Preliminary Plat and Covenants
Conceptual Utilities
Preliminary site plan

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends PT19-109, preliminary plat for Highland 55 at Mission Hills, be approved, subject to the attached checklist.

## Reviewed and Approved By: Larry R. Curtis

BDM

# BROKEN ARROW PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL SUBDIVISION PLAT REVIEW CHECKLIST 

## PLAT INFORMATION

NAME OF PRELIMINARY PLAT: Highland 55 at Mission Hills
CASE NUMBER: PT19-109
RELATED CASE NUMBERS: PUD-189C and BAZ-2005
COUNTY: Tulsa
SECTION/TOWNSHIP/RANGE: Section 35/T19N/R14E
GENERAL LOCATION: North of Albany Street, one-third mile west of $9^{\text {th }}$ Street
CURRENT ZONING: PUD-189/RM (PUD-189C/RM approved subject to platting)
SANITARY SEWER BASIN: Lynn Lane
STORM WATER DRAINAGE BASIN: Adams Creek

ENGINEER:
ENGINEER ADDRESS

ENGINEER PHONE NUMBER:

DEVELOPER:
DEVELOPER ADDRESS: 1000 West Wilshire, Suite 357
Oklahoma City, OK 73116

DEVELOPER PHONE NUMBER: 405-840-4400

## PRELIMINARY PLAT

APPLICATION MADE: May 20, 2019
TOTAL ACREAGE: 19.63
NUMBER OF LOTS: 1
TAC MEETING DATE:
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE:

## COMMENTS:

1. ___ The subdivision statistic says 19.62 acres while the subdivision data and legal description say 19.63 acres. Please rectify.
2. 
3. $\qquad$

Show the mutual access easement and associated document number for connection to Albany Street. At the intersection with Albany Street, the mutual access easement shall be wide enough to accommodate at least one 13' inbound lane, two 12' outbound lanes, and a median in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations. Document number for off-site MAE shall be shown on the plat prior to the plat being recorded.
4. $\qquad$ PUD-189C referenced this development being a part of a gated community. The gate design will need to meet the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations, which may impact right-of-way or mutual access easement widths. Gate design shall be submitted and approved, prior to the plat being recorded.
5. ___ Place case number (19-109) in lower right corner of plat.
6. 
7. 

___ Provide Certificate of Authorization number for engineer and surveyor.
On the location map, delete "East" from both Albany Street and Omaha Street. Use Broken Arrow street names and place County street names in parenthesis (i.e. $9^{\text {th }}$ Street and Omaha Street).
8. ___On Explorer Pipeline revise to say "District Court Case C-71-1168".
9. ____Revise Section IIA of the covenants. PUD 189C references the Zoning Ordinance that was adopted as part of Ordinance 2931.
10. ___Correct typo error in Section II.G of the covenants.
11.
12. $\qquad$ Include the portion of PUD-189C pertaining to Fire Sprinklers in Section II of the covenants. On the north end of the property that connects with East Fargo Street, show "Restricted Access". On Sheet 1add the following, "Restricted Access - The entry at East Fargo Street shall be for emergency access only to vehicular traffic."
13. $\qquad$ Show appropriate utility easement around the perimeter of the property. If there is a utility easement of at least 11 feet on the adjoining property, an 11 -foot wide utility easement is required. If there is no utility easement on the adjacent property, a 17.5 -foot wide utility easement is required, unless modified by TAC.
14. $\qquad$ Show the 50 -foot building setback line from high-pressure pipeline.
15. ___ Add lot and block number.
16.
17.

Show a representative example of the 18 -foot front building line setback.
___Show the 20 -foot wide perimeter landscape area that is required as part of PUD 189C.
18. $\qquad$ The arrows referencing "U/E Document \#2006064830 \& the Park at Mission Hills PUD No. 189" near the northeast corner of the plat are not shown correctly.
19. ___Correct the address for the City of Broken Arrow, it should be " 220 South First Street".
20. $\qquad$ Provide a dimension for locating where the MAE intersects the south property line and show the width of the MAE.
21. $\qquad$ Add the DD number to the Detention Determination note.
22. ___ Add the Horizontal State Plane North Datum to the subdivision data.
23. ___Show a minimum of a 50' tangent between reverse curves to meet AASHTO requirements and verify that all curves are designed with a 30 mph speed limit for a $26^{\prime}$ wide street.
24. ___ Show an Overland Drainage Easement (ODE) where concentrated pipe flow will be channelized and flow overland to existing structures.
25. ____Add a section to the covenants defining the MAE and its uses, restriction, and maintenance responsibilities.
26. $\qquad$ On Sheet 2 please correct the leaders for the South 15 ' U/E label to correctly identify the linework for the U/E, one of them is pointing at the line for the MAE
27. ___Show a stormwater utility Easement and the associated document number for the portion of the private storm sewer that extends onto the property to the South. Document number shall be shown on the plat prior to the plat being recorded.
28. $\qquad$ Show a continuous $15^{\prime}$ U/E that covers the public water and sanitary sewer lines that cross or penetrate into the MAE.
29. Show a 10' $55^{\prime}$ notch around the fire hydrants located 26 ' from the centerline of the MAE.
30. $\qquad$ Obtain a Standard Construction Specification Variance for the sanitary sewer that is shown next to the private road.

## CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT

```
NAME OF CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT:
APPLICATION MADE:
TOTAL ACREAGE:
NUMBER OF LOTS:
TAC MEETING DATE:
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE:
CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE:
COMMENTS:
```

31. 
32. 
33. 
34. ____The conditional final plat and the "no exceptions taken" engineering drawing must agree with respect to Limits of Access and No Access, easement both internal and external, reserve area, traffic control medians, street layouts, rights-of-way, etc. Please provide a written statement (e-mail statement is acceptable) that the conditional final plat agrees with the "no exceptions taken" engineering plans.
35. ____ Finished for elevations (FFE) shall be shown for each lot on the Final Plat along with identification of lots requiring backflow preventers.
36. ___Show monuments on plat.
37. $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## CONDITIONS TO BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL RELEASE OF PLAT

LETTER OF APPROVAL FROM UTILITY COMPANY SUBMITTED?<br>NATURAL GAS COMPANY APPROVAL<br>ELECTRIC COMPANY APPROVAL<br>TELEPHONE COMPANY APPROVAL<br>CABLE COMPANY APPROVAL

## CERTIFICATE OF RECORDS SEARCH FROM OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION SUBMITTED?

OK CORPORATION COMMISSION CERTIFICATE OF RECORDS SEARCH
OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION, 405-521-2271
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES/ENGINEERING APPROVAL ___STORMWATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:

Page 2 of 3

PAVING PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
WATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
SANITARY SEWER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
SEWAGE DISPOSAL PLANS, SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON:
WATER PLANS SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON:
IS A SIDEWALK PERFORMANCE BOND DUE? $\qquad$ HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED?
ARE PERFORMANCE BONDS OR ESCROW AGREEMENT DUE FOR WATER, STORM SEWERS, SANITARY SEWER AND PAVING? (CIRCLE APPLICABLE) $\qquad$ HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED? PROJECT ENGINEER/DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REVIEW COMPLETE ON:

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

ADDRESSES REVIEWED AND APPROVED?
DETENTION DETERMINATION \# ASSIGNED AND VERIFIED?
PLANNING DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMPLETE ON:
FINAL PLAT RECEIVED IN PLANNING DEPARTMENT AFTER UTILITY COMPANY SIGN OFF ON:
FINAL PLAT SENT TO PROJECT ENGINEER FOR FINAL REVIEW ON:

## FEES

_FINAL PLAT PROCESSING FEE (\$150 + (\$5 X___LOTS)
WATER LINE (S) UNDER PAYBACK CONTRACT
EXCESS SEWER CAPACITY FEE (\$700 X ___ACRES
(LESS ANY AREA IN 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN ONLY OR AREA IN GOLF COURSE) ACCELERATION/DECELERATION LANES ESCROW WATER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS SEWER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS STREET IMPROVEMENT (WIDENING) ASSESSMENTS _DRAINAGE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS PRO RATA COST REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR WATER LINE CON. REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR SEWER LINE CON. STREET SIGNS, LIGHTS, ETC. (\$150 X $\qquad$ SIGNS) SIDEWALK ESCROW STORM WATER FEE-IN-LIEU OF DETENTION (. 35 X $\qquad$ (SF INCREASED IMPERVIOUS \$
\$
$\$$
\$ $\qquad$
$\qquad$ AREA) (less any area in Reserve Area of $1 / 2$ acre or more)

## TOTAL FEE(S)

$\$$ $\qquad$

## FINAL PROCESSING OF PLAT

FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED FOR MAYOR AND CITY CLERK SIGNATURE ON: $\qquad$
____FEES PAID ON: $\qquad$ IN THE AMOUNT OF: $\qquad$ FINAL PLAT PICKED UP FOR RECORDATION ON:
2 COPIES OF FILED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PDF OF RECORDED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
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## 55 at Mission Hills <br> PUD NO. 189 C

TEAST QUARTER (SE/4) OF SECTION 35
TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA
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# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 19-644, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>06-13-2019

To:
Chairman and Commission Members
Development Services Department
Title:

> Approval of PT19-107, Conditional Final Plat, Creek Center, a replat of a part of Possum Run Addition, 1.05 acres, 1 Lot, A-1 (Agricultural) to CG (Commercial General), west of the southwest corner of Kenosha Street $\left(71^{\text {st }}\right.$ Street) and $51^{\text {st }}$ Street (Evans Road)

## Background:

Applicant:
Owner:
Developer:
Engineer:
Location:
Road)
Size of Tract $\quad 1.05$ acres
Number of Lots: 1 proposed
Present Zoning: A-1 (Agricultural) to CG (Commercial General)
Comp Plan: Level 4 (Commercial/Employment Nodes)
PT19-107, the conditional final plat for Creek Center, contains 1.05 acres and is proposed to be developed as one lot. This property, which is located west of the southwest corner of Kenosha Street( $71^{\text {st }}$ Street) and $51^{\text {st }}$ Street (Evans Road), was rezoned from A-1 to CG on November 6, 2018, when the City Council approved BAZ-2013, subject to the property being replatted. The preliminary plat for Creek Center was approved by the Planning Commission on May 9, 2019.

This property is currently being used for commercial purposes and was originally platted in Wagoner County as a part of Possum Run on February 4, 1980. The property was annexed into the city limits of Broken Arrow on February 18, 1980 by Ordinance No. 819.

According to the FEMA maps, none of this property is located in the 100 -year floodplain. Water to this development will be available from City of Broken Arrow. Since the development is in excess of 300 -feet from the nearest public sanitary sewer line, sanitary sewer service is proposed to be provided through the use of a septic system to be approved by DEQ and utilities.

Attachments: Checklist

File \#: 19-644, Version: 1
Conditional Final Plat and Covenants

Recommendation:
Staff recommends PT19-107, conditional final plat for Creek Center be approved, subject to the attached checklist.

## Reviewed and Approved By:

Larry R. Curtis

ALY

# BROKEN ARROW PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL SUBDIVISION PLAT REVIEW CHECKLIST 

## PLAT INFORMATION

NAME OF PRELIMINARY PLAT: Creek Center a Resubdivision of a part of Possum Run Addition
CASE NUMBER: PT19-107
RELATED CASE NUMBERS: BAZ-2013
COUNTY: Wagoner
SECTION/TOWNSHIP/RANGE: 8/18/15
GENERAL LOCATION: west of the southwest corner of Kenosha Street and Evans Road
CURRENT ZONING: A-1 to CG
SANITARY SEWER BASIN:
STORM WATER DRAINAGE BASIN:
ENGINEER: Bird Surveying \& Design
ENGINEER ADDRESS: 9020 N. $175^{\text {th }}$ East Avenue
Owasso, OK 74055
ENGINEER PHONE NUMBER: 918-862-9717
DEVELOPER: EuroTexan Investments, LLC
DEVELOPER ADDRESS: 5301 E Dallas Place
Broken Arrow, OK 74014
DEVELOPER PHONE NUMBER: 918-862-9717

## PRELIMINARY PLAT

APPLICATION MADE: 4/15/19
TOTAL ACREAGE: 1.05
NUMBER OF LOTS: 1
TAC MEETING DATE: 5/7/19
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE: 5/9//19
COMMENTS:
1.
___ Remove the proposed building from the plat. This will be added during the site plan review.
2.

3 . Remove all extra lines from the plat. Concrete and gravel drives do not need to be shown.
$\qquad$ Show the property line beginning after the dedication of the ultimate right-of-way along Kenosha Street. This should be a total of 60 -feet from the centerline of Kenosha except for within 350 -feet of the intersection, which should be 65 -feet.
4. $\qquad$ There should be a dedication of utility easement 17.5 -feet inside the ultimate right-of-way. This is increased to $22.5-$ feet within 250 -feet of the intersection.
5. $\qquad$ Remove the text dedicating right-of-way and utility easements from the adjacent property which is not being platted and use a gray line color for the adjacent property information.
___ The building setback line should be measured from the new property line.
. ___ Provide the DD number on the face of the plat.
8. ___ Remove the space for the development number under the title
9.
10. $\qquad$ Place case number (PT19-107) in lower right corner of plat.
11. ___ Remove the 17.5 -foot utility easement which will be encroached upon by the existing building.
12. $\qquad$ In Section 1 of the covenants, revise the spelling from stork drainage to storm drainage.
13. Move the address for the existing building into the box representing the building. An address for the proposed building has been assigned but will not be shown on the plat.
14. $\qquad$ The right side of the plat is cutoff. Please correct.

## CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT

NAME OF CONDITIONAL FINAL PLAT: Creek Crossing
APPLICATION MADE:
TOTAL ACREAGE: 0.90
NUMBER OF LOTS: 1
TAC MEETING DATE: 06-11-19
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE: 6-13-19

## CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: <br> COMMENTS:

15. ___ Please correct either the plat name in the title or in the dedication so that both location match.
16. 
17. 

___Correct the transition between the 60 -foot and 65 -foot ROW along Kenosha Street. Right-of-ways shall transition at the end of the 350 -foot distance back to existing right-of-way boundary along a 30 -degree angle per the engineering design criteria manual.
19. $\qquad$ The conditional final plat and the "no exceptions taken" engineering drawing must agree with respect to Limits of Access and No Access, easement both internal and external, reserve area, traffic control medians, street layouts, rights-of-way, etc. Please provide a written statement (e-mail statement is acceptable) that the conditional final plat agrees with the "no exceptions taken" engineering plans.
Finished for elevations (FFE) shall be shown for each lot on the Final Plat along with identification of lots requiring backflow preventers.
___Show monuments on plat.
____In the location description of the addition, below the CREEK CROSSING name, the township is referenced incorrectly: "T-18-M" should be "T-18-N".
____In the vicinity map the township is referenced incorrectly: "T-18-E" should be "T-18-N".
24. ___ In the verbal description of the property lines, third paragraph, the East side boundary line, S00o03' 36 '" $\mathrm{W} 175.00^{\prime}$ is referred to as "Due South" and the West side boundary line, N00003' 36 "'E 180.00 ' is referred to as "Due North". Please make appropriate corrections to have agreement in property line description and map bearings.
25. ____In the verbal description of the property lines, the section entitled "KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS" and the following four (4) paragraphs are duplicated. Please make appropriate corrections to eliminate duplication.
26. ____At the point identified as "NE CORNER / SECTION 8 / T-18-N R-15-E", the four (4) section identifiers appear to be incorrect. It is believed that CW sequence $9 / 18 / 17 / 8$ should read $4 / 9 / 8 / 5$. Please update as needed.
27. ___ The NE property corner calls out " 45 ' MUTUAL ACCESS", please add "EASEMENT" as a suffix.
28. ___ Please provide more information between the southern boundaries of Creek Crossing and Possum Run. Add a 20' dimension to show the N-S distance between the two southern boundaries.
Add the $10^{\prime}$ U/E North of the southern boundary of Possum Run.
Add 227.00' dimension to the Possum Run eastern border line.

## CONDITIONS TO BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL RELEASE OF PLAT

## LETTER OF APPROVAL FROM UTILITY COMPANY SUBMITTED?

NATURAL GAS COMPANY APPROVAL
ELECTRIC COMPANY APPROVAL TELEPHONE COMPANY APPROVAL CABLE COMPANY APPROVAL

CERTIFICATE OF RECORDS SEARCH FROM OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION SUBMITTED?

```
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES/ENGINEERING APPROVAL
    STORMWATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
    PAVING PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
    WATER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
    SANITARY SEWER PLANS, ACCEPTED ON:
    SEWAGE DISPOSAL PLANS, SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON:
    WATER PLANS SENT TO DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ON:
    IS A SIDEWALK PERFORMANCE BOND DUE?
```

$\qquad$

``` HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED? ARE PERFORMANCE BONDS OR ESCROW AGREEMENT DUE FOR WATER, STORM SEWERS, SANITARY SEWER AND PAVING? (CIRCLE APPLICABLE) ___ HAVE THEY BEEN SUBMITTED? PROJECT ENGINEER/DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REVIEW COMPLETE ON:
```

FINAL PLAT RECEIVED IN PLANNING DEPARTMENT AFTER UTILITY COMPANY SIGN OFF ON: FINAL PLAT SENT TO PROJECT ENGINEER FOR FINAL REVIEW ON:

## FEES

FINAL PLAT PROCESSING FEE (\$150 + (\$5 X___LOTS)
_ WATER LINE (S) UNDER PAYBACK CONTRACT
EXCESS SEWER CAPACITY FEE (\$700 X $\qquad$ ACRES
$\$$ (LESS ANY AREA IN 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN ONLY OR AREA IN GOLF COURSE) _ACCELERATION/DECELERATION LANES ESCROW
___ WATER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS SEWER LINE CONNECTIONS, PAYABLE TO CITY OR OTHERS STREET IMPROVEMENT (WIDENING) ASSESSMENTS _DRAINAGE SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS PRO RATA COST _REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR WATER LINE CON. _REIMBURSEMENT TO CITY OR OTHERS FOR SEWER LINE CON. STREET SIGNS, LIGHTS, ETC. (\$150 X $\qquad$ SIGNS)

## SIDEWALK ESCROW

 STORM WATER FEE-IN-LIEU OF DETENTION (. 35 X ____ (SF INCREASED IMPERVIOUS \$ AREA) (less any area in Reserve Area of $1 / 2$ acre or more)
## TOTAL FEE(S)

\$ $\qquad$

## FINAL PROCESSING OF PLAT

FINAL PLAT SUBMITTED FOR MAYOR AND CITY CLERK SIGNATURE ON: $\qquad$ FEES PAID ON: $\qquad$ IN THE AMOUNT OF: $\qquad$ FINAL PLAT PICKED UP FOR RECORDATION ON:
2 COPIES OF FILED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
PDF OF RECORDED PLAT SUBMITTED TO PLANNING DEPARTMENT


# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 19-710, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>06-13-2019

To:
Chairman and Commission Members
Development Services Department
Title:

> Approval of request to deviate from masonry exterior building materials, ST19-111 (Site Plan), Tulsa Urology, 0.87 acres, PUD (Planned Unit Development)-130B/CH (Commercial Heavy) and RM (Residential Multi-family), 850 W. Mission Street (one-quarter mile north of Albany Street, west of Elm Place)

## Background:

| Applicant: | Chad Walker, Bird Nest Studio |
| :--- | :--- |
| Owner: | Richard Saint, RBS Enterprises |
| Developer: | Richard Saint, RBS Enterprises |
| Architect: | Chad Walker, Bird Nest Studio |
| Location: | 850 W. Mission Street (one-quarter mile North of Albany Street, west of Elm Place) |
| Size of Tract | 0.87 acres |
| Number of Lots: | 1 |
| Present Zoning: | PUD-130B/CH and RM |
| Comp Plan: | Level 3 (Transition Area), Level 6 (Regional Employment/Commercial) |

Tulsa Urology is proposing to construct a new medical office building at 850 W . Mission Street. The property is platted as Lot 1, Block 2 of Stone Ridge Towne Center presently zoned CH (Commercial Heavy), RM (Residential Multi-family) and PUD-130B (approved by the City Council on December 17, 2007). The north portion of this property is zoned RM; however, development is guided by PUD-130B which designates this area for uses allowed in the CH district except as specified in PUD-130B.

On June 22, 2017, the Planning Commission approved BAL-2023, to split a 2.37 -acre lot into three tracts. Emerson Orthodontics constructed a building on Tract A, and Tulsa Urology proposes to build a 7,906 -squarefoot building on Tract C. The site infrastructure was built in conjunction with construction of Emerson Orthodontics including utilities, sidewalks, curb cuts, parking lot, lighting and trash enclosure.

The medical office building for Tulsa Urology is proposed to be two stories and to include two units. Exterior buildings materials are proposed to include a wood rainscreen, exterior tile, aluminum storefront windows, plate steel window surrounds, and standing seam metal roofing on sloped portions of the roof. Section 5.8.G.1. of the Zoning Ordinance states that vertical exteriors of building facades in the office and commercial districts

## File \#: 19-710, Version: 1

that are facing a public street shall be constructed of masonry, concrete panels, glass block, glass curtain walls, Exterior Insulated Finished Systems (EIFS), or stucco. Other materials such as metals, wood, plastic and other masonry material may be considered and approved by the Planning Commission through the site plan review process. Therefore, applicant is requesting Planning Commission approval to have the wood rainscreen, tile, metal and glass for the vertical exteriors of the building facades.

Attachments: Aerial<br>Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Elevations and Renderings<br>PUD-130B Elm Creek Community Development<br>Stone Ridge Towne Center Plat<br>BAL-2023 Lot Split Exhibit

## Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the building elevations for Tulsa Urology be approved as presented.

## Reviewed and Approved By: Larry R. Curtis

JMW


TULSA UROLOGY MEDICAL OFFICE

850 W. MISSION STREET
BROKEN ARROW, OK 74012


## 



| BIRD NEST STUDI |
| :---: |
| www.birdnest.studio <br> walker@birdnest.stud |
|  |
|  |
| GENERAL INFORMATION |
| PROJECT NO.: 18-011 DATE: 05.03.19 REVISED: SHEET: |
| PERMIT SET |
|  |
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PROJECT No: 18-011
DATE:05.03.19

# ELM CREEK COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 

Amended Planned Unit Development No. 130B

December 3, 2007

OWNER:
Broken Arrow Development, LLC P.O. Box 7712

Edmond Ok 73083-7712

PREPARED BY:
Cook \& Associates Engineering, Inc.
121 E College St
Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012
(918) 258-9442 Fax (918) 258-9488

CA \#4479 Exp 06.30.08


## PUD REVISION DESCRIPTION

The intent of this PUD amendment is to modify the development standards of PARCEL 1 only in PUD 130A, dated May 2004. This amendment also is intended to include an additional 2.33 acre tract located on North Elm Place into the PUD Boundary. Within Parcel 1, there shall be no more than six points of access to Albany Street ( $61^{\text {st }}$ Street) and no more than three points of access to Elm Place ( $161^{\text {st }}$ East Avenue). (Six curb cuts were permitted in the existing PUD, however, it should be noted that based on the topography near the west side of this property and based on 300 ft . separation, only 4 curb cuts may be possible). All access points on Albany Street and Elm Place shall be spaced at least 300 feet apart, centerline to centerline.

PARCEL 1's intended usage will be a mixture of commercial, retail, office, hotel, and hospital. The central focus of the development will be a Hospital Campus with the customary surrounding facilities that may consist of, but are not limited to medical offices, helipad, supporting commercial retail, restaurants, and hotels.

The following sections of PUD 130A are hereby modified for Parcel 1 only through this amendment.

> STATISTICAL SUMMARY
> DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
> SITE PLAN REVIEW
> PLATTING REQUIREMENTS EXPECTED SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT (DELETED)

## ALL REMAINING SECTIONS OF PUD 130A ARE STILL IN EFFECT AFTER THE APPROVAL OF THIS DOCUMENT BY THE BROKEN ARROW PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE CITY COUNCIL

## STATISTICAL SUMMARY FOR PARCEL 1

Project Area<br>Total Office Floor Area<br>Total Commercial Floor Area<br>$\pm 68.3$ acres<br>Development Areas:

Tract A: General or Corporate Office/Commercial Shopping/Hotel Conference

Total Tract Area
Maximum Allowable Floor Area
$\pm 68.3$ acres (Includes 2.33 acre tract)
$1,270,000$ sq. ft.

NOTES:

1. Total allowable office and commercial floor area as well as total residential density are based on and less than permitted under the proposed underlying zoning.
2. Actual floor area to be determined by parking, building setback and landscaping requirements.
3. Upon completion/build out of the Elm Creek Development, all open space requirements as defined in Article VII, Section 3: PUD and TPUD of the zoning Ordinance of the City of Broken Arrow will be satisfied.

## DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

## PARCEL 1: Office, Commercial, Shopping, Hotel/Conference Center

Parcel 1 shall be governed by the use and development regulations of the C-5 Zoning District except as follows:

The following uses are not permitted in Parcel 1:

- Agricultural implements, sales, repair and service
- Amusement Park
- Armored car service, office and garage
- Auctioneer Auditorium
- Auctioneer Office
- Baseball Park
- Bingo Hall/Parlor
- Armory
- Concrete and cement product sales
- Concrete and cement retail (small scale)
- Construction company office with storage and equipment
- Delivery service department/warehouse
- Dry goods and apparel wholesale
- Equipment rental (general light and used equipment)
- Fence sales
- Firewood Retail
- Furniture cleaning, repair and restoration
- Golf driving range
- Miniature golf (indoors/outdoors)
- Kennel and animal training
- Lawn and garden maintenance and installation service
- Machine shop
- Machinery rental
- Mini-storage
- Monument sales, including incidental recessing but not shaping
- Motor freight terminal
- Open air/flea market
- Recreation vehicles, manufacture and storage
- Sexually oriented businesses
- Souvenirs
- Roadside stand
- Theater, motion picture (drive-in)
- Tractor rental (heavy equipment)
- Trailer rental
- All wholesaler uses
- Outdoor storage of non-retail equipment
Minimum Internal Landscaped Open Space*15\%
Minimum Building Setbacks:
From Abutting Public Street ..... 50 ft .
From Abutting Residential Development or Zoned Area (single story building) ..... 50 ft .
From Abutting Residential Development or Zoned Area (buildings above one story) ..... 75 ft .
Rear Yards ..... 30 ft .
Side Yards ..... 20 ft .
*Required internal landscaped open space shall include perimeter landscaping within the development area boundaries, parking islands and landscape plazas, but shall exclude walkways which solely provide minimum pedestrian circulation.


## Sign Standards:

All signs will conform to Article IX of the Zoning Ordinance for the City of Broken Arrow, Oklahoma. Signs on lots containing less than 2.5 acres shall not exceed 14 feet in height. All signs shall have a monument base. No portable signs or banners of any type shall be allowed

## Lighting:

Lighting shall be in accordance with the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance.

## Landscaping:

Landscaping will be provided in Parcel 1 in accordance with Article VIII, Section 19 of the City of Broken Arrow Zoning Ordinance except as follows:

- A landscape area of at least 20 feet in width shall be provided along Albany Street and along Elm Place. In this landscape area, at least 1 tree shall be planted per 40 lineal feet of frontage.
- Where Parcel 1 directly abuts Parcel 2, a landscaped edge of at least 20 feet shall be provided. In this 20 foot wide open space area, at least one tree shall be provided for every 25 linear feet. At least $50 \%$ of the trees shall be evergreens.
- Trees shall be planted along all collector streets, as tracts are developed that front and/or border the collector street. The number of trees required along the collector streets shall be the same as that required along an arterial street in the Zoning Ordinance.


## Buffer:

PUD 130A buffered the out parcel fronting Elm. This parcel is now included in Parcel 1 of this PUD, so the buffered is no longer needed.

## SITE PLAN REVIEW

In an effort to accommodate the fast development pace of the nature of this project, the project will be developed under the guidelines of the Broken Arrow Expedited Permit Program, allowing construction to start in a phased program, prior to the site plan and a final plat being completely approved.

## PLATTING REQUIREMENTS

In an effort to accommodate the fast development pace of the nature of this project, the project will be developed under the guidelines of the Broken Arrow Expedited Permit Program, allowing construction to start in a phased program, prior to the site plan and a final plat being completely approved.


COOK \& ASSOCIATES ENGINEERING INC. - Engineering - Surveying - Geotechnical - Construction Management - 918-258-9442 Office 18-258-9488 Fax Certificate of Authonzation \#4479
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# City of Broken Arrow 

## Request for Action

File \#: 19-650, Version: 1

Broken Arrow Planning Commission<br>06-13-2019

To:
Chairman and Commission Members
Development Services Department
Title:
Public hearing, consideration, and possible action regarding BAZ-2029, Doyle Rezoning, 5.10 acres, A-RE to RE, one-third mile north of New Orleans Street ( $\mathbf{1 0 1}^{\text {st }}$ Street), one-quarter mile west of $\mathbf{2 3}^{\text {rd }}$ Street ( $193{ }^{\text {rd }}$ E. Avenue/County Line Road)

## Background:

| Applicant: | Cathleen Doyle |
| :--- | :--- |
| Owner: | Cathleen Doyle |
| Developer: | NA |
| Engineer: | NA |
| Location: | One-third mile north of New Orleans Street (101st Street), one-quarter mile west of 23rd |
|  | Street (193rd E. Avenue/County Line Road) |
| Size of Tract | 5.10 acres |
| Number of Lots: | 2 |
| Present Zoning: | A-RE |
| Proposed Zoning: | RE |
| Comp Plan: | Level 1 (Rural Residential) |

BAZ-2029 is a request to change the zoning designation on 5.10-acres from A-RE (Annexed-Residential Estate) to RE (Residential Estate). The unplatted property is located one-third mile north of New Orleans Street ( $101^{\text {st }}$ Street), one-quarter mile west of $23^{\text {rd }}$ Street ( $193^{\text {rd }}$ E. Avenue/County Line Road).

Applicant is proposing to sell a two-acre portion of the property associated with BAZ-2029 and has submitted a lot split (BAL-2053) and lot consolidation (BAL-2054CB) request in conjunction with the rezoning request. The property currently consists of two, 2.55 -acre lots. With the lot split, 0.55 -acre will be split from the south parcel, and then consolidated with the north parcel resulting in a 3.1-acre parcel and a 2.0 -acre lot.

The property was assigned A-RE when it was annexed into the City of Broken Arrow in 2000. In the RE district, the minimum lot size is 24,000 square feet and the minimum lot frontage is 175 feet. The current lots and the resulting lots meet the minimum lot size and lot frontage requirements in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance for the RE district. As part of the lot split process, right-of-way and utility easements will need to be dedicated along the street frontages in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations for the entire 5.10 acres. Three other properties within the neighborhood have been rezoned from A-RE to RE between 2007 and 2016.

File \#: 19-650, Version: 1

Surrounding land uses and zoning classifications include the following:

| North: | A-RE | Large lot single-family residential |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| East: | A-RE and RE | Large lot single-family residential |
| South: | A-RE | Large lot single-family residential |
| West: | A-RE | Large lot single-family residential |

The Future Development Guide of the Comprehensive Plan shows the site to be designated as a Level 1. The RE zoning being requested is considered to be in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan in Level 1.

## Attachments: Case map

Aerial photo
Exhibit - Existing lots

## Recommendation:

Based on the Comprehensive Plan, the location of the property, and the surrounding land uses, Staff recommends that BAZ-2029 be approved and that platting be waived, subject to the following condition of approval.

1. A 17.5 -foot utility easement shall be recorded in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations along the E. $96^{\text {th }}$ Street, S. 20 Street, and E. $97^{\text {th }}$ Street frontages of the parcels prior to the warranty deeds being stamped.

## Reviewed and approved by: Larry R. Curtis

JMW
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LOCATION MAP

## EXHIBIT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION (AS PROVIDED)
A TRACT DESCRIBED AS BEGINNING AT A POINT 754.94 FEET WEST AND 354.59 FEET SOUTH OF THE NE CORNER OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION 24, T18N, R14E OF THE I.B.\&M., ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF; THENCE WEST 364.97 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 304.76 FEET; THENCE EAST 364.98 FEET; THENCE NORTH 304.70 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 2.553 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

AND
A TRACT DESCRIBED AS BEGINNING AT A POINT 354.59 FEET NORTH AND 754.09 WEST OF THE SE CORNER OF THE NE/4 OF THE SE/4 OF SECTION 24, T18N, R14E OF THE I.B\&M., ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF; THENCE NORTH 304.69 FEET; THENCE WEST 364.98 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 304.74 FEET; THENCE EAST 364.99 FEET; TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, CONTAINING 2.553 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.


