

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
116 WEST NEEDLES
BIXBY, OKLAHOMA
January 23, 2014 6:00 PM**

SPECIAL-CALLED MEETING

In accordance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, Title 25 O.S. Section 311, the agenda for this meeting was posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of City Hall, 116 W. Needles Ave., Bixby, Oklahoma on the date and time as posted thereon, a copy of which is on file and available for public inspection, which date and time was at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting, excluding Saturdays and Sundays and holidays legally declared by the State of Oklahoma.

STAFF PRESENT:

Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner
Patrick Boulden, Esq., City Attorney

OTHERS ATTENDING:

See attached Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Thomas Holland called the meeting to order at 6:01 PM.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Larry Whiteley, John Benjamin, and Thomas Holland.
Members Absent: Jeff Baldwin and Lance Whisman.

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Approval of Minutes for the November 18, 2013 Regular Meeting
-

Chair Thomas Holland introduced the Consent Agenda item and asked to entertain a Motion. John Benjamin made a MOTION to APPROVE the Minutes of the November 18, 2013 Regular Meeting as presented by Staff. Larry Whiteley SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Holland, Whiteley, and Benjamin
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
MOTION PASSED: 3:0:0

2. Approval of Minutes for the December 16, 2013 Regular Meeting

Chair Thomas Holland introduced the Consent Agenda item and asked to entertain a Motion. Larry Whiteley made a MOTION to APPROVE the Minutes of the December 16, 2013 Regular Meeting as presented by Staff. John Benjamin SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Holland, Whiteley, and Benjamin
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
MOTION PASSED: 3:0:0

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PLATS

3. **Preliminary Plat – “Quail Creek Office Park” – Tanner Consulting, LLC.** Discussion and consideration of a Preliminary Plat and certain Modifications/Waivers for “Quail Creek Office Park” for approximately 5.976 acres in part of the E/2 of Section 02, T17N, R13E. **Property Located:** South and west of the intersection of 121st St. S. and Memorial Dr.
-

Chair Thomas Holland introduced the item and asked Erik Enyart for the Staff Report and recommendation. Mr. Enyart summarized the Staff Report as follows:

To: Bixby Planning Commission
From: Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner
Date: Thursday, January 02, 2014
RE: Report and Recommendations for:
Preliminary Plat of “Quail Creek Office Park” (PUD 76)

LOCATION: – The 7300-block of E. 121st St. S.
– South and west of the intersection of 121st St. S. and Memorial Dr.
– Part of the E/2 of Section 02, T17N, R13E
SIZE: – 5.976 acres, more or less (plat area)
– 70 acres, more or less (parent tract)

EXISTING ZONING: CG General Commercial District with PUD 76

EXISTING USE: Agricultural

REQUEST: Preliminary Plat approval for a 1 Lot, 1 Block commercial development

SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USE:

North: CG/PUD 76; Vacant lots in Scenic Village Park.

South: AG & CS/PUD 37; Fry Creek Ditch # 1 to the south zoned AG and the Crosscreek “office/warehouse” heavy commercial / trade center and retail strip center zoned CS with PUD 37.

East: AG, CG, RS-3, OL, CS, & RM-3/PUD 70; Agricultural land, the Easton Sod sales lot zoned RS-3, OL, & CS, the Encore on Memorial upscale apartment complex zoned RM-3/PUD 70, a Pizza Hut zoned CG, and a My Dentist Dental Clinic zoned CS; Memorial Dr. is further to the east.

West: AG & RS-4; Fry Creek Ditch #2; beyond this to the west is vacant/wooded land owned by the City of Bixby, and an RS-4 district containing the Seven Lakes I and Seven Lakes II residential subdivisions, and additional vacant land for a future “Seven Lakes” phase or phases.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Corridor + Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land.

PREVIOUS/RELATED CASES:

BBOA-367 – Holley Hair for Charles Roger Knopp – Request for Special Exception approval to allow a Use Unit 20 “golf teaching and practice facility” on part of the subject property parent tract – BOA Conditionally Approved 04/02/2001 (not since built).

BBOA-442 – Charles Roger Knopp – Request for Special Exception approval to allow a Use Unit 20 golf driving range (evidently same as BBOA-367) on part of the subject property parent tract. Approval of BBOA-367 expired after 3 years, per the Staff Report, and so required re-approval – BOA Approved 05/01/2006 (not since built).

BL-340 – JR Donelson for Charles Roger Knopp Revocable Trust – Request for Lot-Split approval to separate a 41.3384-acre tract from the southern end of the large 140-acre acreage tracts previously owned by Knopp, which includes subject property – It appears it was Administratively Approved by the City Planner on 07/20/2006, but the Assessor’s parcel records do not reflect that the land was ever since divided as approved.

PUD 70 & BZ-347 / PUD 70 (Amended) & BZ-347 (Amended) – Encore on Memorial – Khoury Engineering, Inc. – Request to rezone from AG to RM-3 and approve PUD 70 for a multifamily development on part of subject property – PC Continued the application on 12/21/2009 at the Applicant’s request. PC action 01/19/2010: A Motion to Recommend Approval failed by a vote of two (2) in favor and two (2) opposed, and no followup Motion was made nor followup vote held. The City Council Continued the application on 02/08/2010 to the 02/22/2010 regular meeting “for more research and information,” based on indications by the developer about the possibility of finding another site for the development. Before the 02/22/2010 City Council Meeting, the Applicant temporarily withdrew the applications, and the item was removed from the meeting agenda, with the understanding that the applications were going to be amended and resubmitted.

The Amended applications, including the new development site, were submitted 03/11/2010. PC action 04/19/2010 on the Amended Applications: Recommended Conditional Approval by unanimous vote. City Council action 05/10/2010 on the Amended Applications: Entertained the ordinance Second Reading and approved the PUD and rezoning, with the direction to bring an ordinance back to the Council with an Emergency Clause attachment, in order to incorporate the recommended Conditions of Approval. City Council approved both amended applications with the Conditions of Approval written into the approving Ordinance # 2036 on 05/24/2010.

PUD 76 “Scenic Village Park” & BZ-364 – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for rezoning from AG to CG and PUD approval for former parent tract subject property of 92 acres – PC recommended Approval 02/27/2013 and City Council Conditionally Approved 03/25/2013 as amended at the meeting (Ord. # 2116).

Preliminary Plat of “Scenic Village Park” – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plat and a Modification/Waiver from certain right-of-way and roadway paving width standards of Subdivision Regulations Ordinance # 854 Section 9.2.2 for former parent tract subject property of 92 acres – PC recommended Conditional Approval 02/27/2013 and City Council Conditionally Approved 03/25/2013.

Final Plat of “Scenic Village Park” – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of a Final Plat for a northerly approximately 22 acres (PUD 76 Development Areas A, B, and E) of the former parent tract subject property of 92 acres – PC recommended Conditional Approval 05/20/2013 and City Council Conditionally Approved 05/28/2013 (Plat # 6477 recorded 06/20/2013).

PUD 76 “Scenic Village Park” Major Amendment # 1 – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of Major Amendment # 1 to PUD 76 for subject property parent tract of 70 acres – PC recommended Conditional Approval 09/30/2013. City Council Conditionally Approved the application and held an Ordinance First Reading 10/14/2013. The Emergency Clause to approving Ordinance # 2123, having been on various City Council agendas in various forms since 10/14/2013, the City Council approved on 11/12/2013.

PUD 76 “Scenic Village Park” Major Amendment # 2 – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of Major Amendment # 2 to PUD 76 for subject property parent tract of 70 acres – PC Tabled Indefinitely on 10/21/2013 as requested by Applicant’s letter dated 10/18/2013.

Preliminary Plat of "Quail Creek of Bixby" – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plat for part of parent tract subject property of 70 acres – PC recommended Conditional Approval 12/16/2013.

Preliminary Plat of "Quail Creek Villas of Bixby" – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plat for part of parent tract subject property of 70 acres – PC recommended Conditional Approval 12/16/2013.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

ANALYSIS:

Property Conditions. The parent tract subject property of 70 acres is relatively flat and appears to drain, if only slightly, to the south and west. The development will be planned to drain to the south and west to the Fry Creek Ditch # 2 and # 1, respectively, using stormsewers and paying a fee-in-lieu of providing onsite stormwater detention. It is zoned CG and PUD 76 for "Scenic Village Park," which name became attached to the plat of 22 acres to the north of the subject property, recorded June 20, 2013.

The subject property appears to be able to be served by the critical utilities (water, sewer, electric, etc.) by existing lines and/or planned street and utility extensions and has immediate access to the stormwater drainage capacity in the Fry Creek Ditches abutting to the west and south.

The subject property plat area contains 5.976 acres and is situated between Scenic Village Park to the north and west and the proposed plat of "Quail Creek Villas of Bixby" to the south.

Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as (1) Corridor and (2) Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land.

The commercial development anticipated by this plat would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

General. This subdivision of 5.976 acres proposes one (1) Lot, one (1) Block, and no (0) Reserve Areas. The lot would have 550' of frontage on the proposed 74th E. Ave. collector road and an average depth of 473.295', and appears to meet PUD 76 Development Area F standards.

With the exceptions outlined in this report, the Preliminary Plat appears to conform to the Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations.

The Fire Marshal's, City Engineer's, and City Attorney's review correspondence are attached to this Staff Report (if received). Their comments are incorporated herein by reference and should be made conditions of approval where not satisfied at the time of approval.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) discussed this application at its regular meeting held January 02, 2014. Minutes of that meeting are attached to this report.

Access and Internal Circulation. Primary access to the development would be via a proposed collector street connecting 121st St. S. to Memorial Dr. via the existing 126th St. S. constructed in the past couple years. By this collector road, all the Development Areas within PUD 76 would have access. On November 25, 2013, the City Council accepted a dedication of right-of-way from the Knopp family, allowing the extension of 126th St. S. from its current westerly terminus to the easterly lines of the proposed "Quail Creek of Bixby" and "Quail Creek Villas of Bixby." "Quail Creek of Bixby" would dedicate the connection between this newly-dedicated right-of-way and 74th E. Ave. platted with Scenic Village Park, thus completing the collector system. The subject property plat area would then have access on 74th E. Ave.

With the Preliminary Plat of "Scenic Village Park," on March 25, 2013, the City Council Approved a Modification/Waiver of the Commercial Collector 42' paving width requirement of Subdivision Regulations Ordinance # 854 Section 9.2.2, to allow a 38'-wide roadway width as proposed. Per the City Engineer's review memo at that time, turning lanes should be added at certain intersections and turning points, which should serve to ameliorate traffic congestion and so justify the Modification/Waiver.

Per the recorded plat of Scenic Village Park, the 74th E. Ave. is proposed to intersect with 121st St. S. at the location where there is an existing curb cut/driveway entrance constructed when 121st St. S. was widened. To the west of this, 73rd E. Ave., which serves Fox Hollow and the North Heights Addition, will be extended south of 121st St. S. and continue with the 73rd E. Ave. name. South 73rd and South 74th East Avenues will be connected via 121st Pl. S. Minor streets 73rd E. Ave. and 121st Pl. S. would incidentally serve the commercial lots in Development Area (DA) A, but would primarily serve an assisted living community in DA B. Their geometries (50' in right-of-way width and 26' of roadway paving width, versus the required 60' and 36', respectively) also received City Council approval of a Modification/Waiver with the Preliminary Plat on March 25, 2013.

Per the approved PUD 76 Major Amendment # 1, the 74th E. Ave. portion of the 74th E. Ave. / 126th St. S. collector road was shifted easterly, to accommodate more room for the single-family detached residential area west of the collector road system (“Quail Creek of Bixby”). No significant changes to access and circulation patterns were proposed, except to the extent necessary to allow conventional housing addition(s) to be developed in certain areas. The “Quail Creek of Bixby” and “Quail Creek Villas of Bixby” subdivisions will tie into the realigned collector street system.

The proposed access points to 121st St. S. require City Engineer and/or County Engineer curb cut approval, and the Fire Marshal’s approval in terms of locations, spacing, widths, and curb return radii.

The plat proposes a 26’-wide Mutual Access Easement (MAE) to allow cross-access between future lots if divided by Lot-Split or replat.

Staff Recommendation. Staff recommends Approval of the Preliminary Plat subject to the following corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval:

1. Subject to the satisfaction of all outstanding Fire Marshal, City Engineer, and/or City Attorney recommendations.
2. Subject to a Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-3.A for utility easements along the north and south perimeters which would not achieve the 17.5’ minimum width standard. Such request may be justified by observing that where an 11’ U/E will be back to back with a 17.5’ U/E in an abutting subdivision, resulting in a 28.5’-wide U/E corridor between the subdivisions. A 22’-wide ultimate width utility corridor is fairly standard in the greater Tulsa area. Other justifications may be offered and deemed adequate.
3. Subject to a Modification/Waiver from Subdivision Regulations Section 12-3-2.C to provide no stub-out streets to unplatted tracts abutting to the east. The Modification/Waiver may be justified by the fact that the concerned abutting tracts (Ramsey Trust and the Easton Sod Farm property) will likely develop commercial/nonresidential, and both have adequate access available from 121st St. S. and / or Memorial Dr.
4. All Modification/Waiver requests must be submitted in writing.
5. Title Block area – the “Minor Amendment 1” text is inaccurate and should be removed.
6. Per SRs Section 12-4-2.A.5, a Location Map is required and must include all platted additions within the Section; the following need to be corrected as follows:
 - a. LaCasa Movil Estates 2nd (mis-labeled)
 - b. Poe Acreage (misrepresented as to configuration)
 - c. Seven Lakes II (misrepresented as to configuration)
 - d. The Fry Creek Ditch # 1 and # 2 are represented but do not reflect channel reconstructions from circa 2000.
 - e. “Quail Creek of Bixby,” “Quail Creek Villas of Bixby,” “Seven Lakes III,” “Seven Lakes IV,” and/or “Wood Hollow Estates” should be added if recorded prior to this plat; it should be noted that “Quail Creek of Bixby” gives public street access to the subdivision so likely must be included, at a minimum.
7. An address for the lot may be added, but if to be replatted or if multiple buildings are anticipated for this “office park,” please advise, and this review comment may be dismissed.
8. Preliminary Plat: Elevation contours at one (1) foot maximum intervals not represented as required per SRs Section 12-4-2.B.6.
9. DoD/RCs Section II.A: Other Bulk and Area Requirements: cites “CS” district instead of “CG” as per the approved PUD.
10. DoD/RCs Section II.B.5: Mutual Access Easement language added to PUD provisions. These should be in Section I or a new section as appropriate.
11. DoD/RCs Section II.B.9: Language attending reference to DA H should use the new language per Major Amendment # 1.
12. DoD/RCs Owners’ Block: 2013 year should likely be changed to 2014.
13. Certificate of Survey: Inaccurate self-reference as “Scenic Village Park.”
14. In satisfaction of the City Council’s approval conditions of both the Preliminary Plat and Final Plat of “Scenic Village Park,” and PUD 76 Major Amendment # 1, copies of the Preliminary Plat of Scenic Village Park, including all recommended corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval, shall be submitted for placement in the permanent file (1 full size and 1 11” X 17”).

15. *A copy of the Preliminary Plat, including all recommended corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval, shall be submitted for placement in the permanent file.*

Chair Thomas Holland referenced the following paragraph from the Access and Internal Circulation section of the Staff Report,

“With the Preliminary Plat of “Scenic Village Park,” on March 25, 2013, the City Council Approved a Modification/Waiver of the Commercial Collector 42’ paving width requirement of Subdivision Regulations Ordinance # 854 Section 9.2.2, to allow a 38’-wide roadway width as proposed. Per the City Engineer’s review memo at that time, turning lanes should be added at certain intersections and turning points, which should serve to ameliorate traffic congestion and so justify the Modification/Waiver.”

and asked what had happened to the proposed turning lanes. Justin Morgan of *Tanner Consulting, LLC*, stated that they would be reflected on the Site Plans. Mr. Holland indicated agreement. Erik Enyart stated that, perhaps not in this report but in another related to this [PUD 76], he had pointed out that, since the [City] Council had approved the Modification/Waiver, the development had taken more of a low-density, single-family residential character, with single family residential composing ½ or perhaps more of the overall development. Mr. Morgan indicated agreement.

There being no further discussion, Chair Thomas Holland asked to entertain a Motion. Larry Whiteley made a MOTION to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of the Preliminary Plat of “Quail Creek Office Park” with the corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval as recommended by Staff. John Benjamin SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Holland, Whiteley, and Benjamin
NAY: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
MOTION PASSED: 3:0:0

OTHER BUSINESS

4. **BSP 2013-06 – “Covenant Place of Tulsa” – Tanner Consulting, LLC (PUD 76).**
Discussion and possible action to approve a PUD Detailed Site Plan and building plans for “Covenant Place of Bixby,” a Use Unit 8 assisted living facility development for approximately 11.636 acres consisting of Lot 2, Block 1, *Scenic Village Park*.
Property Located: 7300 E. 121st Pl. S.

Chair Thomas Holland introduced the item and asked Erik Enyart for the Staff Report and recommendation. Mr. Enyart summarized the Staff Report as follows:

To: *Bixby Planning Commission*
From: *Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner*
Date: *Wednesday, January 08, 2014*
RE: *Report and Recommendations for:
BSP 2013-06 – “Covenant Place of Tulsa” – Tanner Consulting, LLC (PUD 76)*

LOCATION: – 7300 E. 121st Pl. S.
– Lot 2, Block 1, Scenic Village Park

SIZE: 11.636 acres, more or less

EXISTING ZONING: CG General Commercial District with PUD 76

SUPPLEMENTAL ZONING: PUD 76 for “Scenic Village Park”

DEVELOPMENT TYPE: Approval of Detailed Site Plan including as elements: (1) Detailed Site Plan, (2) Detailed Landscape Plan, and (3) Detailed Lighting Plan, (4) Detailed Sign Plan, and (5) building plans and profile view / elevations pursuant to PUD 76 for a Use Unit 8 assisted living facility development

SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USE:

North: CG/PUD 76 and (across 121st St. S.) RS-3, RS-1, AG, & OL/CS/PUD 51; Agricultural land for commercial development including Lot 1, Block 1 and Lot 1, Block 2, Scenic Village Park, and across 121st St. S., the Fox Hollow and North Heights Addition residential subdivisions; the Fry Creek Ditch # 2 and the North Elementary and North 5th & 6th Grade Center school campuses to the northwest zoned AG; agricultural land to the northeast zoned OL/CS/PUD 51.

South: CG/PUD 76; Agricultural land proposed for single-family residential (“Quail Creek of Bixby” and “Quail Creek Villas of Bixby”) and commercial (“Quail Creek Office Park”) development per PUD 76.

East: CG/PUD 76, AG, RS-3, OL, & CS; Agricultural land for commercial development including Lot 1, Block 3, Scenic Village Park, proposed Lot 1, Block 1, “Quail Creek Office Park,” and a 1.6-acre tract recently rezoned to CS at the 7700-block of E. 121st St. S. (possibly previously addressed 7600 E. 121st St. S.); the Easton Sod sales lot is further east and is zoned RS-3, OL, & CS.

West: AG & RS-4; Fry Creek Ditch #2; beyond this to the west is vacant/wooded land owned by the City of Bixby, the Three Oaks Smoke Shop located on a 2-acre tract at 7060 E. 121st St. S., and additional vacant land zoned RS-4 for a future “Seven Lakes” phase or phases.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Corridor + Vacant, Agricultural, Rural Residences, and Open Land.

PREVIOUS/RELATED CASES: (Not necessarily a complete list)

BBOA-367 – Holley Hair for Charles Roger Knopp – Request for Special Exception approval to allow a Use Unit 20 “golf teaching and practice facility” on part of the subject property parent tract – BOA Conditionally Approved 04/02/2001 (not since built).

BBOA-442 – Charles Roger Knopp – Request for Special Exception approval to allow a Use Unit 20 golf driving range (evidently same as BBOA-367) on part of the subject property parent tract. Approval of BBOA-367 expired after 3 years, per the Staff Report, and so required re-approval – BOA Approved 05/01/2006 (not since built).

BL-340 – JR Donelson for Charles Roger Knopp Revocable Trust – Request for Lot-Split approval to separate a 41.3384-acre tract from the southern end of the large 140-acre acreage tracts previously owned by Knopp, which includes subject property – It appears it was Administratively Approved by the City Planner on 07/20/2006, but the Assessor’s parcel records do not reflect that the land was ever since divided as approved.

PUD 70 & BZ-347 / PUD 70 (Amended) & BZ-347 (Amended) – Encore on Memorial – Khoury Engineering, Inc. – Request to rezone from AG to RM-3 and approve PUD 70 for a multifamily development on part of subject property – PC Continued the application on 12/21/2009 at the Applicant’s request. PC action 01/19/2010: A Motion to Recommend Approval failed by a vote of two (2) in favor and two (2) opposed, and no followup Motion was made nor followup vote held. The City Council Continued the application on 02/08/2010 to the 02/22/2010 regular meeting “for more research and information,” based on indications by the developer about the possibility of finding another site for the development. Before the 02/22/2010 City Council Meeting, the Applicant temporarily withdrew the applications, and the item was removed from the meeting agenda, with the understanding that the applications were going to be amended and resubmitted.

The Amended applications, including the new development site, were submitted 03/11/2010. PC action 04/19/2010 on the Amended Applications: Recommended Conditional Approval by unanimous vote. City Council action 05/10/2010 on the Amended Applications: Entertained the ordinance

Second Reading and approved the PUD and rezoning, with the direction to bring an ordinance back to the Council with an Emergency Clause attachment, in order to incorporate the recommended Conditions of Approval. City Council approved both amended applications with the Conditions of Approval written into the approving Ordinance # 2036 on 05/24/2010.

PUD 76 "Scenic Village Park" & BZ-364 – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for rezoning from AG to CG and PUD approval for former parent tract subject property of 92 acres – PC recommended Approval 02/27/2013 and City Council Conditionally Approved 03/25/2013 as amended at the meeting (Ord. # 2116).

Preliminary Plat of "Scenic Village Park" – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of a Preliminary Plat and a Modification/Waiver from certain right-of-way and roadway paving width standards of Subdivision Regulations Ordinance # 854 Section 9.2.2 for former parent tract subject property of 92 acres – PC recommended Conditional Approval 02/27/2013 and City Council Conditionally Approved 03/25/2013.

Final Plat of "Scenic Village Park" – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for approval of a Final Plat for a northerly approximately 22 acres (PUD 76 Development Areas A, B, and E) of the former parent tract subject property of 92 acres – PC recommended Conditional Approval 05/20/2013 and City Council Conditionally Approved 05/28/2013 (Plat # 6477 recorded 06/20/2013).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

ANALYSIS:

Property Conditions. The subject property is a rectangular lot containing 11.636 acres. It is zoned CG and is located within Development Area B of PUD 76 "Scenic Village Park." It has a little more than 300' of frontage on 121st Pl. S. and a little more than 800' of frontage on collector road 74th E. Ave., both of which streets are, or are soon to be under construction.

The subject property is relatively flat and appears to drain, if only slightly, to the south and west. The development will be planned to drain to the west to the Fry Creek Ditch # 2 using stormsewers and paying a fee-in-lieu of providing onsite stormwater detention. It is zoned CG and PUD 76 for "Scenic Village Park," which name became attached to the plat of 22 acres recorded June 20, 2013. The southerly 70-acre balance of PUD 76 is being proposed for other development under different names.

The subject property appears to be able to be served by the critical utilities (water, sewer, electric, etc.) by existing lines and/or planned street and utility extensions and has immediate access to the stormwater drainage capacity in Fry Creek Ditch # 2 abutting to the west.

General. The Detailed Site Plan represents a suburban-style design and indicates the proposed internal automobile traffic and pedestrian flow and circulation and parking. The subject property lot conforms to PUD 76 and, per the plans generally, the [2]-story building would conform to the applicable bulk and area standards for PUD 76 and the underlying CG district, except as outlined in this report.

The submitted plan-view Site Plan drawing consists of "Detail Site Plan" drawing SD02 by Tanner Consulting, LLC. It does not represent the entire lot of record, as required by the Site Plan application, so the Applicant has submitted a rescaled version on January 03, 2014 in satisfaction of this requirement. PUD 76 allows a maximum of 160,000 square feet of floor area in this Development Area B. Proposed floor area information has not been provided. Based on the building elevations drawings (A1.10, A2.01, A2.02, A2.03, A2.06, and A2.07), the main building complex will contain two (2) stories throughout, except the "Village Center" projecting southeasterly from the east-west trunk, and possibly except a third story above the entrance, but this may be a cupola (with clerestory lighting?), an "architectural projection" allowed by PUD 76, not to exceed 25' above the second story. The projection is not labeled, and floor plans have not been provided. A third story would be disallowed by PUD 76, and if an architectural projection, its height above the second story must be dimensioned to demonstrate compliance with the 25' height maximum. In pre-application meetings with the Applicant and developer's architect, a small basement/storm shelter has been discussed, but this is not indicated on the plans. The main complex building would have 19' 9" to the truss supporting the pitched roof. Staff was not able to locate total height or roof pitch information. The building segments are identified on the elevations drawings as "ILU Wing," "V.C. & ALU Wing," and "Village Center," etc., with attendant codes such as "Q20," "H20," "E15," etc., but a drawing has not been provided to illustrate in plan-view where these different elements fall in relation to each other.

The main building complex will have (1) independent living, (2) assisted living, and (3) skilled nursing dwelling units. Zoning Code Sections 11-9-8.C.3 and .4 require that the facility must be licensed by the State of Oklahoma, which is expected. Zoning Code Section 11-9-8.C.5 provides:

“5. Elderly/Retirement Housing: Design requirements for elderly/retirement housing include as a minimum: a) elevators for multi-family structures other than townhouses over one story in height; b) emergency alarm systems in every dwelling unit; and c) safety "grab bars" in bathrooms.”

The latter two (b and c) are expected, but the Applicant should advise if otherwise. The former, elevators for this two (2) story structure, should be confirmed by the Applicant. The provided plans do not indicate elevators.

Besides the main building complex, two (2) multi-bay detached garage structures are proposed along the westerly side of the development. The site plan also indicates two (2) future wings to project southerly from the “Village Center” stub.

Fire Marshal’s and City Engineer’s memos are attached to this Staff Report (if received). Their comments are incorporated herein by reference and should be made conditions of approval where not satisfied at the time of approval.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed this application on January 02, 2014. The Minutes of the meeting are attached to this report.

Access and Internal Circulation. Per the recorded plat of Scenic Village Park, the collector road 74th E. Ave. is proposed to intersect with 121st St. S. at the location where there is an existing curb cut/driveway entrance constructed when 121st St. S. was widened. 74th E. Ave. will connect 121st St. S. to Memorial Dr. via 126th St. S. On November 25, 2013, the City Council accepted a dedication of right-of-way from the Knopp family, allowing the extension of 126th St. S. from its current westerly terminus to the easterly lines of the proposed “Quail Creek of Bixby” and “Quail Creek Villas of Bixby.” “Quail Creek of Bixby” would dedicate the connection between this newly-dedicated right-of-way and 74th E. Ave. platted with Scenic Village Park, thus completing the collector system. By this 74th E. Ave. / 126th St. S. collector road system, all the Development Areas within PUD 76 would have access.

North of 121st St. S., 73rd E. Ave. serves Fox Hollow and the North Heights Addition. It will be extended south of 121st St. S. and continue with the 73rd E. Ave. name. South 73rd and South 74th East Avenues will be connected via 121st Pl. S. Minor streets 73rd E. Ave. and 121st Pl. S. would incidentally serve the commercial lots in Development Area (DA) A, but would primarily serve the subject property in DA B. These minor street geometries (50’ in right-of-way width and 26’ of roadway paving width, versus the required 60’ and 36’, respectively) received City Council approval of a Modification/Waiver with the Preliminary Plat on March 25, 2013.

The site plan indicates the main entrance will be on 121st Pl. S., and the address will be 7300 E. 121st Pl. S. The subject property will have second driveway providing secondary access on 74th E. Ave.

With the Preliminary Plat of “Scenic Village Park,” on March 25, 2013, the City Council Approved a Modification/Waiver of the Commercial Collector 42’ paving width requirement of Subdivision Regulations Ordinance # 854 Section 9.2.2, to allow a 38’-wide roadway width as proposed. Per the City Engineer’s review memo at that time, turning lanes should be added at certain intersections and turning points, which should serve to ameliorate traffic congestion and so justify the Modification/Waiver. A turning lane is not indicated on this site plan. However, since the Modification/Waiver, the development has changed to have more of a low-intensity residential character, compared to the original commercial development proposed.

Per the approved PUD 76 Major Amendment # 1, the 74th E. Ave. portion of the 74th E. Ave. / 126th St. S. collector road system was shifted easterly, to accommodate more room for the single-family detached residential area west of the collector road system (“Quail Creek of Bixby”). No significant changes to access and circulation patterns were proposed, except to the extent necessary to allow conventional housing addition(s) to be developed in certain areas. The “Quail Creek of Bixby” and “Quail Creek Villas of Bixby” subdivisions to the south will tie into the realigned collector street system.

The proposed street intersections and driveway/street connections require City Engineer curb cut approval, and the Fire Marshal’s approval in terms of locations, spacing, widths, and curb return radii.

What appear to be sidewalks are shown along 74th E. Ave., as required by the Subdivision Regulations and PUD 76. However, they are not shaded gray, as employed elsewhere in the site plan to indicate paving [proposed at this time]. Also, the required sidewalk along 121st Pl. S. is not indicated. The sidewalk gaps matter was discussed at the pre-application meeting held October 16, 2013. The sidewalks are not labeled as such or dimensioned as to width. ADA standards call for a minimum 5’ X 5’ turnaround area every 200’, which would be applicable here along the 74th E. Ave. frontage and perhaps also along the 121st St. S. frontage. These areas are not indicated if 4’-wide sidewalks are proposed, but

the same would not be necessary if the sidewalks are uniformly 5' in width. Sidewalks are part of complete streets, providing a safe and convenient passageway for pedestrians, separate from driving lanes for automobile traffic.

Internal pedestrian accessibility will be afforded via what appear to be internal sidewalks, connecting pedestrians between parking areas and buildings entrances within the development (reference Zoning Code Section 11-10-4.C). The gray-shaded areas should be labeled as "sidewalk" and widths should be dimensioned (can be qualified as "typical" to reduce the number of labels).

An accessible path is not clear between the streetside sidewalks and the building entrance(s). These should be provided and/or described as appropriate; the same should comply with ADA standards.

PUD 76 Section III.E provides, in relevant part, "Within Development Areas B and C, pedestrian access from residential areas may be provided to the adjoining Fry Ditch." At the pre-application meeting with the Applicant on October 16, 2013, Staff observed that pedestrian access was not indicated to the existing Fry Creek maintenance access drive (gravel), and asked if, when such drive is paved as suitable for trail use, if the site was positioned to be able to connect to it, and the architect responded that this was the case with the parking lot along this westerly side. Although the gravel drive may serve as a de facto trail, the developer does not wish to connect to it at this time, for fear of encouraging residents walking on unstable surfaces.

Parking & Loading Standards. The "Detail Site Plan" drawing SD02 indicates a total of 88 off-street parking spaces. However, Staff counted 96 surface lot parking spaces and 42 garage parking spaces, for a total of 138 off-street parking spaces. This number should be corrected. By interpretation of the SD02 drawing in comparison to the elevations drawings, 28 of those garage spaces compose most of westerly side of the first floor of the westernmost north-south wing.

PUD 76 provides the following development standards for parking in DA B:

"MINIMUM OFF-STREET PARKING:

Independent Living Dwelling Units 0.75 spaces per du

Assisted Living Dwelling Units 0.50 spaces per du

Skilled Nursing Beds 0.35 spaces per bed"

Per the Site Data summary on "Detail Site Plan" drawing SD02, there will be 46 Independent Living Dwelling Units, 34 Assisted Living Dwelling Units, and 38 Skilled Nursing Beds to be built at this time. This would require a minimum of 64.8 parking spaces.

Zoning Code Section 11-10-2.H provides a "minimum plus 15%" maximum parking number cap, to prevent excessive parking that results in pressure to reduce greenspaces on the development site. The 138 parking spaces proposed would represent a 113% increase above the minimum number required, exceeding the 15% cap. However, PUD 76 Section III.D provides that the maximum can be modified by Planning Commission approval of a PUD Detailed Site Plan.

Per the Site Data summary on "Detail Site Plan" drawing SD02, the subject property is subject to a 15% minimum landscaped lot area standard. However, this is not supported by Zoning Code Section 11-71-5.F, the development standards for DA B, or the development standards for PUD 76 generally. Nonetheless, the Site Data summary on SD02 provides that 33% of the lot area will be impervious surface upon completion, leaving approximately 67% unpaved / greenspace. Per the same Site Data, 346,544 square feet of the lot will be provided landscaped area, which would be approximately 68% of the lot area. Secondly, most developments provide only the bare minimum required landscaped strip widths. The landscaping requirements of the Zoning Code call for a 10' minimum-width landscaped strip along 74th E. Ave., and a 7.5' minimum-width landscaped-strip along 121st Pl. S. The site plan demonstrates that these landscaped strips, to include landscaping trees, would be and 28' and 30' respectively, far in excess of the minimums required. Finally, although not required, the development proposes relatively wide landscaped strips along the west side (30.7' width) and south side (almost 300' in width) of the subject property. Also, it is likely that the parking is being constructed now to serve the future phases ("wings") of the main building complex. For all the reasons outlined above, most importantly the fact that the development proposes much more landscaping than is required in several instances, Staff has no objections to the 138 parking spaces as proposed by this Detailed Site Plan. Planning Commission approval of this PUD Detailed Site Plan will constitute a modification of the maximum parking space standard as allowed by PUD 76 Section III.D.

The proposed 9' X 18'/19' regular parking space dimensions comply with the minimum standards for the same per Zoning Code Section 11-10-4.B.

The eight (8) handicapped-accessible parking spaces proposed would comply with the minimum number required by ADA standards (Table 208.2 Parking Spaces / IBC Table 1106.1 Accessible Parking Spaces).

ADA guidelines require one (1) van-accessible design for the handicapped-accessible space, for up to seven (7) accessible spaces (reference New ADAAG Section 208.2.4, DOJ Section 4.1.2(5)b, and IBC/ANSI Section 1106.5). The Site Plan needs to indicate which ADA space(s) will be of van-accessible design, and the same must comply with the ADA van-accessible dimensional standards.

The regular handicapped-accessible parking spaces and access aisles are dimensioned and indicate compliance with the space width and striping standards of Zoning Code Section 11-10-4.C Figure 3.

The parking lot is subject to a 10' minimum setback from 74th E. Ave. and a 7.5' setback from 121st Pl. S. per Zoning Code Section 11-10-3.B Table 1. Dimensions provided on the plan indicate that these setbacks will be met along both streets.

The plans show an internal drive encroaching part of the 17.5' Perimeter Utility Easement along the north side of the subject property. Paving over public Utility Easements is subject to City Engineer and Public Works Director approval.

Zoning Code Section 11-9-8.D requires, for a "Life care retirement center," one (1) loading berth per 10,000 to 200,000 square feet, plus 1 per each additional 200,000 square feet of floor area. Since total square footage has not been provided, the minimum number of loading berths cannot be determined. A loading berth is not indicated, but a paving strip of un-dimensioned width is indicated connecting the southeasterly parking lot to the east side of the "Village Center." The minimum number of loading berths must be identified and/or added, and the same must meet the 10' X 30' with 14' of vertical clearance standard of Zoning Code Section 11-10-5.A.

Screening/Fencing. Neither the Zoning Code nor PUD 76 require a sight-proof screening fence for the subject property, and none are indicated as proposed.

By interpretation of drawing A2.06 together with SD02, the trash dumpster enclosure area is indicated (but not labeled) at the southeast corner of the main building complex. The appearance and details of the enclosure are represented on A2.06, and propose a CMU (Concrete Masonry Unit) structure with a "manufactured stone veneer" and metal screening for the gates. It appears to be sited and designed appropriately. There appears to be another structure behind the [trash enclosure area], but it is not identified. The filtype used for this area shared by the [trash enclosure area] and the unidentified structure is different than the rest of the [paving] areas, perhaps suggesting concrete. These unidentified elements should be labeled appropriately or included in the Legend.

Landscape Plan. The SD02 site plan includes landscaping information, and is to be recognized as the Landscape Plan, until further detailed by a third party Landscape Architect, per communication with the Applicant and the following note on the site plan:

"SEE DETAIL LANDSCAPE PLANS TO BE PREPARED BY OTHERS FOR TREE TYPES, SIZES AND EXACT LOCATIONS. TREES SHOWN HEREON ARE TO DEMONSTRATE THE NUMBER OF TREES REQUIRED TO MEET CODE. THE DETAILED LANDSCAPE PLAN TO BE PREPARED BY OTHERS SHALL ADDRESS PROXIMITY OF TREES TO PARKING SPACES."

The proposed landscaping is compared to the Zoning Code as follows:

1. 15% Street Yard Minimum Landscaped Area Standards (Section 11-12-3.A.1): Standard is not less than 15% of Street Yard area shall be landscaped. The Street Yard is the required Zoning setback, which is 25' from the 74th E. Ave. right-of-way and 20' from the 121st Pl. S. right-of-way per PUD 76. A 28' parking lot setback / landscaped strip is proposed along 74th E. Ave., and a 30' parking lot setback / landscaped strip is proposed along 121st Pl. S., to include landscaping trees in both cases. The landscaping summary information on the Site Data notes also demonstrates compliance. **This standard is met.**
2. Minimum Width Landscaped Area Strip Standards (Section 11-12-3.A.2 and 11-12-3.A.7): Standard is minimum Landscaped Area strip width shall be 10' along 74th E. Ave. and 7.5' along 121st Pl. S. The plan proposes 28' and 30' parking lot setbacks / landscaped strips, respectively, to include landscaping trees, as required. **This standard is met.**
3. 10' Buffer Strip Standard (Section 11-12-3.A.3): Standard requires a minimum 10' landscaped strip between a parking area and an R Residential Zoning District. There are no R districts abutting. **This standard is not applicable.**
4. Building Line Setback Tree Requirements (Section 11-12-3.A.4): Standard is one (1) tree per 1,000 square feet of building line setback area. PUD 76 provides a 17.5' setback along the west

boundary, an 11' setback along the south boundary, and a 20' setback along the north line (excluding the portion fronting 121st Pl. S., which setback area is a Street Yard). Tree requirement calculations are as follows:

West Boundary Setback Tree Requirements: West line @ $833.01' \times 17.5' = 14,577.675$ square feet / 1,000 = 14.6 = 15 trees. Four (4) trees are proposed in the landscaped strip along the west line. **This standard is not met.**

South Boundary Setback Tree Requirements: South line @ $(613.72' - 17.5' \text{ West Boundary Setback Area}) \times 11' = 6,558.42$ square feet / 1,000 = 6.6 = 7 trees. No (0) trees indicated along the south line. **This standard is not met.**

North Boundary Setback Tree Requirements: (Non-frontage) north line @ $(284.36' - 17.5' \text{ West Boundary Setback Area}) \times 20' = 5,337.2$ square feet / 1,000 = 5.3 = 6 trees (3/10 of a tree is not possible, and minimum numbers of required trees are not rounded-down). One (1) tree is proposed in the landscaped strip along this line. **This standard is not met.**

5. Maximum Distance Parking Space to Landscaped Area Standard (Sections 11-12-3.B.1 and 11-12-3.B.2): Standard is no parking space shall be located more than 50' from a Landscaped Area, which Landscaped Area must contain at least one (1) or two (2) trees. Notes on the site plan SD02 provide "THE DETAILED LANDSCAPE PLAN TO BE PREPARED BY OTHERS SHALL ADDRESS PROXIMITY OF TREES TO PARKING SPACES." **Compliance with this standard cannot be determined.**
6. Street Yard Tree Requirements (Section 11-12-3.C.1.a): The Street Yard is the Zoning setback along an abutting street [right-of-way], and calculations are as follows:

74th E. Ave. Street Yard Tree Requirements: The subject property has approximately 833.01' of frontage on collector road 74th E. Ave., for which PUD 76 and the CG district provide a 25' setback. $(833.01' - \text{South Boundary Setback Area of } 11') \times 25' = 20,550.25$ square feet / 1,000 = 20.6 = 21 trees in the 74th E. Ave. Street Yard. 24 trees are proposed in the greater landscaped strip area containing the 74th E. Ave. Street Yard.

121st Pl. S. Street Yard Tree Requirements: The subject property has approximately 329.36' of frontage on 121st Pl. S., for which PUD 76 provides a 20' setback. However, the Zoning Code does not allow a PUD to reduce landscaping standards by virtue of setback reductions, and the Zoning Code would otherwise require a 25' setback here. $(329.36' - 74th E. Ave. Street Yard width of } 25') \times 25' = 7,609$ square feet / 1,000 = 7.6 = 8 trees in the 121st Pl. S. Street Yard. Six (6) trees are proposed in the 121st Pl. S. Street Yard area.

Due to the 121st Pl. S. Street Yard tree deficit, **this standard is not met.**

7. Tree to Parking Space Ratio Standard (Section 11-12-3.C.2): Standard is one (1) tree per 10 parking spaces. The "Detail Site Plan" drawing SD02 indicates a total of 88 off-street parking spaces. However, Staff counted 96 surface lot parking spaces and 42 garage parking spaces, for a total of 138 off-street parking spaces. $138 / 10 = 13.8 = 14$ trees required by this standard. Excluding trees elsewhere accounted for, eight (8) trees proposed. When adding the three (3) excess trees proposed in the greater landscaped strip area containing the 111th St. S. Street Yard, 11 total are proposed. **This standard is not met.**
8. Parking Areas within 25' of Right-of-Way (Section 11-12-3.C.5.a): Standard would be met upon and as a part of compliance with the tree standard per Section 11-12-3.C.1.a.
9. Irrigation Standards (Section 11-12-3.D.2): The "Irrigation Note" on site plan drawing SD02 provides, "AN UNDERGROUND, FULLY AUTOMATIC IRRIGATION SYSTEM WILL BE PROVIDED FOR ALL LANDSCAPED AREAS. THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR WILL INSTALL THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM TO PROVIDE 100% COVERAGE TO ALL PLANTING AREAS AND TURF AREAS, INCLUDING THE STREET RIGHT-OF-WAYS. TURF AND PLANTING BEDS SHALL BE ON SEPARATE ZONES." Zoning Code Section 11-12-4.A.7 requires the submission of plans for irrigation. An irrigation plan was not submitted. **This standard is not met.**

10. Miscellaneous Standards (Sections 11-12-4.A.5, 11-12-3.C.7, 11-12-3.D, etc.): The tree planting diagram(s), reported heights and calipers of the proposed trees, the notes on the drawings, and other information indicate compliance with other miscellaneous standards, with the following exceptions:

- a. In the Site Data summary, the “Total tract landscaped area (15%)” requirement cited does not exist, and should be clarified such as follows: “Total tract landscaped area ~~(15%)~~ provided...~~76,033~~ 346,544 SF”
- b. In the Site Data summary, the number of trees required per the 1/10 tree to parking space ratio is inconsistent with the City of Bixby’s interpretation as provided herein and should be reconciled or removed.
- c. In the Site Data summary, the number of trees required in the Street [Yard] is inconsistent with the City of Bixby’s interpretation as provided herein and should be reconciled or removed.

Until the above are resolved, **this standard is not met.**

11. Lot Percentage Landscape Standard (Section 11-7I-5.F; PUDs only): Standard requires a certain minimum percentage of a non-residential lot to be landscaped open space. Development proposed is residential. **This standard is not applicable.**

Exterior Materials and Colors. The elevations drawings (A1.10, A2.01, A2.02, A2.03, A2.06, and A2.07) indicate the proposed exterior materials and overall appearance. Color information was not provided, but is not required by PUD 76. The pertinent Development Standards for PUD 76 Development Area requires:

“The exterior walls of buildings shall have a minimum masonry finish of not less than 25%, excluding windows and doors.”

The main building complex’s exterior material will primarily consist of (1) “Manufactured lap siding,” (2) various manufactured masonry siding materials, (3) “Manufactured shingle siding,” and (3) various trim materials (including “cast stone trim” cornices over the windows). The detached garage buildings appear to be similarly clad. Staff was not able to determine or locate claims as to compliance with the 25% minimum masonry standard of PUD 76.

The roof will be composed of asphalt shingles. The roof pitches have not been provided.

Outdoor Lighting. The lighting plans consists of “Site Lighting Plan” drawing ME1. It is not a photometric plan, and does not have a legend describing the different light fixtures proposed, proposed mounting height, or other particulars. What appear to be proposed [pole-mounted] lights appear typical for the proposed assisted living facility application, in terms of locations.

PUD 76 provides for lighting:

“Exterior lighting shall be limited to shielded fixtures designed to direct light downward. Lighting shall be designed so that the light producing element of the shielded fixture shall not be visible to a person standing within an adjacent residential district or residential development area.”

There are residential areas to the north, and proposed lighting should be clearly represented and described in detail. A photometric plan and the customary “cut sheets” showing actual lighting fixtures to be used, with specific mounting height information (grade to top of lighting element) should be required. The “cut sheets” must demonstrate compliance with the shielding and downward-directing standards of PUD 76. Recognizing the houses to the north, the photometric lighting plan should demonstrate that the footcandle effects of the proposed lighting will be reduced to 0.0 at all points on the north lot line, or otherwise within the north boundary of PUD 76.

Wall-mounted lights are not indicated on the lighting plan or represented on the elevations drawings. If planned, they should be incorporated into the lighting plan and represented on the elevations drawings.

Signage. A Sign Plan was not provided, but site plan drawing SD02 indicates what appears to be a ground sign at the northeast lot corner. It should be identified as such, and as to type. Based on its relative placement, it would appear to be the “Monument Sign” on drawing A2.08. A second symbol is located in the grassy area in front of the main entrance, which may be the “Directional Sign” per A2.08. It too should be identified.

PUD 76 provides the following for ground signs as applicable to the subject property:

“Within each lot, a ground sign may be located, but shall not exceed 20 feet in height and 75 square feet of display surface area.”

At approximately 5 ½' in height and 14 square feet in display surface area, the "Monument Sign" would comply with this standard.

The "Directional Sign" would be approximately 4' in height and 8.75 square feet in display surface area. Directional signs are limited to a maximum of three (3) square feet in display surface area per Zoning Code Section 11-9-21.C.3.k. If recognized as a second ground sign, it would exceed the one (1) allowed per the relevant text in PUD 76, and Zoning Code Section 11-9-21.C.8.b would otherwise restrict ground signs to arterial street frontages, which the subject property does not have. It should be reduced to not exceed the three (3) square feet maximum display surface area, or an amendment to PUD 76 may be sought to relax applicable signage restrictions.

Wall signs are not indicated on the elevations drawings. If proposed, they need to be represented, dimensioned, and must comply with applicable standards for same.

Signs reserving the ADA accessible parking spaces and directional signage painted to the pavement of the driveways (not visible from adjoining public streets) should conform to applicable standards or are otherwise exempt per Federal standards.

Staff Recommendation. *The Detailed Site Plan adequately demonstrates compliance with the Zoning Code and is in order for approval, subject to the following corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval:*

- 1. Subject to compliance with all Fire Marshal and City Engineer recommendations and requirements.*
- 2. Please provide proposed floor area to demonstrate compliance with the maximum of 160,000 square feet of floor area in this Development Area B of PUD 76.*
- 3. The highest elevation of the structure above the entrance: A third story would be disallowed by PUD 76, and if an architectural projection, its height above the second story must be dimensioned to demonstrate compliance with the 25' height maximum.*
- 4. The building segments are identified on the elevations drawings as "ILU Wing," "V.C. & ALU Wing," and "Village Center," etc., with attendant codes such as "Q20," "H20," "E15," etc., but a drawing has not been provided to illustrate in plan-view where these different elements fall in relation to each other. Please provide.*
- 5. Zoning Code Section 11-9-8.C.5 requires elevators for this two (2) story structure, but the provided plans do not indicate elevators. This should be confirmed by the Applicant.*
- 6. The lot boundaries are missing dimensions (cf. Site Plan application requirements). These may be more appropriately applied to the rescaled version showing the entire lot.*
- 7. The proposed street intersections and driveway/street connections require City Engineer curb cut approval, and the Fire Marshal's approval in terms of locations, spacing, widths, and curb return radii.*
- 8. What appear to be sidewalks are shown along 74th E. Ave., as required by the Subdivision Regulations and PUD 76. However, they are not shaded gray, as employed elsewhere in the site plan to indicate paving [proposed at this time]. Please clarify.*
- 9. The required sidewalk along 121st Pl. S. is not indicated – please add.*
- 10. Please label streetside sidewalks as such and dimension as to width.*
- 11. ADA standards call for a minimum 5' X 5' turnaround area every 200', which would be applicable here along the 74th E. Ave. frontage and perhaps along the 121st St. S. frontage. These areas are not indicated if 4'-wide sidewalks are proposed, but the same would not be necessary if the sidewalks are uniformly 5' in width. Please address as appropriate.*
- 12. Please label interior [sidewalks] as such and dimension as to width (can be qualified as "typical" to reduce number of labels).*
- 13. An accessible path is not clear between the streetside sidewalks and the building entrance(s). These should be provided and/or described as appropriate; the same should comply with ADA standards.*
- 14. The "Detail Site Plan" drawing SD02 indicates a total of 88 off-street parking spaces. However, Staff counted 96 surface parking spaces and 42 garage parking spaces, for a total of 138 off-street parking spaces. This number should be corrected.*
- 15. Planning Commission approval of this PUD Detailed Site Plan will constitute a modification of the maximum parking space standard as allowed by PUD 76 Section III.D.*
- 16. ADA guidelines require one (1) van-accessible design for the handicapped-accessible space, for up to seven (7) accessible spaces (reference New ADAAG Section 208.2.4, DOJ Section*

- 4.1.2(5)b, and IBC/ANSI Section 1106.5). The Site Plan needs to indicate which ADA space(s) will be of van-accessible design, and the same must comply with the ADA van-accessible dimensional standards.
17. The plans show an internal drive encroaching part of the 17.5' Perimeter Utility Easement along the north side of the subject property. Paving over public Utility Easements is subject to City Engineer and Public Works Director approval.
 18. The minimum number of loading berths must be identified and/or added, and the same must meet the 10' X 30' with 14' of vertical clearance standard of Zoning Code Section 11-10-5.A.
 19. Please label appropriately or include in the Legend the unidentified elements at the southeast corner of the main building complex: [trash enclosure area], structure behind/south of [trash enclosure area], and the filltype used for this area shared by the [trash enclosure area] and the unidentified structure, which is different than the rest of the [paving] areas, perhaps suggesting concrete.
 20. Please resolve the Building Line Setback Tree Requirements (Section 11-12-3.A.4) matter as described in the Landscape Plan analysis above.
 21. Please resolve the Maximum Distance Parking Space to Landscaped Area Standard (Sections 11-12-3.B.1 and 11-12-3.B.2) matter as described in the Landscape Plan analysis above.
 22. Please resolve the Street Yard Tree Requirements (Section 11-12-3.C.1.a) matter as described in the Landscape Plan analysis above.
 23. Please resolve the Tree to Parking Space Ratio Standard (Section 11-12-3.C.2) matter as described in the Landscape Plan analysis above.
 24. Please resolve the Irrigation Standards (Section 11-12-3.D.2) matter as described in the Landscape Plan analysis above.
 25. Please resolve the Miscellaneous Standards (Sections 11-12-4.A.5, 11-12-3.C.7, 11-12-3.D, etc.) matter as described in the Landscape Plan analysis above.
 26. Please provide information to demonstrate compliance with the 25% minimum masonry standard of PUD 76.
 27. In respect to the residential areas to the north, please provide a photometric plan and the customary "cut sheets" showing actual lighting fixtures to be used, with specific mounting height information (grade to top of lighting element). The "cut sheets" must demonstrate compliance with the shielding and downward-directing standards of PUD 76.
 28. Recognizing the houses to the north, the photometric lighting plan should demonstrate that the footcandle effects of the proposed lighting will be reduced to 0.0 at all points on the north lot line, or otherwise within the north boundary of PUD 76.
 29. Wall-mounted lights are not indicated on the lighting plan or represented on the elevations drawings. If planned, they should be incorporated into the lighting plan and represented on the elevations drawings.
 30. On site plan drawing SD02, please identify the symbols which appear to be the "Monument Sign" and the "Directional Sign" per A2.08.
 31. The "Directional Sign" (approximately 8.75 square feet in display surface area) should be reduced to not exceed the three (3) square feet maximum display surface area per Zoning Code Section 11-9-21.C.3.k, or an amendment to PUD 76 may be sought to relax applicable signage restrictions.
 32. Please submit complete, corrected copies of the Detailed Site Plan incorporating all of the corrections, modifications, and conditions of approval as follows: Two (2) full-size hard copies, one (1) 11" X 17" hard copy, and one (1) electronic copy (PDF preferred).
 33. Minor changes in the placement / locating individual trees or parking spaces, or other such minor site details, are approved as a part of this Detailed Site Plan, subject to administrative review and approval by the City Planner. The City Planner shall determine that the same are minor in scope and that such changes are an alternative means for compliance and do not compromise the original intent, purposes, and standards underlying the original placement as approved on this Detailed Site Plan, as amended. An appeal from the City Planner's determination that a change is not sufficiently minor in scope shall be made to the Board of Adjustment in accordance with Zoning Code Section 11-4-2.

Chair Thomas Holland expressed concern over how the agenda item was styled, wherein it included the words “approve...and building plans.” Mr. Holland indicated concern that the information provided was not a complete set of building plans. Erik Enyart responded that this was “boilerplate language probably owing to provisions in the Zoning Code.” Mr. Enyart stated that the Commission was only being asked to approve building plans “to the extent they are included in what you have,” and that they were informational elements of the overall, umbrella “PUD Detailed Site Plan,” along with the plan-view site plan, the landscape plan, signage plans, screening/fence plans, lighting plans, and elevation drawings. Justin Morgan stated that the Zoning information provided for the building included such things as height, minimum masonry requirement, and setbacks.

Chair Thomas Holland recognized Joel Erickson of Scenic Development, LLC of Kansas City. Mr. Erickson stated that he was developing the site for Covenant, a company out of Chicago, and that it would include senior living and assisted living. Mr. Erickson stated that this would be phase one (1) of a potential two (2) phases. Mr. Erickson stated that the building would include a village center, which would feature such things as a coffee shop, small banking, and fitness facilities, and that “Wing 2” would be assisted living / apartments for seniors.

Larry Whiteley asked Joel Erickson about the nature of the separation between the units, and Mr. Erickson stated that it would be “like apartments.” Mr. Whiteley asked if a sprinkler system would be employed, and Mr. Erickson responded that it would be “fully-sprinkled.” Chair Thomas Holland asked if the attic would also be protected, and if there would be fire-[rated] doors and separations, and Mr. Erickson affirmed on both accounts.

Chair Thomas Holland reiterated his concern over the Commission’s approval of building plans. Erik Enyart stated that certain building plans were elements of the umbrella PUD Detailed Site Plan, and to the extent they were included in the Detailed Site Plan, they were for the Commission’s consideration. Mr. Enyart stated that, as Justin Morgan had said, the building plans include information showing height, the percentage masonry requirement, and setbacks.

Patrick Boulden had Joel Erickson describe certain design elements of the assisted living facility.

Chair Thomas Holland noted that there was a lot of discussion in the Staff Report about missing sidewalks, and asked if this had been resolved. Erik Enyart stated that a gray shading method was employed on the site plans, evidently indicating what paving was actually proposed at this time. Justin Morgan stated that the sidewalk along 74th E. Ave. was not shaded because it was considered “existing” because it was being constructed along with the street by the developer. Mr. Enyart addressed Mr. Morgan and stated that he could think of two (2) ways to resolve this. Mr. Enyart stated that, “For Detailed Site Plan purposes, it doesn’t matter who does it, so you can show it as” you’re doing it now, or you can “call it out as ‘by developer’ or ‘by someone else.’” Mr. Morgan indicated agreement.

Chair Thomas Holland noted that there was a lot of discussion in the Staff Report about landscaping and asked, had it been “all satisfied?” Justin Morgan stated that the landscape plan was only designed to show compliance with minimum tree numbers and locations. Mr. Morgan stated that he had not previously realized that the back part of the lot, which was not being developed now, would

have to have trees as well, but that he was working to add these. Mr. Morgan estimated that 70% of the lot was being developed now. Larry Whiteley asked what would become of the other 30%, and Mr. Morgan stated that it would be “open space for now.”

Erik Enyart stated that the City of Bixby interpreted the landscaping requirement flexibly, and that the landscaping trees in the rear yard can be planted anywhere within the greater connected landscaped area, and not necessarily within the setback area. Mr. Enyart stated that this meant the trees could be planted closer to the building campus, which should save on irrigation. Joel Erickson clarified with Mr. Enyart and Justin Morgan that irrigation would be required.

Chair Thomas Holland stated that, within the TAC Minutes and notes, he had observed that the a fire lane was not proposed along the south, and that the [building] sprinklers requirement was already a requirement. Justin Morgan or Joel Erickson indicated this was correct. Mr. Holland stated, “I’m not sure what the trade-off is.” Mr. Holland, Mr. Morgan, and Mr. Erickson discussed standpipes and Fire Department Connection (FDC) locations proposed for the building in satisfaction of Fire Code standards. Mr. Morgan approached the dais and indicated the locations of these features. Mr. Holland indicated agreement.

Chair Thomas Holland asked if there were no plans to have the south drive connect [to 74th E. Ave.] even after Phase 2 was constructed, and Justin Morgan responded that there were not. Mr. Morgan stated that there had been some previous discussion about permeable pavement, but that ultimately, the first phase was seen as apartment construction, and that some or another building element would be constructed to a “full 13 system.”

Chair Thomas Holland asked, “If and when there is a second phase, will we see this again?” Erik Enyart responded, “We’ll have to review a brand new site plan, yes.”

Chair Thomas Holland reiterated his concern over the Commission approving “building plans,” and Erik Enyart reiterated his response that it was only within the context of the “umbrella” site plan.

In response to a question, Joel Erickson stated that he had been in on a two (2) hour phone call with the City Staff, and that “it’s all good.”

Erik Enyart confirmed with Justin Morgan that there were no recommended corrections, modifications, or Conditions of Approval that would be problematic to him.

Chair Thomas Holland asked to entertain a Motion. John Benjamin made a MOTION to APPROVE BSP 2013-06 subject to the corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval as recommended by Staff. Larry Whiteley SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE:	Holland, Whiteley, and Benjamin
NAY:	None.
ABSTAIN:	None.
MOTION PASSED:	3:0:0

OLD BUSINESS:

Chair Thomas Holland asked if there was any Old Business to consider. Erik Enyart stated that he had none. No action taken.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chair Thomas Holland asked if there was any New Business to consider. Erik Enyart stated that he had none. No action taken.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chair Thomas Holland declared the meeting Adjourned at 6:30 PM.

APPROVED BY:

Chair

Date

City Planner/Recording Secretary