

**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
116 WEST NEEDLES  
BIXBY, OKLAHOMA  
August 15, 2011                      6:00 PM**

**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 6:03 PM.

**ROLL CALL:**

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

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

1. Approval of Minutes for the June 20, 2011 Regular Meeting
2. Approval of Minutes for the June 30, 2011 Special-Called Meeting
3. Approval of Minutes for the July 18, 2011 Regular Meeting (Record of No Meeting)

---

Chair Thomas Holland introduced Consent Agenda Items numbered 1, 2, and 3. Larry Whiteley made a MOTION to APPROVE Consent Agenda Items numbered 1, 2, and 3, the Minutes as presented by Staff. John Benjamin SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

**ROLL CALL:**

AYE: Whiteley, Holland, Benjamin, & Whisman  
NAY: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
MOTION CARRIED: 4:0:0

4. Case # AC-11-07-01. Discussion and possible action to approve a replacement wall sign for “Angie’s Salon” at 13330 S. Memorial Dr. Ste. 11 in the “Riverbend Shoppes” shopping center, Lots 1, 2, & 3, Block 1, *Riverbend Commercial Center Amended*.
5. Case # AC-11-07-02. Discussion and possible action to approve a wall sign for “Zoller Designs & Antiques” at 8222 E. 103<sup>rd</sup> St. S., Suite 100 in the *The Palazzo* shopping center, part of Tract A, *101 South Memorial Center*.

6. Case # AC-11-08-01. Discussion and possible action to approve a replacement ground sign for *South Park Self Storage* at 10901 S. Memorial Dr. in the “South Park Shopping Center,” part of the W/2 of the SW/4 Section 25, T18N, R13E.
7. Case # AC-11-08-02. Discussion and possible action to approve a wall sign for “Outdoor Living Spaces” at 10462 S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. # 106, 107, & 108, Lot 7, Block 1, *Regal Plaza*.
8. Case # AC-11-08-03. Discussion and possible action to approve a wall sign for “Yummy Asia” at 10903 S. Memorial Dr. in the “South Park Shopping Center,” part of the W/2 of the SW/4 Section 25, T18N, R13E.

Chair Thomas Holland introduced Consent Agenda Items numbered 4 through 8, inclusive, and asked Erik Enyart if they were like similar such cases where they had already been approved. Mr. Enyart confirmed and stated that, in all of these cases, Staff had reviewed and approved the sign permits, finding that the signage conformed to the Zoning Code requirements. Mr. Enyart requested ratification of the approval given.

Larry Whiteley made a MOTION to APPROVE Consent Agenda Items numbered 4 through 8, inclusive. Lance Whisman SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE:	Whiteley, Holland, Benjamin, & Whisman
NAY:	None.
ABSTAIN:	None.
MOTION CARRIED:	4:0:0

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

PLATS

None.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. **AC-11-08-04 – “Kirkendall Design, LLC” – g.kesler | Residential Design.** Discussion and consideration of a Detailed Site Plan and building plans for “Kirkendall Design, LLC,” a Use Unit 11 office development for the E. 100’ of the W. 648’ of the N. 150’ of Lot 11, Block 2, *Southwood*.  
Property located: 8210 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S.

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

<b>To:</b>	<i>Bixby Planning Commission</i>
<b>From:</b>	<i>Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner</i>
<b>Date:</b>	<i>Monday, August 15, 2011</i>

**RE:** Report and Recommendations (Revised 08/15/2011 to reflect revised Site Plan information received 08/12/2011) \*Blue text indicates new wording added, and ~~strikeout text~~ indicates text removed, as compared to that in the report included in the agenda packet for:  
AC-11-08-04 – Kirkendall Design, LLC – g.kesler | Residential Design

---

**LOCATION:** – 8210 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S.  
– The E. 100' of the W. 648' of the N. 150' of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood

**SIZE:** 1/3 acre, more or less

**EXISTING ZONING:** CS Commercial Shopping Center District

**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 Zoning Code Sections 11-7G-4 and 11-7G-6 for a building expansion to an existing Use Unit 11 office.

**SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USE:**

**North:** CS; The “Market Place” and/or “Market Pointe South” (name is not certain/not distinguishable from trade center on south side of 111<sup>th</sup> St. S.) shopping center and trade center development at 8303 : 8315 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S.

**South:** CS & CG; The “Market Place” and/or “Market Pointe South” (name is not certain/not distinguishable from shopping center and trade center on north side of 111<sup>th</sup> St. S.) trade center development at 11110 & 11145 S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Pl., 8220, 8225, and 8230 E. 111<sup>th</sup> Pl. S. in part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood and an automobile sales business to the southwest zoned CG.

**East:** CS; Two (2) commercial and trade center buildings at 8240 & 8250 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S.

**West:** CS; The Tej D. Lad, DDS, Inc., PC dental office, the Primary Concepts Preschool & Child Development Center childcare facility, and the Auto Pride Car Wash aka Bixby Car Wash III carwash facility.

**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:** Medium Intensity + Commercial Area.

**PREVIOUS/RELATED CASES:**

**BL-5 – William G. LaForge** – Request for Lot-Split approval for Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood – created lot abutting to the west at 8194 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. – PC Approved 08/27/1973.

**BBOA-22 – Everett Forrest for L.C. Neel** – Request for Special Exception to allow sales of autos, motorcycles, mobile homes, horse trailers, and campers for [all of] Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood – BOA Denied 11/10/1975.

**BZ-43 – L.C. Neel** – Request for rezoning from CS to CG for part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood for a nonconforming used car sales lot at 11121 / 11125 S. Memorial Dr. – PC recommended Denial 01/26/1976, Appealed, and not approved by City Council 02/17/1976.

**BBOA-28 – Everett Forrest for L.C. Neel** – Request for Special Exception for an existing nonconforming used car sales lot on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood at 11121 / 11125 S. Memorial Dr. – BOA Conditionally Approved for one (1) year 04/13/1976.

**BBOA-82 – Bill Ellis for L.C. Neel** – Request for Special Exception for an existing nonconforming used car sales lot on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood at 11121 / 11125 S. Memorial Dr. – BOA Conditionally Approved 01/12/1981.

**BBOA-85 – L.C. Neel** – Request for Special Exception to allow a Use Unit 17 auto wash on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood at 11119 / 11121 S. Memorial Dr. – BOA Approved 02/09/1981.

**BBOA-101 – George B. Suppes for L.C. Neel** – Request for Appeal from the determination of the Building Inspector to recognize propane tanks as a Use Unit 16 and not Use Unit 25 on gas station property on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood at 11115 S. Memorial Dr. – BOA Approved the Appeal 03/08/1982.

**BBOA-123 – L.C. Neel** – Request for Special Exception to allow a Use Unit 17 car wash on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood, containing a gas station at 11115 S. Memorial Dr. and the Auto Pride Car Wash / Bixby Car Wash III at 8112 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. – BOA Approved 02/13/1984.

**BBOA-164 – Condell Pollard for L.C. Neel** – Request for Special Exception to allow a Use Unit 17 car sales and a Variance to allow open air storage and display of merchandise within 200' of an R District on the W. 448' of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood, less and except the property containing a gas station at 11115 S. Memorial Dr. – BOA Conditionally Approved 04/14/1986.

BL-119 – Donnie Reed – Request for Lot-Split approval for Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood (separated the Auto Pride Car Wash / Bixby Car Wash III at 8112 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. from the balance of Lot 11) – PC Approved 01/26/1987.

BBOA-181 – Dennis Reed for L.C. Neel – Request for Special Exception to allow a Use Unit 17 car wash and a Variance to reduce the frontage requirement in CS from 150' to 125' to allow a Lot-Split on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood, containing the Auto Pride Car Wash / Bixby Car Wash III at 8112 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. – BOA Approved 02/09/1987.

BL-140 – L.C. Neel – Request for Lot-Split approval for Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood – included part of subject property – PC Approved 05/31/1988.

BBOA-204 – L.C. Neel – Request for Variance to reduce the frontage requirement in CS from 150' to 85' to allow a Lot-Split on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood – included part of subject property – BOA Approved 06/06/1988.

BBOA-205 – L.C. Neel – Request for Variance to reduce the frontage requirement in CS from 150' to 100' to allow a Lot-Split on part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood (the Auto Pride Car Wash / Bixby Car Wash III at 8112 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S.) – BOA Approved 08/01/1988.

BL-141, 166, 172, 173, 201, 202, 210, & 227 – L.C. Neel – Request for Lot-Split approvals for Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood – PC Approved 08/15/1988, 11/16/1992, 08/16/1993, 08/16/1993, 10/16/1995, 11/20/1995, 02/20/1996, and 01/20/1998, respectively.

BBOA-257 – L.C. Neel – Request for Special Exception to allow a single family dwelling unit in a CS district and a Variance from the frontage requirement for a 0.5-acre part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood containing the Tune & Sons Auto Service business at 8104 E. 111<sup>th</sup> Pl. S. – BOA Conditionally Approved 11/02/1992.

BBOA-276 – L.C. Neel – Request for Variance to allow a Use Unit 17 auto lube service in a CS district for a 0.5-acre part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood containing the Same Day Auto Repair business at 11121 S. Memorial Dr. – Withdrawn by Applicant 03/24/1994 after determining with the City that it would not be necessary.

BL-219 – L.C. Neel – Request for Lot-Split approval for Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood – case file incomplete so approved lot split areas cannot be verified, but it appears to have included the subject property based on the case map – PC Approved 04/21/1997.

BZ-237 – Robert Cook – Request for rezoning from CS to CG for part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood for the N. 128.6' (should have been N. 228.6'), containing the Auto Pride Car Wash / Bixby Car Wash III at 8112 E. 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. – PC recommended Approval 01/20/1998 and City Council Approved 02/23/1998 (Ord. # 769).

BZ-263 – Robert Kinyon – Request for rezoning from CS to CG for part of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood for a 0.35-acre tract containing the automobile sales business at 8215 E. 111<sup>th</sup> Pl. S. – PC recommended Approval 01/18/2000 and City Council Approved 02/28/2000 (Ord. # 806 – misrepresented on Zoning Map – requested for correction 03/25/2011 and 08/04/2011).

BL-252 – Jeffrey D. Lower for Home Ventures, Inc. – Request for Lot-Split approval for Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood to adjust property lines shared with Lots 3, 4, & 5, Block 2 based on existing fence lines – PC Approved 09/18/2000.

AC-08-11-02 – Kirkendall Homes – Request for approval for a replacement ground sign on the subject property – the old sign was located several feet within the street right-of-way and its replacement is located just within the subject property – Architectural Committee Approved 11/17/2008.

AC-09-12-03 – Kirkendall Interior Design – Request for approval for a temporary banner sign for the subject property – Planning Commission Approved 12/21/2009.

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

##### ANALYSIS:

Subject Property Conditions. The subject property of approximately 1/3 acre contains an office building for the Kirkendall Design, LLC (and perhaps also Kirkendall Homes, LLC) business and is zoned CS. It is a rectangular lot having 100' of frontage on 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. and measuring 150' on a north-south axis. The subject property would have 150' of frontage on the private 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Pl., but it appears to be separated from that street by a strip of privately-owned land.

The subject property is located in part of the 10 2/3 acre "Commercial" Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood, platted March 11, 1965 and since subdivided into 16 tracts containing several Use Unit 17 automotive-related businesses, a few multitenant "trade center" buildings, a couple vacant lots, a gas station, a car

wash, a daycare, and a couple office buildings along the center of the 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. frontage. Together with the perimeter arterial streets, the development is served by private streets 111<sup>th</sup> Pl. S. and S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Pl., forming an "L" rotated 90 degrees counterclockwise.

The subject property appears to have been created in its current form pursuant to Lot-Split application BL-219, approved in 1997. Previously, BL-140, approved in 1988, concerned the better part of the subject property, and the Tulsa County Assessor's data shows the structure was built in 1988.

General. The Applicant is proposing to build a 27' 9 1/2" X 55' 2 1/2" (1,534 square feet) building addition to the back/south end of the existing office building for an expansion of the existing Unit 11 Kirkendall Design, LLC (and perhaps also Kirkendall Homes, LLC) business. The existing building is 56' 2 1/2" along the east-west axis and 25' 11 1/2" along the north-south axis (1,435 square feet).

The Site Plan represents a conventional, suburban-style small, detached office building, located in the center of the lot, with a parking lot in front.

The existing building with the proposed addition appears to comply with the height, maximum FAR, and minimum building setback standards of the Zoning Code for the CS district, including the 50' setback requirement from 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. per Zoning Code Section 11-7D-4 Table 2. The 25' setback from S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Pl. does not appear to apply due to the operative term "abutting" in Zoning Code Section 11-7D-4 Table 2, and the subject property does not appear to abut the street due to the intervening private ownership strip. See the following section of this report.

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

This application was not placed on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) agenda because it was only received Friday, July 29, 2011, with the City Manager's waiver as to deadline. The Applicant should coordinate with the TAC utility providers to ensure their utility service provision concerns are satisfied.

The subject property lot does not meet the 150' minimum lot width standard of the CS district. However, per BBOA-204, a Variance from the 150' minimum lot width was approved, allowing the creation of a lot being the E. 85' of the W. 633' of the N. 150' of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood per BL-140, both in 1988. The lot was evidently since allowed, perhaps per BL-219, to be increased to the E. 100' of the W. 648' of the N. 150' of Lot 11, Block 2, Southwood (an expansion of 15' to the east of the originally-approved lot). Therefore, the lot complies with the applicable lot width requirement specific to this lot, recognizing the approved Variance and its subsequent expansion. Therefore, the subject property lot complies with the applicable bulk and area requirements of the CS district.

Access and Internal Circulation. The subject property has an existing driveway connecting to 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. South 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Pl., a north-south private street roadway, is located east of the subject property.

According to the Tulsa County Assessor's parcel data, the subject property actually abuts a narrow strip of land belonging to Home Ventures, Inc., which strip appears to contain, along its easterly side, a part of the private roadway known as S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. The majority of the roadway appears to be located on the Tsa La Gi Investments, LLC property further east. Home Ventures, Inc. used to own the "Market Place" / "Market Pointe South" trade center properties to the south, which now belong to Market Pointe Tulsa, LLC, and perhaps this strip of land was not conveyed along with those parcels. Information pertaining to the existence, width, and/or relative location of any roadway easement(s) was not researched for this report.

No changes to access are proposed by this development.

A 3' 9" sidewalk flanks the north and east sides of the existing building, and connects pedestrians from the front parking lot to the entrance on the east side of the building (reference Zoning Code Section 11-10-4.C). The sidewalk along the east side will be widened to 4' 6" and will connect a handicapped-accessible ramp to the east building entrance.

Parking Standards. The Site Plan indicates the number, type, and dimensions of the parking spaces in the existing parking lot. Per Zoning Code Section 11-9-11.D, for 2,969 square feet of building on the lot, 10 parking spaces would be required, and 10 are shown on Site Plan drawing A0. Parking Notes on drawing A0 summarize the site's compliance with certain parking standards.

For up to 25 parking spaces, one (1) handicapped-accessible parking space would be required by ADA standards (Table 208.2 Parking Spaces / IBC Table 1106.1 Accessible Parking Spaces). One (1) such space is represented on Site Plan drawing A0 as required.

Per the Building Inspector, the 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). Therefore, the one (1) handicapped-accessible space must be of a van-accessible or universal design. Site Plan drawing A0 designates this existing accessible space as van-accessible, including reserving signage, as required.

Zoning Code Section 11-10-3.B Table 1 requires a 10' minimum setback from 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. Dimensions on Site Plan drawing A0 show an average setback of 10' 1" on the west side and 10' 0" on the east side of the driveway. For the angled setback indicated on the plans, by approval of this Detailed Site Plan, an average setback of 10' on both sides will be recognized as in compliance.

Screening/Fencing. The Zoning Code does not require a sight-proof screening fence for the subject property, as it does not abut an R district. The plans indicate there is no fence and no fences are proposed.

Landscape Plan. Site Plan drawing A0 indicates the location of existing landscaping, and so is reviewed here as the landscape plan. A note on the plan states,

- “ 1. NO EXISTING TREES TO BE REMOVED.
2. NO EXISTING LANDSCAPING ALONG FRONT OR SIDE STREETS TO BE REMOVED.
3. EXISTING LANDSCAPE MEETS CURRENT REQUIREMENTS AND NO ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING IS PROPOSED TO BE INSTALLED.”

The existing landscaping is compared to the landscaping standards of 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 50' from the 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. right-of-way. The S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Pl. roadway does not appear to create a Street Yard due to the intervening private ownership strip, as described elsewhere in this report. All of the existing parking lot setback area appears to have landscaping covering. **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 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. The average setback is 10' or more per Site Plan drawing A0. **This standard is met.**
3. 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. Excluding the building line setback along 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. (which is a Street Yard), there are no other applicable setbacks. **This standard is met.**
4. 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' or 75' from a Landscaped Area, which Landscaped Area must contain at least one (1) or two (2) trees. **This standard is met.**
5. Street Yard Tree Requirements (Section 11-12-3.C.1.a): Standard is one (1) tree per 1,000 square feet of Street Yard. The Street Yard is the Zoning setback along an abutting street right-of-way. The subject property has 100' of frontage along 111<sup>th</sup> St. S., which has a 50' setback.  $100' \times 50' = 5,000$  square feet / 1,000 = 5 trees required in the 111<sup>th</sup> St. S. Street Yard. Per Site Plan drawing A0, there is one (1) existing oak tree and one (1) existing crepe myrtle within the Street Yard. Even if the crepe myrtle is a tree and not a shrub, as determined by the Applicant's Landscape Architect or qualified expert, there are still three (3) trees missing from the Street Yard. **This standard is not met. See new information below.**
6. Tree to Parking Space Ratio Standard (Section 11-12-3.C.2): Standard is one (1) tree per 10 parking spaces. Excluding the trees elsewhere accounted for, four (4) oak trees are represented. **This standard is met.**
7. 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.
8. Irrigation Standards (Sections 11-12-3.D.2 and 11-12-4.A.7): No plans for irrigation have been provided. **This standard is not met.**
9. Miscellaneous Standards (Section 11-12-3.D, etc.): Height and caliper of the existing and any newly proposed trees and other information needed for demonstration of compliance with other miscellaneous standards has not been provided. **This standard is not met.**

One (1) existing crepe myrtle [tree] is proposed in partial satisfaction of the landscaping requirement of the Zoning Code. Per internet sources, it would appear that some crepe myrtles may be classified as trees, while others appear to be shrubs. If it is intended to be recognized as a tree, the Applicant's Landscape Architect or other qualified expert should provide a statement to that effect, preferably on the plan sheet.

For satisfaction of the Street Yard tree requirement per Zoning Code Section 11-12-3.C.1.a, the Applicant has requested credit for two (2) existing mature oak trees, by email correspondence on 08/12/2011, which Staff has responded to as follows:

**“Per 11-12-3.C.3.: An existing or planted tree which is at least six inches (6”) in caliper shall be considered as two (2) trees for the purpose of determining compliance with the requirements of this subsection; provided, that there is no alteration of the grade under an existing tree’s drip line. (Ord. 727, 10-9-1995) – would the existing 27” caliper Oak tree not meet this requirement? If so, and we can count the crepe myrtle as a tree, we would only need (2) additional trees, correct?”**

Correct. That would leave two (2) to be planted. However... [t]here is a 28” caliper oak immediately south of the first one mentioned. In the past, we have accepted an interpretation that trees falling just outside the technical boundaries of the Street Yard can qualify if within the same “landscaped area” as defined, and meaning it is a contiguous linear strip. This would appear to qualify.”

The Applicant subsequently requested that the two (2) existing oak trees within the north approximately 60’ of the 10’-wide landscaped strip along the west side of the property be recognized as two (2) trees each per Zoning Code Section 11-12-3.C.3, and that they both count toward the number required in the Street Yard. Staff is supportive of this recognition based on previous flexible interpretations.

Also by email correspondence on 08/12/2011, the Applicant and Staff discussed the irrigation plan requirement as follows:

“There is an existing hose bib within 100’ of all the landscaping on the site. This will be noted on the site plan.

***That will work in accordance with Zoning Code Section 11-12-3.D.2.c. Please represent the hose bib location(s) (existing and/or newly proposed) on drawing A0 or another appropriate drawing.”***

Exterior Materials and Colors. Drawing A4 indicates the existing and proposed new exterior materials and colors. The exterior material is/will be “shake siding” with some stone/stone veneer trim. The gable roof appears to have a modest pitch, and is/will be surfaced with (presumably asphalt composition) “shingles.”

Color information, as required by Zoning Code Section 11-7G-6.A, ~~has not been represented on the plans. The color information needs to be represented on the plans as is necessary for architectural site plan review.~~ is provided in a note box on drawing A4 as follows:

**“EXISTING SHINGLES: TAMKO HERITAGE 30-YEAR  
ARCHITECTURAL COMPOSITION  
COLOR: WEATHERED WOOD**

**EXISTING SIDING: TRU-WOOD, RANDOM SHAKE  
COLOR: SW 6151 QUIVER TAN**

**EXISTING TRIM: 1x WOOD TRIM - CEDAR  
COLOR: SW 6000 SNOWFALL”**

Outdoor Lighting. Drawing A4 represents one (1) existing wall-mounted outdoor light, mounted above the front porch roof and within the pediment. The Applicant has indicated there is or will be at least one (1) other wall-mounted outdoor light, but the same has not been represented on drawing A4. The Applicant should represent all planned outdoor lights and/or include a statement on the appropriate plan sheet if no additional lighting is planned with this building expansion.

The proposed lighting appears appropriate for this development in its context. There are no residential areas close to the subject property, and so a photometric plan should not be required for something as simple as a building expansion on an existing developed site.

Signage. Site Plan drawing A0 indicates the location of the one (1) existing ground sign, located at the northeast corner of the lot. This ground sign was permitted in November of 2008 per AC-08-11-02. It replaced an older sign which was located several feet within the street right-of-way.

The sign is labeled and identified as 107” X 53” on a 16” high stone base, which appears substantially consistent with the sign approved per AC-08-11-02, at 8’ X 4’. If the dimensions are in fact slightly off, they are still consistent with the Zoning Code standards for the same and will be approved by this Detailed Site Plan approval.

*A diagram representing the existing sign in perspective has not been received. Staff has requested the Applicant confirm that the sign is the same as the approved sign plan per AC-08-11-02, and if so, no new sign diagram would be required.*

*For signage, a note on the plan states,*

*“ SIGNAGE NOTES:*

*1. EXISTING SIGNAGE NOT TO BE REMOVED.*

*2. NO NEW SIGNAGE IS PROPOSED.”*

*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. The Applicant should coordinate with the TAC utility providers to ensure their utility service provision concerns are satisfied.*
- ~~*3. Please add three (3) or four (4) trees in the Street Yard landscaped area as required by Zoning Code Section 11-12-3.C.1.a.*~~
- 4. Please provide plans or information showing existing and/or any newly-proposed irrigation for landscaping as required by Zoning Code Sections 11-12-3.D.2 and 11-12-4.A.7.*
- 5. Please provide information on tree height for existing trees and height and caliper of any newly-proposed landscaping trees as required by Zoning Code Section 11-12-3.C.7.*
- 6. One (1) existing crepe myrtle [tree] is proposed in partial satisfaction of the landscaping requirement of the Zoning Code. Per internet sources, it would appear that some crepe myrtles may be classified as trees, while others appear to be shrubs. If it is intended to be recognized as a tree, the Applicant’s Landscape Architect or other qualified expert should provide a statement to that effect, preferably on the plan sheet.*
- ~~*7. Color information, as required by Zoning Code Section 11-7G-6.A, has not been represented on the plans. The color information needs to be represented on the plans as is necessary for architectural site plan review.*~~
- 8. The Applicant should represent all planned outdoor lights and/or include a statement on the appropriate plan sheet if no additional lighting is planned with this building expansion.*
- 9. A diagram representing the existing sign in perspective has not been received. Staff has requested the Applicant confirm that the sign is the same as the approved sign plan per AC-08-11-02, and if so, no new sign diagram would be required.*
- 10. 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).*

Erik Enyart stated that he was surprised the Applicant was not in attendance, as he had been in constant communication with the Applicant for the past couple weeks [and told the Applicant their attendance was expected].

Erik Enyart noted that he had provided copies of a revised Staff Report prior to the meeting. Mr. Enyart stated that the revisions were primarily to recognize by interpretation the existing, mature oak trees along the northwest side of the property as satisfying four (4) of the five (5) required Street Yard trees and secondly to show that color information has been provided on drawing A4.

The Commissioners discussed with Erik Enyart where the property was located, the commercial area in which the property was located, the private street system serving the commercial area, the size of the building addition in relation to the existing structure, and the siding, roofing, and colors proposed. Mr. Enyart noted that the existing building would remain much the same, except that the east-facing entrance would be moved into the new building addition, and the doorway would be re-sided with materials matching existing.

One of the Commissioners asked Erik Enyart if the drainage report had been provided. Mr. Enyart responded that he had received that morning a drainage report letter from the Applicant's civil engineer in Tulsa, and that the City Engineer would be reviewing it. Mr. Enyart stated that the City Engineer had told him it should not be too difficult to meet the stormwater detention requirements, as it may be able to be done within the parking lot or towards the back of the lot, where there is room for a small detention pond.

Chair Thomas Holland asked what kind of business was done here. Erik Enyart stated that it was an office for Kirkendall's interior design business, and possibly also "Kirkendall Homes," which he believed was a homebuilding business.

There being no further discussion, John Benjamin made a MOTION to APPROVE the AC-11-08-04 subject to meeting the requirements as recommended by Staff. Larry Whiteley SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE:	Whiteley, Holland, Benjamin, & Whisman
NAY:	None.
ABSTAIN:	None.
MOTION CARRIED:	4:0:0

OLD BUSINESS:

None.

NEW BUSINESS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, Chair Thomas Holland declared the meeting Adjourned at 6:15 PM.

APPROVED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Planner/Recording Secretary