

**MINUTES**  
**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE**  
**6:00 PM**  
**116 WEST NEEDLES**  
**BIXBY, OKLAHOMA**  
**Monday**  
**April 21, 2008**

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Erik Enyart, AICP, City Planner

**ATTENDING:**

See attached Sign-in Sheet

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order by Chair Jim Powell at 6:00 PM.

*ROLL CALL:*

Members Present: Jim Powell, Richard Altmann, David Skaggs, Tim Remy, and Beverly Savage.

Members Absent: None.

2. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of Minutes for February 18, 2007

Chair Jim Powell asked to entertain a Motion. David Skaggs made a MOTION to APPROVE the Minutes of the February 18, 2007 regular meeting as provided by Staff. Beverly Savage SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Powell, Altmann, Skaggs, Remy, & Savage

NAY: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

MOTION CARRIED: 5:0:0

b. Approval of Minutes for March 17, 2007 (no meeting)

Chair Jim Powell asked to entertain a Motion. Beverly Savage made a MOTION to APPROVE the Minutes of the March 17, 2007 regular meeting as provided by Staff. David Skaggs SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Powell, Altmann, Skaggs, Remy, & Savage

NAY: None.

ABSTAIN: None.

MOTION CARRIED: 5:0:0

Jim Powell stated that items 2.e and 2.g on the agenda, the banner sign items for Joggin Ur Noggin and QuikTrip, would be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

- c. Case # AC-08-03-01 Discussion and possible action to approve wall signs for “X & Y Clothing Unique” at 10462 S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave., Suite 104, Lot 7, Block 1, *Regal Plaza*
- d. Case # AC-08-03-02 Discussion and possible action to approve wall signs for “Joggin Ur Noggin” at 10462 S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave., Suite 105/106, Lot 7, Block 1, *Regal Plaza*.
- f. Case # AC-08-04-02 Discussion and possible action to approve wall signs for “Tea & Magnolias” at 10425 S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave., Suite 106, Lot 9, Block 1, *Regal Plaza*.
- h. Case # AC-08-04-05 Discussion and possible action to approve a wall sign for “Paper Girl” at 11083 S. Memorial Dr.

Chair Jim Powell asked Erik Enyart for the report and recommendations on the remaining Consent Agenda items. Mr. Enyart stated that, in all cases, the signs met the Zoning Code requirements and so were approved, and he requested ratification of their approval.

Chair Jim Powell asked to entertain a Motion. David Skaggs made a MOTION to APPROVE Consent Agenda items 2.c (AC-08-03-01), 2.d (AC-08-03-02), 2.f (AC-08-04-02), and 2.h (AC-08-04-05). Richard Altmann SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE:	Powell, Altmann, Skaggs, Remy, & Savage
NAY:	None.
ABSTAIN:	None.
MOTION CARRIED:	5:0:0

- e. Case # AC-08-03-03 Discussion and possible action to approve a temporary banner sign for “Joggin Ur Noggin” at 10525 S. Memorial Dr., Lot 2, Block 1, *Regal Plaza*.
- g. Case # AC-08-04-03 Discussion and possible action to approve a temporary banner sign for QuikTrip at 15102 S. Memorial Dr. in *Quiktrip Commercial Center #51*.

Chair Jim Powell expressed need to have clear standards for banner signs, not allowing them to remain up for extended periods of time, and requiring a permit and payment of a permit fee.

Erik Enyart stated the City approved an ordinance within the past few years that added provisions to the Zoning Code for temporary/banner signs, and that that that is what these two banner signs applications were submitted and approved pursuant to.

Tim Remy stated that he had told all the banner sign owners [in Regal Plaza] to go get permits from the City or take them down, as the situation had gotten out of hand. Mr. Remy said that the Regal Plaza area was all cleaned up now. Mr. Remy stated that five (5) of the banners had been removed.

Erik Enyart described that banner signs, under the new Zoning Code provisions, are allowed to be permitted for 30 days, extendable to 60 days, must be on private property (as opposed to in the public street right-of-way) and get written permission from the property owner to place the sign on their property, if they did not happen to own that frontage property.

The Committee discussed the City’s code enforcement program, and the need for a Code Enforcement Officer. Richard Altmann stated that the Committee has been recommending the City

get a code enforcement officer at just about every meeting for the past year, and asked Erik Enyart when the City would get one. Erik Enyart stated that it was the City Council's decision, and that the Council would have to make a budget amendment to provide for the salary [and benefits] of such an officer. Mr. Altmann asked what he could do to speed the process along, and Jim Powell and Beverly Savage advised him to talk to the Mayor and his Ward Councilmember.

There being no further discussion, Chair Jim Powell asked to entertain a Motion. David Skaggs made a MOTION to APPROVE Consent Agenda Items 2.e (AC-08-03-03) and 2.g (AC-08-04-03). Beverly Savage SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Powell, Altmann, Skaggs, Remy, & Savage  
NAY: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
MOTION CARRIED: 5:0:0

3. Case # AC-08-04-01 Discussion and possible action to approve a Detailed Site Plan and building plans for Bank of Oklahoma at 12052 S. Memorial Dr., Lot 9, Block 1, *Bixby Centennial Plaza*.

Chair Jim Powell introduced the item and called on Erik Enyart for the staff report and recommendation. Mr. Enyart summarized the staff report as follows:

LOCATION: – 12052 S. Memorial Dr.  
– Northwest corner of the intersection of Memorial Dr. & 121<sup>st</sup> St. S.  
– Lot 9, Block 1, *Bixby Centennial Plaza*.

LOT SIZE: 63,442 square feet (1.46 acres), more or less

EXISTING ZONING: CS Commercial

DEVELOPMENT Approval of Detailed Site Plan and building plans pursuant to Zoning

TYPE: Code Sections 11-7G-4 and 11-7G-6 for a Use Unit 11 bank

PREVIOUS/RELATED CASES: (not a complete list)

*BZ-279 – Charles Norman/Martha Plummer Roberts et al. – Request for rezoning from AG to CS, OM, RM-1, and RS-2 for 73 acres, more or less, which became Bixby Centennial Plaza and Fox Hollow and an unplatted 10-acre tract later approved as PUD 51 – PC Recommended Approval as amended for CS, OM, OL, RS-3, and RS-2 on November 19, 2001 and Approved by City Council December 10, 2001 (Ord. # 842). Subject property included in that part approved for CS zoning.*

*Preliminary Plat of Bixby Centennial Plaza – Request for Preliminary Plat approval – Approved by PC 07/17/2006 and by City Council 07/24/2006.*

*Final Plat of Bixby Centennial Plaza – Request for Final Plat approval – Approved by PC 10/16/2006 and by City Council 10/23/2006.*

ANALYSIS:

General. *The Site Plan exhibits a conventional design and indicates appropriate internal traffic flow and circulation and parking. The lot will have access to privately-maintained internal drives on its north and west sides. No access is to be provided directly on Memorial Dr.*

*Based on the submitted Site Plan, the building would conform to the applicable bulk and area standards of the CS district.*

Parking Standards. *The bank building is proposed to be 3,548 square feet. Zoning Code Section 11-9-11.D does not provide for minimum parking spaces, which is an error which was passed through from the 'old' Zoning Code when codified/recodified as City Code Title 11. If Section 11-9-11.D were the same as the parking standards for Use Unit 11 Offices, Studios, and Support Services per Tulsa Zoning Code Section 1211.D (at 1 parking space per 300 SF of floor area for the first 30,000 SF of floor area in a building and if the building exceeds 30,000 SF, 1 per 350 SF of*

*floor area for the floor area exceeding 30,000 SF), 12 parking spaces would be required. A total of approximately 21 parking spaces are proposed, and so would exceed the 12 which are/should be required. One (1) handicapped-accessible parking space is indicated on the provided Site Plan. At 21 spaces, the one (1) handicapped-accessible parking space meets the ADA standards.*

*Screening/Fencing. The subject property does not abut an R district and is not within a PUD. Sight-proof screening is not required. The trash enclosure appears to be appropriately sited and designed to adequately screen receptacles.*

*Landscape Plan. The proposed Landscape Plan demonstrates full compliance with the Landscape Chapter standards of the Zoning Code.*

*Exterior Materials and Colors. The exterior materials will be primarily red brick with some painted EIFS. The roof will be metal, presumably using corporate colors.*

*Outdoor Lighting. The "Architectural Site Plan" drawing "A101" depicts the location of proposed lighting, which appears typical for a bank application. As there are no single family residential areas within relatively close proximity, and recognizing the location of the property in relation to existing and planned commercial in all directions, excessive outdoor lighting does not appear to be a major concern.*

*Signage. The Site Plan indicates the proposed location of the one (1) proposed sign. The Sign location suggests it would be located out of the right-of-way. Architectural Committee approval of a specific sign, including detailed location, dimensional, and appearance information, is required prior to the issuance of a sign permit.*

*Staff Recommendation. The Detailed Site Plan complies with all applicable Zoning Code standards. Staff recommends Approval.*

Chair Jim Powell stated that the Architectural Committee's guidelines recommended the use of Mediterranean architecture for the City of Bixby, and noted that Tim Remy used the Mediterranean theme for his Palazzo shopping center.

Chair Jim Powell asked if the Applicant was present and wished to speak on the item. Applicant Jim Beach of Wallace Engineering was present. Mr. Powell, noting that the staff report advised that the roof color information was not provided, and asked Mr. Beach about the proposed color of the metal roof. Mr. Beach looked at the drawings and stated that he could not answer that question.

Richard Altmann advised Mr. Beach that the Committee's guidelines provided that primary / bright colors (such as red) are not permitted. Jim Beach stated that he would be surprised to see red, considering the company and the fact that it would be a bank. Mr. Beach stated that he didn't see Bank of Oklahoma doing anything garish.

Jim Powell stated that the Committee would accept a darker green or some other muted color, a soft blue, green, or sundried tomato would fit into the acceptable color scheme.

Jim Beach stated that he would communicate the Committee's color requirements to his client, and if the color turned out to be something else, he would bring it back to the Committee as required.

Richard Altmann clarified with Jim Beach that the trash dumpster enclosure would be located at the northwest corner of the property, and not next to Memorial Dr. Beverly Savage asked what materials would be used to screen the trash dumpster, and Mr. Beach referred to the site plan drawings.

Jim Powell asked to entertain a Motion. Richard Altmann made a MOTION to APPROVE AC-08-04-01 subject to use of what is acceptable under parameters of what the Committee discussed as far as roof colors. Beverly Savage SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Powell, Altmann, Skaggs, Remy, & Savage  
NAY: None.  
ABSTAIN: None.  
MOTION CARRIED: 5:0:0

4. Case # AC-08-04-04 Discussion and possible action to approve a Detailed Site Plan and building plans for Marquis on Memorial at 8260 and/or 8200-block of E. 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. in part of *Market South Second* and part of the NW/4 SW/4 of Section 13, T17N, R13E.

Chair Jim Powell introduced the item and called on Erik Enyart for the staff report and recommendation. Mr. Enyart summarized the staff report as follows:

LOCATION: – 8260 and/or 8200-block of E. 146<sup>th</sup> St. S.  
– A part of *Market South Second* and unplatted land in Section 13, T17N, R13E

LOT SIZE: 7.81 acres, more or less

EXISTING ZONING: CG General Commercial District and PUD 61

REQUEST: Approval of a Detailed Site Plan, including as elements: (1) Detailed Site Plan (includes fencing/screening), (2) Detailed Landscape Plan, (3) Detailed Lighting Plan, and (4) Detailed Sign Plan

SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USE:

North: CG, RM-1, & PUD 56; Pending “South Village” mixed use commercial and multifamily development north of 146<sup>th</sup> St. S.

South: CG; Ryder Brick and mini storage.

East: RM-1, RS-2, & PUD 5; Pecan Valley Addition and vacant land.

West: CG & CS; Ryder Brick, Tire Barn, and the River Run shopping center.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Corridor + Development Sensitive/Low Intensity + [Existing] Commercial Area.

PREVIOUS/RELATED CASES: (not a complete list)

Sketch Plat of River Run Storage – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for direction on possible future development of mini storage units on subject property – Discussed by Planning Commission 08/21/2006 (no action).

V-14 – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request to Vacate S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. through subject property –Item withdrawn from the Planning Commission agenda by the City Planner on 10/16/2006.

BBOA-458 – Tanner Consulting for David Yonce – Request for Special Exception per Zoning Code Section 11-7D-2 to allow Use Unit 8 Multifamily Residential in the CG General Commercial District – Approved 10/01/2007 subject to a PUD as recommended by Staff.

BBOA-458 – Tanner Consulting for David Yonce – Request for Variance from the Zoning Code to reduce required setbacks in the CG General Commercial District – Withdrawn by Applicant 10/01/2007.

PUD # 61 – Marquis on Memorial – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for PUD zoning approval for subject property – Recommended for Approval by PC November 19, 2007 and Approved by City Council 01/14/2008.

Preliminary Plat of Marquis on Memorial – Request for Preliminary Plat approval for subject property – Approved by PC 12/17/2007 and by City Council 01/14/2008.

Final Plat of Marquis on Memorial – Request for Final Plat approval for subject property – pending consideration 04/21/2008.

BSP 2008-01 – Marquis on Memorial – Tanner Consulting, LLC – Request for Planning Commission Detailed Site Plan approval for subject property – pending consideration 04/21/2008.

ANALYSIS:

General. The Site Plan demonstrates appropriate overall design, including placement and orientation of buildings, internal traffic flow and circulation, parking, clubhouse/pool[central leasing office], and pedestrian accessibility.

Based on the submitted Site Plan, the buildings would conform to the applicable bulk and area standards of PUD 61.

Parking. The Site Plan demonstrates compliance with parking standards of PUD 61, which requires a total of 262 parking spaces, and would exceed the minimum number of parking spaces for the proposed mix of 1- (48), 2- (72), and 3- (12) bedroom units and the clubhouse per Zoning Code Sections 11-9-8.D and 11-9-5.D. The Site Plan appears to exceed the minimum number of handicapped-accessible parking spaces as per ADA guidelines, seven (7), when considering the parking lot to include the overall parking of the entire site. However, if the physically separated parking lot on Lot 1 Block 2 is determined a separate parking lot for purposes of conformity with ADA guidelines, it should have one (1) additional handicapped-accessible parking space for a total of five (5). Staff recommends the addition/conversion of this one (1) additional handicapped-accessible parking space or clarification of interpretation of ADA guidelines.

The Site Data summary does not accurately reflect the correct total of parking spaces in terms of regular versus handicapped-accessible, and will need to be updated to reflect the above change.

The Site Plan shows parking areas in Lot 1 Block 1 to encroach on existing 50' drainage easement (which is to become Reserve A). This would require City Engineer approval. Reduction in the number of parking spaces to less than the 262 required by PUD 61 (but not required by Zoning Code standards) would require a PUD Minor Amendment.

Screening/Fencing. The east line of the addition will be screened with a 6'-high wood fence, and the frontage along 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. and 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. will have decorative aluminum fencing.

The proposed aluminum ornamental fencing along the east line of 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. should help enclose the open area on Lot 1 Block 2 and allow it to serve as an appropriate passive recreation area for residents and children and provide protection/buffering from automobile traffic.

Aluminum ornamental fencing will also be placed around the pool for safety purposes.

Screening/buffering along the west and a portion of the south line would be achieved by the existing 50'-wide drainage channel. Placement of parking areas and garage units would serve to achieve buffering needs along certain other boundaries as well.

Trash enclosures appear to be appropriately sited and designed to adequately screen receptacles.

Landscape Plan. The proposed Landscape Plan is compared to the Landscape Chapter standard of the Zoning Code as follows:

1. Minimum Landscaped Area Standards (Sections 11-12-3.A.1 and 11-12-3.A.2): Standard is not less than 15% of Street Yard area shall be landscaped, and the minimum Landscaped Area strip width shall be 7.5'. These standards are met.
2. 10' Setback from Abutting R District Standard (Section 11-12-3.A.3): Standard requires a minimum 10' landscaped strip along property lines abutting an R Residential District. This standard applies to the east property line, which abuts an RM-1 district. This standard would be met upon and as a part of compliance with the standard of Section 11-12-3.A.4.
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 building setback lines along 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. and 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. (which are Street Yards), the building line setbacks are 20' uniformly along all PUD property boundaries. **This standard is not 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' to 75' from a Landscaped Area, which Landscaped Area must contain at least one (1) tree. These standards are 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. **This standard met for S. 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. only.** The PUD-required setback from 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. is 50', and the street yard is approximately (230' X 50' = ) 11,500. 12 trees required in 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. street yard, but only eight (8) trees provided. Recognizing site constraints and minimum tree spacing needs (to avoid mature canopy congestion), Staff would support an Alternative Compliance plan pursuant to Zoning Code Section 11-12-4.D, provided the required trees are relocated within the development in order to achieve the minimum number required.

The revised Landscape Plan received April 14, 2008 indicates the four (4) additional trees would be placed within the development and around the two (2) buildings on Lot 1 Block 2 as a part of a future Alternative Compliance Plan submittal.

6. Tree to Parking Space Ratio Standard (Section 11-12-3.C.2): Standard is one (1) tree per 10 parking spaces. At approximately 237 such parking spaces, this standard is met. The tree size, irrigation, and other such standards of the Landscape Chapter are demonstrated to be complied with per the General Notes on the Landscape Plan.

Exterior Materials and Colors. Details on exterior materials and colors have not yet been provided. The building profile view/elevations give an indication of the planned exterior appearance. However, details should be provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission and Architectural Committee.

Outdoor Lighting. A Lighting Plan has been submitted and is in order. As there are no single family residential areas within relatively close proximity, and recognizing the location of the property in relation to existing commercial along Memorial Dr. and planned commercial to the north and south, outdoor lighting does not appear to be a major concern.

Signage. The Site Plan indicates the proposed location of the two (2) proposed signs: the northerly one at the 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. entrance and the southerly one toward the middle of 82<sup>nd</sup> E. Ave. in front of the clubhouse/central leasing office]. PUD 61 only allows one (1) sign, to be located at the entrance at 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. and to be not higher than six (6) feet and no more than 60 square feet in display surface area. The proposed sign(s) are seven (7) feet in height, but 40 square feet in display surface area. The sign must be reduced to six (6) feet in height, or otherwise be approved for a PUD Minor Amendment to allow a seven (7) foot high sign. The southerly sign can only be allowed by PUD Minor Amendment.

To address this issue, PUD 61 Minor Amendment # 1 was received April 14, 2008 and will be placed on the May 19, 2008 Planning Commission agenda.

Staff Recommendation. Staff recommends Approval of the Detailed Site Plan subject to the following corrections, modifications, and conditions of approval:

1. Subject to requesting and receiving approval of an Alternative Compliance plan pursuant to Zoning Code Section 11-12-4.D to allow for alternative placement of required trees from the 146<sup>th</sup> St. S. street yard to another appropriate location, and alternative placement of trees per the Zoning Code Section 11-12-3.A.4 standard as applied to the drainage channel PUD boundaries, all as described more fully above.
2. Subject to the approval of a PUD Minor Amendment to allow a second sign, to be located in front of the clubhouse/central leasing office], and to allow the two (2) signs to be seven (7) feet in height, instead of six (6) as per the current PUD.
3. Add trees to comply with 20' PUD Exterior Boundary building line setback tree planting standards of Zoning Code Section 11-12-3.A.4. For PUD Boundaries coterminous with the outside edges of the 50' drainage easement (which is to become Reserve A), required trees are to be located on Lot 1 Block 1 as a part of the anticipated Zoning Code Section 11-12-4.D Alternative Compliance plan request.
4. Remove parking areas encroaching on existing 50' drainage easement (which is to become Reserve A) adjacent to Lot 1 Block 1 and make adjustments to parking as appropriate and allowable, unless the encroachment is otherwise approved by the City Engineer. Reduction in the number of parking spaces to less than the 262 required by PUD 61 (but not required by Zoning Code standards) would require a PUD Minor Amendment.
5. Add/convert one (1) additional handicapped-accessible parking space for Lot 1 Block 2 or clarify proper interpretation of ADA guidelines for a 'parking lot' in relation to planned improvements.
6. Correct the Site Data summary table and update the same to reflect the conversion of one (1) additional handicapped-accessible parking space for Lot 1 Block 2.
7. Provide information on planned exterior materials and colors to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission and Architectural Committee.
8. A copy of the Detailed Site Plan (inclusive of all elements) including all recommended corrections shall be submitted for placement in the permanent file.

Erik Enyart stated that, after the agenda was published and mailed to the Committee, he had discovered that recommended Condition of Approval number 4 was not entirely correct, as his interpretation of the PUD was that a 1.85 parking space to dwelling unit ratio was required, as well as the requirement that parking must be 'as required by the Zoning Code,' and that the 262 parking

space figure referred to the number of parking spaces planned to be included, but that that number was not made mandatory by the PUD.

Jim Powell noted that the Staff Report stated that the Applicant had not provided information on the colors to be used, and stated that primary colors would not be permitted. The Committee discussed the project and Mr. Enyart answered questions.

The Applicant was not present.

After further discussion, Jim Powell made a MOTION to APPROVE AC-08-04-04 as follows:

1. Subject to the recommended corrections, modifications, and Conditions of Approval as listed in the Staff Report, except the half part of recommended item number 4 which Staff reported was not relevant,
2. Subject to the use of no primary colors, and
3. Subject to all the conditions of approval placed on the Site Plan by the Planning Commission.

Beverly Savage SECONDED the Motion. Roll was called:

ROLL CALL:

AYE:	Powell, Altmann, Skaggs, Remy, & Savage
NAY:	None.
ABSTAIN:	None.
MOTION CARRIED:	5:0:0

NEW BUSINESS: None.

OLD BUSINESS:

Richard Altmann stated that he would call Mayor Ray Bowen this week, and try to do lunch with him and Erik Enyart to discuss the Committee's recommendations as to code enforcement.

5. Adjournment. There being no further business, Chair Jim Powell declared the meeting adjourned at 6:53 PM.

APPROVED BY:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

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