

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1611
Wednesday, July 9, 1986, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes Doherty, 2nd Vice- Chairman Draughon Kempe Paddock, Secretary Parmele, Chairman Selph VanFossen Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman Woodard	Crawford	Frank Gardner Setters	Linker, Legal Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, July 8, 1986 at 9:42 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of Minutes of June 25, 1986, Meeting #1609:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-1** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Wilson, "abstaining"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of June 25, 1986, Meeting #1609:**

REPORTS:

Approval of the Report of Receipts & Deposits:

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Report of Receipts & Deposits for the Month Ended June 30, 1986.**

Committee Reports:

Mr. VanFossen announced the **Comprehensive Plan Committee** would be meeting July 16, 1986 at 12:30 to review the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) policies and procedures.

Mr. Paddock advised the **Rules & Regulations Committee** met last Wednesday, July 2nd, to discuss time limitations for speakers. Mr. Paddock requested the draft items incorporating the time limitations into the TMAPC Rules of Procedure be set for a vote at the July 16th TMAPC meeting. Mr. Paddock suggested discussing these items at this meeting as to resolving any questions or differences.

In regard to the draft of the TMAPC Rules of Procedure, Mr. Doherty stated it appeared clear enough to him, but he felt some further clarification might be needed on the time allocation for protestants, equating it to the time given the applicant. Chairman Parmele advised it appeared clear to him.

Ms. Wilson stated she thought the time allotted, whether used or not, should be equal to both parties, and this should be clarified before putting it to a vote next week. In regard to the draft of the TMAPC Rules of Procedure, Ms. Wilson stated the wording "imposition of maximum time for addressing the Commission is at the discretion of the Chairman" needed to be removed entirely, as she thought this was not part of the motion and vote at the Rules & Regulations Committee meeting last week. Chairman Parmele stated he recalled the discussion at the Committee did involve the time limitations, as marked in parentheses in the Opening Statements, and it was to be at the discretion of the Chairman, depending on the number of speakers present, to read or not read these references to time limitations.

Mr. Gardner commented that this was the reason the reference to time limits was left in parentheses. If a time limitation was to be imposed, it would be as stated in the parentheses. It would be up to the Chairman, depending on the number of cases on the agenda to be heard and number of speakers present, whether the time limits would be read (imposed) or not read (not imposed). Ms. Wilson stated she was in agreement with the information on the Zoning Public Hearing Information sheet (read as the Opening Statements), but she did have a problem with the proposed draft of the TMAPC Rules of Procedure as to imposition of time limitation. Mr. Paddock stated agreement with Ms. Wilson as to deleting reference to imposition of time limitations being at the discretion of the Chairman.

Lengthy discussion followed among Commission members as to how definite the time limitations should be and the enforcing of time limits being at the discretion of the Chairman. The discussions indicated some confusion and difference of opinions as to actions taken at the last Rules & Regulations Committee meeting. Mr. Paddock made a motion to place this issue on the July 16, 1986 TMAPC agenda, and direct Staff to revise the drafts for discussion at that meeting.

TMAPC ACTION: 10 members present

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-0 (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, "absent") to APPROVE Placing the Time Limitations Review on the July 16, 1986 TMAPC Agenda, with regard to finalizing the drafts of the TMAPC Rules of Procedure, and the Speaker Sign-In Sheet; and to Consider Rescission of the Vote taken at the July 2, 1986 TMAPC Meeting in regard to approval of the Opening Statements with references to Time Limitations.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6117

Applicant: Reed

Location: Southeast corner of 2nd & Quincy

Size of Tract: .1 acres, approximate

Present Zoning: RM-2

Proposed Zoning: CH or IL

Date of Hearing: July 9, 1986

Presentation to TMAPC by: Mr. Troy Reed, 27 South 184th East Place (437-5914)

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 4 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Special District - Industrial.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts", the requested IL and CH District may be found in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis: The subject tract is approximately .1 acres in size and is located on the southeast corner of 2nd Street and Quincy Avenue. It is nonwooded, vacant on the north half and contains a single-family dwelling unit on the south half, and is zoned RM-2.

Surrounding Area Analysis: The tract is abutted on the north by a gasoline service station zoned CH; on the east by duplex dwellings zoned RM-2; on the south by commercial uses zoned CH; and on the west by a used furniture store zoned RM-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary: Recent zoning actions in this area indicate a strong move towards industrial type zoning and land uses, in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Conclusion: Based on the Comprehensive Plan, the existing land uses (conforming and nonconforming) and the existing zoning patterns in the area, Staff does not consider granting the requested intensity to be an encroachment into the area. It should be noted the area is in transition from residential to industrial and this lot is the first along this particular stretch of property to have a rezoning application filed. The Staff, however, does feel the more appropriate zoning for the property would be IL, due to the character of the neighborhood and existing uses. Staff recognizes that if IL zoning was granted, BOA approval would be required for redevelopment and appropriate conditions could be placed on the development to provide a measure of protection to adjacent single-family residences.

Therefore, Staff recommends DENIAL of CH and APPROVAL of IL zoning.

Comments & Discussion:

In reply to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Gardner clarified the size of the Special District area in District 4.

Mr. Reed advised that, as an inventor, he intended to build a facility where he could manufacture his inventions; mainly small motors that do not use gasoline. For the applicant's benefit, Mr. Gardner explained the advantages/disadvantages of both CH and IL zoning designations, adding that either way, the applicant be going to the Board of Adjustment. If CH is approved an Exception would be needed allowing the applicant to manufacture on the site; if IL is approved, a BOA approval would be needed for setbacks. Mr. Gardner added that the BOA has frequently granted Variances for setbacks in this area.

TMAPC ACTION: 10 members present

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **10-0-0** (Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Selph, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE Z-6117 Reed for IL and DENY CH**, as recommended by Staff.

Legal Description:

Lot 11, Block 15, LYNCH - FORSYTHE ADDITION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Date Approved 7-23-86
Rant I [Signature]
Chairman

ATTEST:

AB Paddock
Secretary

