

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1639
Wednesday, February 25, 1987, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes	Crawford	Frank	Linker, Legal
Draughon	Doherty	Gardner	Counsel
Kempe		Kane	Connelly, DCD
Paddock, 1st Vice- Chairman		Lasker	
Parmeale, Chairman		Matthews	
Rice		Setters	
VanFossen, Secretary			
Wilson			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, February 24, 1987 at 9:55 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 1:36 p.m.

MINUTES:

Approval of Minutes of February 11, 1987, Meeting #1637:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-1** (Carnes, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Wilson, "abstaining"; (Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes of February 11, 1987, Meeting No. 1637.**

Approval of Amendment to the Minutes of February 4, 1987, Meeting #1636:

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; "abstaining"; (Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Amendment to the Minutes of February 4, 1987, Meeting No. 1636, page 10, regarding the Preliminary Plat for Crow Creek Office Park.**

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report: Consider calling a public hearing to amend the City of Tulsa Zoning Code to include establishing a Historic Preservation (HP) Zoning District and related matters.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Doherty, Kempe, Crawford, "absent") to **SET** a **PUBLIC HEARING** for Wednesday, **April 1, 1987** to consider amendment(s) to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code in regard to establishing a Historic Preservation (HP) Zoning District and related matters, as recommended by Staff.

Committee Reports:

- a) **Comprehensive Plan Committee:** Review and recommendation on the FY 1988 City of Tulsa Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Project requests for conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Dane Matthews advised the additional project to be added to the CIP involved a request to purchase right-of-way and relocate utilities for the Creek Expressway. She stated this has been reviewed by the Comprehensive Plan Committee as to conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Matthews added that Staff wished to bring forward two issues on this matter: 1) the cost figures, as submitted, were significantly higher than those previously submitted by the State; and (2) Staff felt a resolution might be in order regarding the alignment of a number of proposed streets in the general area of 96th Street and Delaware Avenue.

In response to Ms. Wilson, Mr. Tom Kane stated that he was advised by City Engineering that the segment of the Creek Expressway south of 91st Street between Mingo and Garnett, south and west to 96th and Memorial, potentially had a 600' wide area set aside for the expressway corridor. Mr. Kane explained that 600' might have to be purchased, instead of the usual 300', because the remaining property abutting the normal 300' right-of-way could be unsuitable for any other use. Mr. Kane advised that he requested a breakdown of the costs for utility and right-of-way for this segment from the City. He was advised that the City Engineering staff could not do that at this time. Discussion followed as to the costs for this particular segment of the Creek Expressway, and the inconsistency of the numbers previously submitted and those currently presented. Mr. Pat Connelly pointed out that, in regard to the cost estimates, it did not necessarily mean that the City would be required to pay the full amount, as a percentage should be funded by the State/Federal government.

Committee Reports - Cont'd

Mr. VanFossen stated the purpose of any action of the Comprehensive Plan Committee was to acknowledge that the items under consideration for the CIP were in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. He advised that this Committee and the Rules & Regulations Committee had met on this and acknowledged compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, he moved that "the TMAPC accept the Creek Expressway requests to the CIP as complying with the Comprehensive Plan, but make no acceptance or acknowledgement of the costs presented for the integration of the Expressway with adjacent transportation facilities". Mr. Paddock remarked that the motion, as stated by Mr. VanFossen, was in variance with that made at the previous Joint Committee Work Session, in that the Committees previously felt that only the costs involved in utility relocation should be put on the CIP list, and not right-of-way acquisition costs. Therefore, Mr. VanFossen withdrew his motion.

Mr. Paddock expressed concerns as to the differences in the cost figures previously submitted from those currently under review. Discussion followed among Staff and Commission on this matter as to this being on the CIP, schedule of funds from the State, the selection of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) consultants, the anticipated construction/completion schedule, etc.

Mr. Paddock moved that the TMAPC recommend this additional request to be added to the CIP as being in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **PADDOCK**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Draughton, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Doherty, Crawford, "absent")) to **APPROVE** the recommendation that the Creek Expressway request be added to the Capital Improvement Program project list as being in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Paddock further moved that only the costs involved in utility relocation be put on the CIP list and no cost figures for right-of-way acquisition. Discussion followed on this motion and it was the general consensus of the the Commission that the TMAPC had no responsibility in this area, but could only express their concerns in regard to the funding. Therefore, Mr. Paddock withdrew his motion, and agreed that the concerns of the TMAPC should be made known and placed in the record regarding the utilization of funds for the Creek Expressway.

- b) **Rules & Regulations Committee:** Mr. Paddock advised this Committee would be meeting March 4, 1987 to review a recommendation in regard to the public hearing that date on an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations, Section 2.4, Final Construction Plans.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: **Z-6146** Present Zoning: RS-2
Applicant: **Nichols (Hausam)** Proposed Zoning: RM-T
Location: W/side of Sheridan Road at East 54th Street
Size of Tract: 2.5 acres, approximate
Date of Hearing: February 25, 1987
Continuance Requested to: March 11, 1987

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **RICE**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6146 Nichols (Hausam)** until Wednesday, **March 11, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6147** Present Zoning: AG
Applicant: **Bowline** Proposed Zoning: CS
Location: NW/c of South 177th East Avenue & East 31st Street
Size of Tract: 10 acres, approximate
Date of Hearing: February 25, 1987
Continuance Requested to: March 4, 1987

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **RICE**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6147 Bowline** until Wednesday, **March 4, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

* * * * *

Application No.: **Z-6148 & PUD 425** Present Zoning: OM
Applicant: **Riddle** Proposed Zoning: IL/CG
Location: West of South Mingo Road, North side of East 48th Place South
Size of Tract: 1.2 acres, approximate
Date of Hearing: February 25, 1987
Continuance Requested to: March 4, 1987

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **RICE**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Doherty, Crawford, "absent") to **CONTINUE Consideration of Z-6148 & PUD 425 Riddle** until Wednesday, **March 4, 1987** at 1:30 p.m. in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

SUBDIVISIONS:

FINAL PLAT APPROVAL & RELEASE:

Heritage Park (3602) SE/c of East Oklahoma Street & North Greenwood Avenue

On **MOTION** of **KEMPE**, the Planning Commission voted **7-0-2** (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; no "nays"; Carnes, Woodard, "abstaining"; (Doherty, Crawford, "absent")) to **APPROVE** the **Final Plat of Heritage Park** and release same as having met all conditions of approval.

OTHER BUSINESS:

PUD 221: South of the SE/c of East 41st Street and South 129th East Avenue

Staff Recommendation: Detail Sign Plan

PUD 221 is approximately 160 acres in size and is located at the southeast corner of East 41st Street South and South 129th East Avenue (Quail Ridge). It was approved for multi-family and single-family use. The applicant is now requesting Detail Sign Plan approval for the single-family area.

Review of the applicant's submitted plans indicates an existing identification sign to be removed that is located in the center of the right-of-way median and entrance from East 45th Street South. The two new signs will be located off of City right-of-way and are 3' tall by 6' wide and located within a brick wall. The total height of the sign columns will be 6'6". The applicant has received permission from the property owners to relocate the sign. Staff finds the request to be consistent with the original PUD.

Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the Detail Sign Plan per applicant's submitted plot plan and elevation and subject to the City of Tulsa, Traffic Engineering Department approval to insure the proposed signs do not restrict line of sight for automobile traffic at the intersection, and subject to being off the City right-of-way.

NOTE: The applicant should coordinate with other City Departments for matters such as utility easement, etc.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted **9-0-0** (Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; (Doherty, Crawford, "absent")) to **APPROVE** the **Detail Sign Plan for PUD 221**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

PUD 190-25: Lot 1, Block 12, Minshall Park One

Staff Recommendation: Minor Amendment to Front Yard Setback

The subject tract is described as Lot 1, Block 12, Minshall Park One and is a corner lot as indicated on the attached plot plan and survey. As indicated on the survey, the front of the residential dwelling encroaches 1.5' into the approved setback per PUD 190.

According to the applicant, this condition has existed for several years; however, it was discovered recently in the process of resale of the residence. This item was received Monday, February 23rd and is placed on the agenda to allow the applicant to be heard by the TMAPC. Notices were mailed to abutting property owners the day the application was received. Staff suggested that in view of the inadequate notice, the applicant personally contact the abutting owners and receive their approval (preferably in writing) of the requested action.

Based on the finding that this request is minor, Staff recommends that the front yard setback for Lot 1, Block 12 be approved per the attached plot plan and survey. Staff support is conditioned upon satisfying at least the intent of the notice process with evidence of compliance presented by the applicant at the TMAPC hearing.

Comments & Discussion:

The applicant submitted letters from the abutting property owners stating support of this request.

TMAPC ACTION: 9 members present

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the Planning Commission voted **8-0-1** (Carnes, Draughon, Kempe, Parmele, Rice, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, "abstaining"; (Doherty, Crawford, "absent")) to **APPROVE** the **Minor Amendment to Front Yard Setback for PUD 190-25**, as recommended by Staff.

* * * * *

Mr. VanFossen, referring to the City Commission's action on Z-6136/PUD 179-M (71st and Memorial area), asked Staff as to the status of the study for inclusion of this area in the Special District. Mr. Gardner stated that this was one of the items on the agenda for the Joint Work Session of the TMAPC Committees, as the Development Guidelines were to be reviewed for amendment to recognize these kinds of situations.

Discussion followed as to the time frame needed for review and amendment of the Development Guidelines to address this and other similar situations. The final consensus was to request that the INCOG Staff work on this project, to be completed within a six month time frame.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 2:28 p.m.

Date Approved 3-11-87
[Signature]
Chairman

ATTEST: [Signature]
Secretary

