

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1528  
Wednesday, October 31, 1984, 1:30 p.m.  
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center  
(Moved from Langenheim)

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Connery Draughon Kempe, 1st Vice- Chairman Paddock VanFossen Wilson Woodard	Higgins Rice Young	Compton Frank Gardner Wiles	Jackere, Legal Department

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Monday, October 29, 1984, at 10:50 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Cherry Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of WOODARD, the Planning Commission voted 5-0-2 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Paddock, Wilson, "abstaining"; Higgins, Rice, Young, "absent") to approve the Minutes of October 17, 1984 (No. 1526).

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Kempe informed there is a vacancy on the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee. She appointed Gary VanFossen to fill that vacancy and to Chair that Committee.

Committee Reports:

Comprehensive Plan Committee:

Chairman Kempe informed there will be a Comprehensive Plan Committee meeting at 12:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 7, 1984, in Room 1131 of City Hall. The purpose of that meeting will be to go over the Turkey Mountain Special District Study.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Continued Public Hearing for the purpose of considering amendments to the Major Street and Highway Plan by the following:

- (a) deletion of the expressway classification for Riverside from the southeast corner of the Inner Dispersal Loop extending south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to the Proposed Creek Expressway near 96th Street and South Delaware Avenue;
- (b) adoption of a new street and highway designation, titled Parkway, and Trafficway Right-of-Way Standards for said Parkway designation and;
- (c) designation of Riverside to a Parkway from approximately Denver Avenue and Riverside Drive south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to 131st Street, then east along 131st Street to South Memorial Drive.

---

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Compton informed that, since the Public Hearing on this matter was opened up at the last meeting, the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee and the Transportation Policy Committee have met concerning the amendments of the Riverside Corridor to the Major Street and Highway Plan. He is bringing before the Commission today the recommendations of the Transportation Policy Committee. As it exists, the Major Street and Highway Plan designates an expressway starting at the southeast corner of the Inner Dispersal going south along the abandoned right-of-way of the Midland Valley Railroad to the east bank of the Arkansas River, then further south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to the proposed location of the Creek Expressway near 96th Street and South Delaware Avenue. An expressway-type facility would require a 300-foot right-of-way and would have limited access. That portion of the expressway north of Skelly Drive came before the Planning Commission at a Public Hearing in December, 1981. The Planning Commission, at that time, recommended that the expressway from the Inner Dispersal Loop south to Skelly Drive be deleted, that a Parkway designation be placed from Denver Avenue to Skelly Drive, and that a Parkway classification and standards be adopted. This recommendation was taken to the City Commission where it was decided that action at that time would not be taken. The expressway designation south of Skelly Drive was not a part of this previous Public Hearing or the recommendations; however, at the request of Street Commissioner J. D. Metcalfe and the Transportation Policy Committee, the INCOG Staff evaluated the impact of deleting the expressway designation for the entire length and replacing it with a Parkway that extends farther south to the intersection of 131st Street and South Memorial Drive. The Staff's studies to date indicate that this change can accommodate future traffic loads without adversely impacting the overall transportation system. Mr. Compton submitted a packet of information which included a letter to the Commission from Commissioner

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

Metcalfe, who serves as Chairman to the Transportation Policy Committee (Exhibit "A-1"). The body of the letter reads as follows:

"The Tulsa Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (TMATS) Transportation Policy Committee met on Thursday, October 24, 1984, to discuss an amendment of the Tulsa City-County Major Street and Highway Plan regarding the Riverside Corridor.

The Transportation Policy Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Riverside Corridor be redesignated a Parkway from approximately Denver Avenue south to East 131st Street and South Memorial Drive with a requirement of 150 feet of right-of-way and limited access, as practicable.

The Transportation Policy Committee also recommended that the Parkway standards should require a minimum of 150 feet of right-of-way; a 30 foot median; a 38 foot cross section on either side of the median, specifically for roadway purposes; and a variable planning area on either side of the roadway.

It is my understanding that the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission opened the public hearing process on the Riverside Corridor issue on Wednesday, October 24, 1984, and the public hearing has been continued to Wednesday, October 31, 1984. Please consider the committee's recommendations in your actions on the amendment of the Tulsa City-County Major Street and Highway Plan for the Riverside Corridor and for the development of the Parkway standards."

Mr. Compton noted that the exact alignment of the parkway has not been determined at this point, and it can only be determined after the Engineering Department has completed functional design for the facility. What is being recommended is a Parkway facility which requires 150 feet of right-of-way as opposed to an expressway facility which requires 300 feet of right-of-way, thereby, in their opinion, reducing the impact to the abutting properties and neighborhoods.

Mr. Paddock asked Mr. Compton if, in the consideration that was given to this proposal, reference was made to the District 6 Plan and Text and the recommendations that were contained in that document. Mr. Compton informed that consideration was given to all the districts that this runs through. There may need to be some rehearings to change the Comprehensive Plan if the Major Street and Highway Plan is amended.

Mr. Connery asked whose definition of "Parkway" requires 150 feet of right-of-way, and Mr. Compton informed that is the definition that is being recommended. There is a variety of standards for a parkway. This definition is what was recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Committee after going through a review process.

Mr. VanFossen asked if Mr. Compton could show on the map what existing rights-of-way the City holds in this area and what widths they are. Mr.

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

Compton informed they do have that information sketched out on a plan and the widths vary all the way down the entire length of the proposed expressway.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Compton about the variable planning area on either side of the proposed roadway, and Mr. Compton informed that area exists on any roadway. In a right-of-way, an area is designated for the pavement to actually go through. It does not always go down the center of the right-of-way. The variable planning area is an area on either side of the roadway to allow utilities to go in and to allow other facilities like acceleration and deceleration lanes.

Mr. Woodard asked Mr. Compton how many residents would be affected as a result of this parkway, and Mr. Compton informed they will not know exactly where the street will be until detail plans are drawn. At this time, they are just looking at the Major Street and Highway Plan. On that Plan is shown a 300-foot wide corridor going through this area where an expressway would be located. They are recommending that that designation be changed to a parkway which would reduce that 300 foot wide area down to 150 feet. When the plans are developed, they would know exactly where the street will be located and what properties would be necessary to acquire.

Mr. Draughon asked Mr. Compton how many lanes of traffic will be on the parkway, and Mr. Compton informed that, under this proposal, when the parkway is completed, there will be six lanes--three lanes on each side of the median.

<u>Interested Parties:</u>	Addresses:
Herb Beattie	c/o The Williams Companies Box 2400
Tom Manhart	2703 Riverside Drive
Hal T. Gibson	124 East 24th
Jill Tarbel	3111 South Madison
Steve Schuller	202 Hazel Boulevard
Susan Douze	19 East 26th Place
Marcia Manhart	2703 Riverside Drive
Reah Duhl-Stammes	5658 S. Boston Avenue
John H. Ewert	16 East 26th Place
Harold B. Ward	7 East 26th Street
Robert R. Rosander	2114 South Norfolk
Herb Fritz	1217 S. Indian
Jim Owens	2301 South Boston
James L. Means	23 East 26th Place
John McCoy	2442 East 25th
Gary Madison	4 East 24th Street
Commissioner J. D. Metcalfe	200 Civic Center
Bill O'Brien	914 North First, Jenks
Al Frampton	5 East 25th Street

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

Interested Parties' Comments:

Ms. Kempe requested that the Interested parties confine their comments to the practicability and the desirability of having a 150-foot wide parkway rather than a 300-foot expressway.

Mr. Beattie informed that he would speak in favor of down-grading from the current expressway classification. He is a member of the River Parks Authority and is the Chairman of Park Friends which has put a lot of money into the River Parks. He feels that there is a third option--to leave Riverside as it is today. He feels that it is unnecessary to destroy this area with a Parkway.

Mr. Manhart informed he is the owner of a piece of property that would have to be taken because there is not much right-of-way in front of his house. He is not as concerned about that as he is about what this will do to the River Parks system. He does not think the impact that six lanes of traffic will have on the park system has been taken into consideration. It will cut the park in half--the north being one section, and the south being another section. He thinks this would be an enormous mistake. He feels that this park system is the most successful element that has been placed in this community in the last 20 years. He does not think that six lanes of traffic going through this area is a solution to the problems in the area. He suggested having reversible lanes to handle the rush hour traffic, and he informed he is concerned because no one has mentioned a solution like this.

Mr. Gibson informed he realizes that the Planning Commission has a problem they are trying to solve. He feels that this involves a question of getting people to and from Downtown Tulsa. He endorses the concept of a "Parkway" as opposed to an expressway because of the advantages that Mr. Compton mentioned concerning the amount of right-of-way that will be required. He has no objection to a parkway, but he does not want the streets closed that exit onto Riverside Drive (specifically, 26th Place and 31st Street). He would like the Commission to consider having at least one street from 21st to 31st have access to Riverside.

Ms. Kempe informed Mr. Gibson that his concern about having access to Riverside is one of the details that the Planning Commission does not even know about at this time.

Ms. Tarbel informed she feels there must be a third alternative. She feels that the River Parks system is one of the best things that has happened to Tulsa in several years, and she does not want the streets widened because she is afraid doing so would ruin that park system.

Mr. Schuller informed he does not feel that an expressway is needed along Riverside Drive. They would like to leave the street as it is. He is concerned that, if both a parkway and an expressway are abandoned at this time, some day people will once again press for an expressway down Riverside. He would rather have a parkway at this time than to leave it as it is and have someone come in later and build an expressway. A

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

parkway would at least provide for less loss of private property along the street than would an expressway. An expressway would restrict access to the River Parks, whereas a parkway would probably not do that. He described how a median would be helpful along Riverside Drive. He would also prefer at grade intersections which a parkway would provide as opposed to entrance ramps and bridges which would be provided on an expressway. He would like Riverside Drive to be left alone, but if anything is done, he would prefer a parkway over an expressway.

Ms. Douze informed she would like to have Riverside Drive left as it is. She is concerned that an expressway or a parkway would eliminate easy access to the Riverside Parks. She wanted to know if the Planning Commission has looked at more creative solutions to the traffic situation. She is concerned that building a parkway along Riverside will kill the Park system. She informed she does not see how the Planning Commission can vote yes or no on this proposal until they know how many residences will be destroyed as a result.

Ms. Manhart is concerned because the proposed parkway does encroach upon a historic district. She is worried about the designation of the historic district. She is also concerned about the parkland in the area. She does not think that a parkway will enhance the parks. She is against an expressway and a parkway because she thinks that Tulsa has too much at stake to destroy one of its finest assets--the River Parks.

Ms. Duhl-Stamnes informed she realizes that there will have to be some improvement to Riverside out where she lives. She would like to get rid of the expressway designation. She feels that the parkway designation is fine, but not where there are already buildings. She thinks the parkway would be great for new construction and she feels that it will solve problems farther out in Tulsa. She does not want to see the park system destroyed.

Mr. Ewert informed that the River Park system is in full use 24 hours a day. He is concerned because they cannot get across Riverside Drive because of the traffic. He does not think they need six lanes of traffic going down Riverside.

Mr. Ward informed he does not favor changing Riverside Drive at all. He feels that it should go down the old Midland Valley railroad tracks.

Mr. Rosander informed he does not think there is a major traffic problem on Riverside Drive. He thinks that four lanes is adequate. He does not see any need to build six lanes to accommodate approximately a half hour traffic problem each morning and each evening. He feels a parkway would destroy the River Parks and the close-in neighborhoods.

Mr. Fritz informed he is a Tulsa architect. He feels that a third option would be better than the expressway or a parkway. He is concerned about the health hazards which will be created by six lanes of traffic on Riverside Drive. He read some excerpts from a book entitled "The Granite Garden" which suggests that a heavy-usage highway is incompatible with

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

the current uses of the River Parks. He suggested that the landscaping proposed in the parkway designation be added, but that the road remain four lanes.

Mr. Owens informed he endorses dropping the expressway designation, but he feels this is just a game of words. He feels the highway planners, especially those who work for the City and State, are part of a very large and tragically inflexible bureaucracy. He thinks that the guidelines the Planning Commission gives the planners should have written into them the charge to be flexible and use common sense. Mr. Owens informed that someone who had been retained by the City to look at alternatives to the Riverside Expressway problem had been told that reversible lanes were an option that were not to be considered in his approach to a solution. Mr. Owens wants the planners to be flexible in planning the proposed parkway. He does not want the parkway designation to require 150 feet of right-of-way--he wants that number to be flexible.

Mr. Means wanted to make three points that have not been addressed. First, he informed there is a Black Letter Law that applies to any government agency that says that property in public use cannot be used for any other purpose without showing an over-riding necessity for that use. Riverside Drive cannot be extended into the park, because he has yet to see an over-riding necessity to do so. Secondly, he described the history of Riverside Drive and how it came about, and he informed that Riverside Drive was intended to be an access road to the River Parks system. It is his understanding that if this road is used for any other purpose, title first must go back to the original titled land owners and their heirs and must be passed with their permission. Thirdly, he feels that there are other alternatives. He likes the idea of closing the streets from Riverside Drive to the residential neighborhoods.

Mr. McCoy informed he does not think the alternative of a parkway is a good idea because of the higher speeds and the safety involved because this area is so crowded. He suggested putting a parkway on the west side of the river to connect with the southern parts of the City.

Mr. Madison informed he does not understand what options the Planning Commission has today. Ms. Kempe informed this hearing is to consider an amendment to the Major Street and Highway Plan which currently designates Riverside Drive as an expressway corridor.

Commissioner Metcalfe, the current Commissioner of Streets and Public Property, informed he has advocated this as Chairman of the Policy Planning Commission. He presided at the meeting in which the members of that body unanimously approved the recommendation of the Technical meeting. He informed that, at the present time, they have as part of the Major Street and Highway system a 300 foot expressway providing for interchanges at very selected locations, and, otherwise, no access. He described how this would impact the people in the area. The parkway would have 150 feet of right-of-way and at grade intersections. There would be access at suitable locations. There would be no impact, as long

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

as he is the Commissioner of Streets and Public Property, upon the River Parks. They would have, at suitable locations, provisions for pedestrian overpasses to the River Parks. There would be no increase in the present posted speeds on Riverside Drive. He pointed out that, regardless of what action the Planning Commission takes today, before the process is completed, the City Commission would have to act. If there is any activity at all, proper funding would have to come at some stage in the future from City government--it would be either in the form of a bond issue or other means by which to raise money. If the funding was approved, functional plans would have to be drawn up by a qualified consulting engineer. Once the functional plans were approved, detail plans and specifications would follow, and then the purchase of right-of-way would take place. Utilities would have to be relocated if needed, and then actual construction would proceed. He pointed out that, at every step of the way, the review process would be open as far as the public is concerned. No property would be purchased without proper compensation. He asked that the Commission give consideration to resolving this problem that has gone on for some time. In his opinion, leaving it in its current status only contributes to uncertainty, and it does not allow developers to the south of 61st Street to know what might be expected in the future. In his opinion, the expressway designation should be deleted, and a parkway designation should be substituted in its place.

Mr. O'Brien informed he is for the parkway from 51st Street to 121st Street. He does not want it to go to 131st Street.

Mr. Frampton informed he would like Riverside Drive left alone from 51st Street into downtown and would like the parkway left as it is from the standpoint of adding any more traffic to it. He would like there to be better access to the Red Fork Expressway so that people would not have to use Riverside Drive to come into downtown.

Comments and questions:

Ms. Wilson asked the Staff if reversible lanes had been taken into consideration when the study was made. Mr. Compton informed that for years there have been discussions with the Major Street and Highway Plan in consideration to reversible lanes. It is a means of moving traffic without increasing the amount of lanes necessary. The parkway would not be built right now. There would have to be further studies, etc., and in those studies the Staff would be looking at all the alternatives of how traffic can flow on Riverside. The Planning Commission can make a recommendation to the Staff to address other alternatives. At this point they have been looking at traffic flows on segments of the Major Street and Highway Plan. They identified that, by reducing from an Expressway to a Parkway, there would not be an adverse impact on the remainder of the traffic system. He informed that there is no parkway designation on the Major Street and Highway Plan right now. He told why they would like to have this designation.

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

Mr. VanFossen asked what procedures would take place between now and the time a road would be built. He wanted to know if the Planning Commission would have an opportunity to review plans before the road is built. Bill Thomas of the City Traffic Engineering Department informed that if this roadway is redesignated as a parkway, the decision of what to build in the parkway right-of-way would come from the Street Commissioners' Office and would be publicized. The plans would be made public and would have to be approved by the City Commission.

Mr. Connery asked Mr. Owens to clarify what he had in mind concerning the 150 feet right-of-way for a parkway. Mr. Owens informed he does not want the right-of-way to have to be 150 feet if the parkway designation is made. He thinks that what people are uptight about is not the word definition. The parkway concept was explained to him by the consultant hired by the City as being restricted access. His problem is a definition stating that the right-of-way has to be 150 feet or it is not a parkway. He thinks that in areas where there is restricted real estate, access could be restricted without knocking down everything within eyesight. He thinks the definition of Parkway should be flexible enough to where they are not held or constrained to the 150 foot minimum.

Mr. Lasker informed the reason they need a specification for a parkway is that they are redoing the Transportation Plan. There may be other parkways that are proposed in other areas of Tulsa, and they need a specification in which to make that design. Mr. Lasker informed that everyone likes the River Parks and nobody is out to destroy that park system. Any roadway done by the City is going to be put in in such a way that it will accommodate all the uses in the area. They need something to accommodate the forecasted traffic loads, and the studies they have done have suggested that they need more than four lanes down Riverside Drive. He thinks the question of reversible lanes is something that needs further study. Mr. Lasker informed that INCOG will do a study of reversible lanes as part of the update of the transportation study and this will be accomplished by the end of this fiscal year. They do need the classification in the Plan, and the engineers have said that 150 feet is something that they should be looking at. In the undeveloped areas they can accommodate that, but in the developed areas, they may want something different. He feels that there is the flexibility to do something different.

Mr. Paddock asked Mr. Lasker if he thinks there should be a definition of parkway inserted in the Zoning Code should the parkway designation be adopted, and Mr. Lasker informed he doesn't mind putting in a definition, but he does not know what purpose it would serve. The definition will have to be in the Comprehensive Plan and the Functional Transportation Plan.

Mr. Paddock asked Mr. Lasker if the 150 feet of right-of-way is predicated upon the six lanes with a 30 foot median, and Mr. Lasker informed that it is. Mr. Lasker informed that the Planning Commission

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

needs to recognize that this does not just deal with one parkway along Riverside, it deals with a classification that will be used in the Transportation Plan that could be used to accommodate other designated parkways when revisions are made to the Plan. The planners need a number to go by, and six lanes is what is needed.

Mr. Manhart asked if there is any format in place where people within a neighborhood can discuss their questions with the planners, and Ms. Kempe informed that changes in the Major Street and Highway Plan could affect the District Plans. At the District Plan level there is an opportunity to sit down and discuss with the planners. Mr. Compton informed that the Greater District Council has input into the District Plans and is also a vehicle for discussion for any sort of planning activity. The INCOG Staff can be available at those meetings. GTC is an organization that was established in order to have citizen input into the planning process.

Mr. VanFossen informed he likes the definition of parkway as related to parks. One of the reasons for the 150 feet of right-of-way is to create a park atmosphere with a median in the middle. He informed that most of the major arterial streets in the City are designated 120 feet although, in most cases, the City does not own anywhere near that amount of land. Having the right-of-way means that the City has the right to use that property if it really becomes necessary. Mr. VanFossen informed he would be opposed to using the 150 feet down from 51st Street to Denver Avenue, but he feels it is appropriate at this point to designate that property so that if there is the need in the future to use it, they will be able to.

Mr. Paddock informed that Commissioner Metcalfe has assured the Commission that if the designation is changed, it will in no way adversely impact the River Parks.

Ms. Wilson informed she likes the concept of having pedestrian overpasses because she feels they are an absolute necessity. She informed she has no objections to the parkway concept.

Mr. Woodard informed that not only will the six-lane parkway affect the residences in the area, it will also affect the park atmosphere. He informed he cannot support the application.

Mr. Connery informed he has no objection to deleting the expressway classification, and he has no objection to adopting the parkway classification. He cannot, at this time, accept defining a parkway as having a minimum of 150 feet of right-of-way unless it is in a new development situation. He thinks that 150 feet down Riverside Drive is a luxury that cannot be afforded. He thinks a third alternative should be considered. He would support a definition of parkway which would state that a parkway could contain up to a maximum of 150 feet.

Mr. VanFossen informed that the people along a right-of-way designation must know what could be taken from them. He feels there has to be a

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

designation of some degree so that there can be a definition for people to go by. He informed he would support designating this as parkway with the hope that the right-of-way will be used only if necessary.

Ms. Kempe informed she supports deleting the expressway classification from the Major Street and Highway Plan, and she can support the parkway designation with the hope that, in the detail planning stages, the appropriate amount of right-of-way is all that will be used.

Mr. Paddock asked if the Planning Commission can be involved in the design process of this roadway before it goes to the City Commission for consideration. Mr. Compton informed that, at this point, the Planning Commission being involved in the design process would be a unique situation. In previous times, those sorts of public hearings have been before the City Commission. He assumed that, with the support of Commissioner Metcalfe and the City Traffic Engineer, there could be some means where this could come back to the Planning Commission for their review when the design of those areas become available.

Mr. Paddock suggested that there could be a working session of the City Commission in which citizens could have their input.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 5-2-0 (Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, "aye"; Connery, Woodard, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Rice, Young, "absent") to approve\* the amendments to the Major Street and Highway Plan as proposed by the Staff.

\*This motion failed for the lack of six affirmative votes.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Draughon asked if this would be sent on to the City Commission showing the split vote, and Mr. Gardner informed that this Commission is charged with amending the Major Street and Highway Plan as a part of the Comprehensive Plan--that takes six affirmative votes. Without six affirmative votes the Planning Commission has done nothing--Riverside is still designated as an expressway on the Plan. Mr. Gardner informed that from a planning standpoint the Commission is charged with moving the traffic and the traffic demands within the City. The parkway designation was a compromise. If there is not a standard given for right-of-way designation, then a developer does not know how much right-of-way must be dedicated south of 61st Street as he develops those areas.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of of WILSON, the Planning Commission voted 5-0-2 (Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Connery, Draughon "abstaining"; Higgins, Rice, Young, "absent") to reconsider the amendments to the Major Street and Highway Plan as proposed by the Staff.

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

Comments and questions:

Mr. VanFossen informed that if the Planning Commission does not amend the Plan as proposed, Riverside will still be designated as an expressway--he does not want to leave it that way.

Mr. Jackere informed that under the present designation of expressway, not only could an expressway be built, but a parkway could be built as shown on the presented plan. The parkway designation, if adopted, is intended to place limitations and nothing more on what is conceivable and possible at this time.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Connery if his major objection to this proposal deals with the description of 150 feet as being in the definition, and Mr. Connery informed that is one of his objections. He informed that it has been his experience that once anything is defined, anyone who comes along will go to the maximum that is allowed to use the definition to their advantage.

Ms. Wilson informed she thinks the Planning Commission could state that they would like common sense to be used in the construction of the parkway. She informed she definitely thinks the expressway designation needs to be taken off of the Plan and needs to be replaced with something that is a more viable alternative.

There was discussion about the flexibility concerning the right-of-way that would be provided if the Commission approves these standards for a parkway. Mr. Jackere pointed out that the State Law requires that after the adoption of a Major Street and Highway Comprehensive Plan, no improvement embraced within that Plan can be approved until those plans are brought to this Commission and approved by this Commission. They will have an opportunity to look at specific proposals by the City Engineer for the construction of a Parkway or whatever he may have in mind.

Ms. Wilson informed that Lasker agreed to do the reversible lane study prior to the end of this fiscal year.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present.

On MOTION of VANFOSSEN, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughton, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Rice, Young, "absent") to approve the following amendments to the Major Street and Highway Plan as follows:

- (a) deletion of the expressway classification for Riverside from the southeast corner of the Inner Dispersal Loop extending south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to the Proposed Creek Expressway near 96th Street and South Delaware Avenue;

Public Hearing: Major Street and Highway Plan (continued)

- (b) adoption of a new street and highway designation, titled Parkway, and Trafficway Right-of-Way Standards for said Parkway designation and;
- (c) designation of Riverside to a Parkway from approximately Denver Avenue and Riverside Drive south along the east bank of the Arkansas River to 131st Street, then east along 131st Street to South Memorial Drive.

Continuation of a public hearing on proposed amendments to Title 42, Tulsa Zoning Code, Section 1730.3 Notice Required, to comply with Oklahoma Statutes. Law requires publication of a map identifying the area of request.

---

Mr. Gardner informed last week the Legal Department brought before the Commission a proposed amendment having to do with notice so that the Zoning Code would be consistent with the State Statutes. He informed that this amendment will change only Section 1730.3(a). Since the last meeting the Legal Department has inserted the wording in the last provision "by publication as above provided" so that there is no question that a map has to be published and that the property has to be posted, but the notice does not have to be sent out to the property owners within 300 feet. The Staff recommends approval of the revised language per the Legal Department to amend Title 42, Chapter 17, Section 1730.3 a. of the Tulsa Revised Ordinances as follows:

"a. The Planning Commission shall give notice of public hearing on any proposed zoning change as follows:

1. At least twenty (20) days' notice of the date, time, and place of the hearing by publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Tulsa. Said notice shall include a map of the area to be affected which indicates street names or numbers, streams, or other significant landmarks in said area.

2. By posting of the affected property at least twenty (20) days before the date of the hearing. The notice shall state:

- a. The date, time, and place of the public hearing; and
- b. Who will conduct the public hearing; and
- c. The present and desired zoning classifications; and
- d. The proposed use of the property; and
- e. Other information as may be necessary to provide adequate and timely public notice.

3. Twenty (20) days notice by mailing written notice to all owners of real property included in the proposed change and all owners of real property within a three hundred (300) foot radius of the exterior boundary of the property included in the proposed change. The notice shall contain:

- a. The legal description of the property and the street address or approximate location in the City of Tulsa; and

Public Hearing: Title 42 (continued)

- b. The present zoning of the property and the zoning sought by the applicant; and
- c. The date, time and place of the public hearing.

Provided that, if the City of Tulsa proposes zoning reclassifications in order to revise its comprehensive plan or official map or to identify areas which require specific land use development due to topography, geography or other distinguishing features, including but not limited to floodplain, drainage, historic preservation and blighted areas, mailing of notice as above provided shall not be required and notice shall be given at least twenty (20) days before the date of the hearing by publication as above provided and by posting on designated properties within the area affected by the proposed zoning reclassification. The sign and the lettering thereon shall be of sufficient size so as to be clearly visible and legible from the public street or streets toward which it faces and shall state:

- (1). The date, time and place of the public hearing; and
- (2). Who will conduct the public hearing; and
- (3). The desired zoning classification; and
- (4). The proposed use of the property; and
- (5). Other information as may be necessary to provide adequate and timely public notice."

The Staff submitted a sample map (Exhibit "B-1") and informed that they recommend that the published map be two columns wide--it will cost \$80 or less. This size of map can be tried for a period of time to see if it will be sufficient. It will be the Staff's responsibility to provide to the Legal News the map that they will publish. Legal News has said that a one-column wide map cannot be read. He informed that this amendment will change only Section 1730.3(a).

There was discussion about whether or not street names would be legible on the published map. Mr. Gardner informed the Staff will identify those streets that are most readily identifiable, such as major streets, collectors, etc. They will also identify two local streets if the subject tract is located interior to a neighborhood.

Public Hearing: Title 42 (continued)

On MOTION of PADDOCK, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Connery, Draughon, Kempe, Paddock, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Higgins, Rice, Young, "absent") to approve the amendment to Section 1730.3 of Title 42, Tulsa Zoning Code, per the language submitted by the Legal Department, and to approve publication of a two-column wide map of the area of request for each advertised case for a trial period.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Date Approved December 13, 1984

Cheryl Kempe  
Chairman

ATTEST:

Marilyn A. Wilson  
Secretary