

**TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION**  
Minutes of Meeting No. 1855  
Wednesday, October 2, 1991, 1:30 p.m.  
City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

<b>Members Present</b>	<b>Members Absent</b>	<b>Staff Present</b>	<b>Others Present</b>
Ballard	Harris	Gardner	Linker, Legal
Carnes	Neely	Hester	Counsel
Doherty, 1st Vice Chairman	Wilson	Stump	
Draughon,		Wilmoth	
Horner			
Midget, Mayor's Designee			
Parmeale, Chairman			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Tuesday, October 1, 1991 at 12:29 p.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 1:35 p.m.

**Minutes:**

Approval of the minutes of 1853, September 18, 1991, Meeting No. 181853:

On **MOTION** of **DRAUGHON**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-1** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; Horner "abstaining"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of September 18, 1991 Meeting No. 1853.

**REPORTS:**

**Rules and Regulations**

Mr. Doherty announced the Rules and Regulations Committee will meet October 9, 1991, at 11:30 a.m., in the INCOG Large Conference Room to finalize recommendations on antennas and towers.

**Subdivisions:**

**Preliminary Plat:**

Swan Lake Amended (793) (PD-6) (CD-4)  
1586 Swan Lake Drive

(RS-3)

**Staff Recommendation**

This plat is being filed in connection with the abandonment of PUD 463 scheduled for TMAPC review on 9/25/91. The resulting plat is almost identical to a previous lot split approved prior to platting

and inclusion in PUD 463. The office building on South Utica is not included in this plat and the zoning on that tract will remain as is. In order to save some processing time, this plat will be scheduled for TMAPC review on 10/2/91, a week after the abandonment of the PUD, but before City Council abandonment review. (Usually plats are not scheduled until after Council approval of zoning and/or PUD, but in this case the abandonment of the PUD and the plat can be done concurrently to save some processing time.) A "Draft Final" should be circulated for release letters.

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Adrian Smith.

On MOTION of HILL, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plat of *Swan Lake Amended*, subject to the following conditions:

1. Legal description under title and in Deed of Dedication should reflect that this plat is an amendment of "Swan Lake" (Plat #4810). Identify remainder of Swan Lake on plat.
2. Easements shall meet the approval of utilities and the Department of Public Works (Stormwater). Show any additional easements if required.
3. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Stormwater Management and/or Engineering), including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by the City of Tulsa. If the storm sewer has been installed on the easterly side of Lot 1, show the easement therefor.
4. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations.
5. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Mr. Wilmoth noted this now consists of three single-family lots which face Swan Drive. He pointed out these lots taper and staff has calculated the average lot width and they do meet the RS-3 district requirements.

There were no interested parties present wishing to speak.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On MOTION of DRAUGHON, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Plat of *Swan Lake Amended*, subject to staff recommendation.

Final Approval and Release:

Bizjet Addition (2203) (PD-16) (CD-3)

3400 Block N. Sheridan Road

(IL)

Staff Recommendation

Mr. Wilmoth advised all release letters have been received and staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** the Final Plat for Bizjet Addition **RELEASE** same as having met all conditions of approval.

\* \* \* \* \*

Extension of Final Approval

Gilcrease Oaks (PUD-413-A) (392) (PD-10) (CD-2)

(CS, RM-1, RS-3)

NE/c Keystone Expressway & Gilcrease Museum Road

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends a one year extension. Most release letters have been received, but the plat has not been filed because of the economy.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** one year extension of final approval of Gilcrease Oaks.

\* \* \* \* \*

Waiver Request; Section 213

BOA-15837 Buenos Vista Subdivision (1202) (PD-25) (CD-1)

(RS-3)

1224 E. 50th Street North

Staff Recommendation

This is a request to waive plat on Lot 3, block 2 of the above named subdivision. The Board of Adjustment approved a day care use on this lot on September 24, 1991, utilizing the existing house on the property. Since the lot is already platted and improvements are in place, and controls set by the Board of Adjustment, it is recommended the plat requirement be waived, noting that the

existing plat of record meets the requirements of Section 213 of the Code.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** Waiver Request of Buenos Vista Subdivision

\* \* \* \* \*

BOA-15813 Unplatted (583) (PD-18) (CD-8) (RS-1)  
East and South of 61st Street and South Lewis Avenue

**Staff Recommendation**

This is a request to waive plat requirement on a 600' x 600' tract entirely within the confines of the existing Southern Hills Country Club. The application approved by the Board of Adjustment was to permit the enclosure of existing tennis courts and reduce unnecessary lighting in the abutting residential neighborhood. Since this tract is all interior, contains no new uses, and would not serve any purpose as a platted tract, Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the request as submitted, noting that controls and conditions set by the Board of Adjustment will suffice for section 213 of the Code.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** request to waive plat requirement on BOA-15813.

\* \* \* \* \*

Lot Splits for Ratification of Prior Approval  
L-17445 Roark (2993) (PD-6) (CD-9) 2915 E. 44th Pl  
L-17452 Altman (2892) (PD-8) (CD-2) 5000 S. 45th W. Ave.

**Staff Recommendation**

Mr. Wilmoth advised the above listed lot splits were in order and staff recommends approval.

**TMAPC Action; 8 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **RATIFY** the above listed lot splits having received prior approval.

\* \* \* \* \*

Other Business

**PUD 179-C** Detail Landscape Plan for Development Area "B" --  
West of the southwest corner of East 71st Street  
South and South 85th East Avenue

Staff Recommendation

Staff has reviewed the Detail Landscape Plan for Development Area of "B" of PUD 179-C, Village Inn Restaurant, and finds that it complies with the PUD standards. Therefore, Staff recommends **APPROVAL**.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson "absent") to **APPROVE** the Detail Landscaped Plan for PUD 179-C.

\* \* \* \* \*

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING  
TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF TULSA  
ZONING CODE REGARDING THE PARKING OF  
RECREATIONAL VEHICLES, BOATS, ETC**

Chairman Parmele advised the first public hearing was held August 21, 1991 and continued until today. He explained the procedure would be to first hear from staff for an outline of the proposed amendments to the zoning code, then from the Rules and Regulations Committee, which has reviewed the amendments and will make a recommendation, and finally from any interested parties wishing to speak.

Mr. Gardner reported that the legal department instructed an agricultural district be added because of residential subdivisions being zoned AG Agricultural; standards should be the same for all residential areas. The proposed amendments are as follows:

**PROPOSED RECREATIONAL VEHICLES REGULATIONS**

**A. Accessory Uses Permitted In Agriculture Districts**

Other than for purposes of loading and unloading, which shall take place within a 48 hour period, recreational vehicles located in an **AG** District shall be parked or stored:

1. Inside a garage, or
2. Within a rear yard, if located at least three feet from any lot line; provided, however, where said lot line abuts a public street, the recreational vehicle shall be setback from the centerline of the street 20 feet plus one-half of the right-of-way designated

on the Major Street and Highway Plan, or 45 feet from the centerline of the street if said street is not designated on the Major Street and Highway Plan; or

3. Within a side yard; provided, the vehicle does not encroach into the required side yard, except recreational vehicles which are less than six (6) feet in height (excluding height of the outboard motor or windshield) may be **parked or stored** in a required side yard if screened by a six (6) foot screening fence along the lot line nearest the vehicle and extending the full length of the vehicle; or
4. Within the front yard, provided:
  - (a) space is not available or there is no reasonable access to either the side yard or rear yard; a corner lot is always deemed to have reasonable access to the rear yard; a fence is not necessarily deemed to prevent reasonable access;
  - (b) parking inside the garage is not possible **because of the size of the garage structure;**
  - (c) the unit is parked perpendicular to the front lot line;
  - (d) the body of the recreational vehicle is at least twelve (12) feet from the face of the curb or traveled portion of the street, but in no instance shall any portion of the vehicle extend over a sidewalk; and
  - (e) not more than one recreational vehicle is **parked or stored in the front yard.** A combination boat and **boat** trailer is considered one recreational vehicle.

**B. Accessory Use Conditions in the Agriculture District**

The parking and storage of recreational vehicles in an AG District is permitted as set out above provided:

1. the vehicle is not used for dwelling purposes;
2. the vehicle is not permanently connected to sewer lines, water lines, or electricity; **and**
3. the vehicle is not used for storage of goods, materials, or equipment other than those items; considered to be a part of the unit or essential for its use as a recreational vehicle.

**C. Accessory Uses Permitted In Residential Districts**

Other than for purposes of loading and unloading, which shall take place within a 48 hour period, recreational vehicles located in an R District shall be parked or stored:

1. Inside a garage, or
2. **Within a rear yard, if located at least three feet from any lot line; provided, however, where said lot line abuts a public street, the recreational**

vehicle shall be setback from the centerline of the street 20 feet plus one-half of the right-of-way designated on the Major Street and Highway Plan, or 45 feet from the centerline of the street if said street is not designated on the Major Street and Highway Plan; or

3. Within a side yard; provided, the vehicle does not encroach into the required side yard, except recreational vehicles which are less than six (6) feet in height (excluding height of the outboard motor or windshield) may be **parked or stored** in a required side yard if screened by a six (6) foot screening fence along the lot line nearest the vehicle and extending the full length of the vehicle; or
4. Within the front yard, provided:
  - (a) space is not available or there is no reasonable access to either the side yard or rear yard; a corner lot is always deemed to have reasonable access to the rear yard; a fence is not necessarily deemed to prevent reasonable access;
  - (b) parking inside the garage is not possible **because of the size of the garage structure;**
  - (c) the unit is parked perpendicular to the front lot line;
  - (d) the body of the recreational vehicle is at least twelve (12) feet from the face of the curb or traveled portion of the street, but in no instance shall any portion of the vehicle extend over a sidewalk and;
  - (e) not more than one recreational vehicle is parked or stored **in the front yard.** A combination boat and **boat trailer** is considered one recreational vehicle.

D. Accessory Use Conditions in Residential Districts

The parking and storage of recreational vehicles in an R District is permitted as set out above provided:

1. the vehicle is not used for dwelling purposes;
2. the vehicle is not permanently connected to sewer lines, water lines, or electricity; **and**
3. the vehicle is not used for storage of goods, materials, or equipment other than those items; considered to be a part of the unit or essential for its use as a recreational vehicle.

E. Use of Yards in R Districts

No inoperative or unlicensed motor vehicles shall be parked or stored within the front or exterior side yard in an R district. No vehicle shall be parked or stored except on a hard surface area constructed of an all-weather material. **The width and length of the hard**

surfaced area on which the vehicle is parked or stored shall be equal to or greater than the width and length of the vehicle being parked or stored. Within the RM districts not more than one vehicle shall be parked for each 600 square feet of area contained in a required front or exterior side yard. (Section 210.C).

F. Board of Adjustment

Subject to the requirements of Section 1607.C, the Board of Adjustment may, as a minor special exception, permit recreational vehicles to be parked or stored in the front yard, or required side yard if the conditions listed above cannot be met.

G. Definitions

**All-Weather Material:** A hard surface, dust-free material capable, during ordinary use, of withstanding without substantial deterioration, normal weather conditions. **Gravel, rock, or screenings alone, without use of a petroleum or cement binder, does not meet the definition of an all-weather, dust-free material.**

**Recreational Vehicle:** A trailer, boat trailer, travel trailer, camping trailer, truck camper, camper shell, motor home, tent trailer, boat, houseboat, or similar vehicle or unit. Camper shells which are attached to a pickup truck are not considered a recreational vehicle.

Mr. Gardner reviewed the changes made from the first draft and explained the reason for the changes. Changes and additions are in bold print.

Mr. Gardner stated the Planning Commission was given copies of letters and photos received to support arguments that recreational vehicles should be prohibited from the front yard. One of the examples was an unlicensed recreational vehicle which had been damaged on one side and is never moved or used as a recreational vehicle. He stated there may be a way to require having such an unlicensed vehicle removed if it is not used for recreational purposes, which may be something to consider while progressing with the public hearing.

Comments and Discussion

Mr. Doherty commented that the Rules and Regulations Committee had met at great length to consider these amendments with input from the public, elected officials, and staff. The proposed amendments represent a compromise. He pointed out that some people have encouraged banning of recreational vehicles outright while others have encouraged leaving the area completely alone. Legal council had informed the Committee that according to the current ordinance storage of a recreational vehicle on residential property is not authorized. The Committee is attempting to make provision in the Zoning Code where such provision had been absent previously. It



was the consensus of the Committee to recommend adoption of the proposed amendments to the zoning code as presented today.

Mr. Parmele reported that a number of letters were received both in support of and in opposition to the proposed amendments. Also a petition was presented. All these will be a part of the record which will be forwarded to the City Council. He commented that the proposed ordinance allows parking of recreational vehicles and/or boats, etc in the front yard if the back yard or side yard can not be used and if certain conditions are met.

Interested Parties

**Virginia Lewis** **3739 East King Place**  
Ms. Lewis asked if speaking at the public hearings was taken in to consideration regarding support of or opposition to the proposed amendments. Mr. Parmele assured her it was. She felt her rights would be violated if control is taken over private property and use of her own land. She believed her neighbors would find a 6' screening fence more offensive than the sight of her recreational vehicle. Ms. Lewis stated the type fence required should be the decision of herself and her neighbors and not complainers in a few exclusive neighbors. In addition, she felt the fence would restrict vision of neighborhood watch groups.

**Arthur Petros** **218 S Sandusky**  
Mr. Petros asked clarification of *permanently attached to electricity*. He remarked he failed to see why gravel driveways, which are hard packed and had been in existence for many years, should require paving under the proposed ordinance. Mr. Petros inquired why enforcement of other vehicles blocking sidewalks were not currently enforced. He felts this is discriminating against recreational vehicle owners.

Mr. Doherty responded in regard to permanent connections that Candy Parnell of Protective Inspections, who would be enforcing the code, has advised a permanent connection would be hard wire from the utility pole and not a temporary extension cord attachment. In response to the comment of vehicles blocking the sidewalk Mr. Doherty acknowledged this is currently against the law and is an enforcement problem. He acknowledged in some areas there are hard packed driveways that would not hurt anything to allow recreational vehicle parking; however, according to the current code they are nonconforming. The reason for the hard surface is to eliminate dust, weeds, etc. for health purposes.

**Golan Winkler** **3345 South Louisville**  
Mr. Winkler, Disaster Director of the Southern Plains, stated he must keep his vehicle in a constant state of readiness which requires an electrical connection.

Mr. Doherty reiterated that an extension cord was not considered a permanent connection.

**Maurice Kisler**

**4218 South Darlington Place**

Mr. Kisler complimented the Planning Commission on the work accomplished and extended his approval of the revised draft.

**James Godwin**

**1605 East 54th Place**

Mr. Godwin stated he believed the Planning Commission was trying to be too specific in expressing exact distance requirements. He suggested specifying footage for vehicle setback perhaps by expressing that it be well out of the traffic pattern and well onto private property. He will not meet the 45' from centerline requirement without infringing onto his neighbor's yard.

Mr. Parmele acknowledged the amendments can not be specifically tailored to fit every situation. Hopefully, there can be provided a measure of relief so when exceptions occur there may be possible alternatives.

Mr. Doherty stated the Planning Commission intends to recommend to the Board of Adjustment (BOA) that such cases be considered as a minor variance at a reduced fee. This will enable citizens to appear before the Board, present their cases and get relief.

Mr. Godwin disagreed with the requirement of installing a privacy fence when a boat is in the side yard.

Mr. Doherty explained this was to screen the boat from the adjacent yard.

Mr. Godwin stated that it appears this was for aesthetic purposes and feels this is unconstitutional.

Mr. Doherty stated legal council had advised to the contrary.

Mr. Gardner clarified the only time a fence is required, and this is only for the length of the vehicle, is if it is in the required side yard. Many subdivisions have a required 5' side yard, if there is a large side yard no fence is required.

**Leonard Goddard**

**10931 E 28th Street**

Mr. Goddard stated he spoke at the first public hearing and had the preconceived notion that the Planning Commission was attempting to run recreational vehicles out of town. He stated there is no enforcement of those violating common decency in the neighborhood. He feels strongly many RVers will not be able to comply to the letter of the proposed amendments and if some exception can be made without a lot of expense and inconvenience then the Planning Commission has come up with a good ordinance.

**Charles McCaughin**

**1627 S. Baltimore**

Mr. McCaughin distributed copies of the constitution to the Planning Commission. He referred to the 4th amendment which relates being secure in one's personal effects and the right of privacy to be preserved. Mr. McCaughin feels the easement is where the city's rights to govern cease except in regard to health or

safety matters. He stated he did not have an RV, but does admit to having unkempt property and feels the constitution gives him this right. He questioned zoning for aesthetic purposes. He stated that the amount of money needed to ask for a variance from the Board of Adjustment is a fraud and feels this ordinance is being created to increase revenues. He feels the Planning Commission is violating the law in order to make the city pretty. There must be a place to stop; he believes the easement is that place.

**Charles Ketterer**

**9225 East 58th Street**

Mr. Ketterer is president of the Union Homeowners Association. He gave a specific example of not being able to park an RV on a corner lot. He questioned if it would then be possible to park in the front, yet not meet the propose front parking requirement.

Mr. Doherty responded that such a situation would require convincing the BOA and the neighbors it would be acceptable to park in the front. Should the neighbors show good cause why this would not be acceptable, the BOA would not approve.

Mr. Parmele added the Planning Commission will recommend the BOA charge a minimum fee.

Mr. Ketterer asked about measurements from center of street.

Discussion ensued regarding conditions for parking in a side yard. Requirements for parking to be within the requirements of the proposed ordinance were discussed at length.

Mr. Ketterer stated his objection to the 45' parking from centerline requirement and under the proposed ordinance would not be allowed to park within his house line.

**Deborah Redding**

**1627 S Baltimore Avenue**

Ms. Redding stated Article IV of the Constitution deals with property rights, Article V with how to amend it, and VI makes it be the supreme law of the land. She feels the proposed ordinance supersedes federal law. She questioned the Planning Commission's right to rule on aesthetics.

**Ms Dodson**

**802 S Birch PL, Broken Arrow**

Ms. Dodson, with the Loners Association of RVers, asked if the grandfather clause would apply.

Mr. Doherty replied it would not apply in this case.

**Dan Shumaker**

**842 N. Irvington**

Mr. Shumaker stated from the front of his garage to the curb is 37'. He stated that he would not have room to park his RV legally under the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Parmele stated that Mr. Shumaker would be able to go to the BOA to obtain relief so he may park there legally.

Mr. Doherty stated the best that could be recommended to the City Council was an ordinance, that while it leaves him illegal as he is now parked, does provides for an avenue of relief through BOA.

**Joe Creekmore**

**3172 E 26th Street**

Mr. Creekmore stated this ordinance came about because of instances in District 8. He expressed concern regarding the expense of the BOA fee.

**Olin Boyer**

**10810 E. 27th Street**

He stated he originally had come to complain, but after reviewing the proposed ordinance believes it looks good. He feels if the city pursues the new ordinance with the same vigor as current ordinances are enforced there will be nothing to be concerned about.

**Deborah Redding**

Ms. Redding inquired about complaints that would go before BOA, she asked who would make the complaints.

Mr. Parmele explained that should a neighbor complain to Code Enforcement, then Code Enforcement would make the inspection of the violation. In response to Ms. Redding's inquiry Mr. Parmele responded that any citizen could make a complaint.

Ms. Redding asked what the process was to apply for a variance.

Mr. Parmele replied application would be made to BOA through INCOG for a special exception.

Mr. Doherty explained BOA would give notice to the neighbors that a case was being heard. The neighbors could then comment in writing or may attend the hearing.

Ms. Redding asked about reduction of the filing fee.

Mr. Parmele stated the Planning Commission intended to recommend by letter, along with the proposed draft, that the fee be minimal. The regular filing fee is \$150.00, and he feels \$25.00 would be appropriate.

**Paul Kendal**

**4813 E. 26th Street**

Mr. Kendal inquired how many of the Commissioners had an RV that complied with the regulation.

Comments and Discussion

Mr. Doherty submitted letters and photographs received to be made a part of the record.

Since there were no others wishing to address the Planning Commission Mr. Parmele announced the public hearing closed.

Review Session

Mr. Carnes suggested taking a vote on recommending a filing fee to the City Council.

In response to Mr. Doherty's question on the cost to process an application through BOA, Mr. Gardner responded \$25.00 is the public hearing fee set out by statutes, and that the additional \$125 processing fee only covers about 1/3 of the actual cost to process a request.

Mr. Carnes made the motion that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council a \$25.00 filing fee under this proposal presented to the City Council.

TMAPC Action; 7 members present:

On MOTION of CARNES, the TMAPC voted 7-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson Woodard "absent") to APPROVE recommendation to the City Council of a \$25.00 minimum statutory filling fee for recreational vehicles.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Doherty advised Mr. Ketterer brought up a valid point on the 45' requirement from center line. This is a statutory designation on buildings; however, as Mr. Ketterer pointed out in some of the older additions this may not apply. He believes the intent is to not have the RV encroaching into the open space. It is the intent of the code to provide for more than just aesthetic reasons. It might be useful to suggest under A 2 and C 2 where it states *within a rear yard if located at least 3' from any lot line, etc..... or 45' from the center line*, to change that to make provision for not to be closer to the street than the building set back line. Mr. Doherty suggested leaving to legal council to draft the language. The intent is to preserve the open space and if the RV does not encroach on that open space, there should be no problem with it coming out to the building set back line. The Planning Commission concurred.

Mr. Doherty made the motion to recommend to the City Council the adoption of the amendments to the Zoning Code as presented with the exception stated above of using the building set back line for the rear yard on a corner lot and in deference to council the as built was the intent of the motion where applicable throughout the proposal.

Chairman Parmele stated he felt the Planning Commission has completed the task as asked for by City Council, which was for the Planning Commission to review the Zoning Code regarding the parking of recreational vehicles, boats, etc. and make appropriate recommendations. The finding was that presently recreational vehicles are parked illegally everywhere. Staff was commended for

their work on the proposed amendments and those attending the public hearings were thanked for their input. We have provided relief for RV owners, parking is allowed in the side and rear yards and front yards if reasonable restrictions are met. This is what the Planning Commission was charged with doing, to provide a place to park recreational vehicles, boats, trailers, etc. with reasonable controls imposed, and Mr. Parmele feels this has been accomplished.

**TMAPC Action; 7 members present:**

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Neely, Wilson Woodard "absent") to **APPROVE** submittal of the Proposed Recreational Vehicle Regulations for adoption to the City Council as presented by staff with the following changes as amended.


**A.2 and C.2**

2. Within a rear yard if located at least three feet from any lot line; provided, however, where said lot line abuts a public street, the recreational vehicle shall **not be parked or stored closer to the street than the existing dwelling.**

\* \* \* \* \*

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Date Approved: 10-14-91

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary