TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

For Meeting No. 2562

October 7, 2009, 1:30 PM
175 East 2nd Street, 2nd Level, One Technology Center
Tulsa City Council Chambers

CONSIDER, DISCUSS AND/OR TAKE ACTION ON

Call to Order:

REPORTS

Chairman's Report:

Worksession Report:

Comprehensive Plan Report:
Report on the update of the Comprehensive Plan

Director's Report:
Review TMAPC Receipts for the Month of August 2009

1. Minutes of September 16, 2009, Meeting No. 2560

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters under "Consent" are considered by the Planning Commission to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. Any Planning Commission member may, however, remove an item by request.

2. LS-20337 – Tein Lam (9331)/Lot-Split
Northwest corner of South Rockford Avenue and East 58th Street, 5746 South Rockford Avenue

3. LS-20338 – Lou Reynolds (9334)/Lot-Split
East of South Kingston Avenue and North of East 60th Place, 6010 South Lakewood Avenue

4. LC-211 – Lou Reynolds (9334)/Lot Combination
East of South Kingston Avenue and North of East 60th Place, 6010 South Lakewood Avenue

5. The Reserve at Stonebrook – (8211) Final Plat
West of the northwest corner of West 81st Street South and South Elwood Avenue

6. Tom's Kids – (8333) Final Plat
Southwest corner of 116th Street alignment and South Yale Avenue

7. BOA-20964 – (9330) Plat Waiver
1347 East Skelly Drive, East of South Quaker Avenue, North of East 51st Street

8. PUD-600-A – Castlerock Builders/Steve Wright
South and west of the southwest corner of 91st Street South and South Yale Avenue (Detail Site Plan for a 3,250 square foot office building.)
CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS

West of Highway 169, North of West 46th Street North (Request continuance to 10/21/2009 for work on platting issues.) (Continued from 9/16/2009.)

OTHER BUSINESS

Plat Waiver was withdrawn before review.

11. Discussion regarding TMAPC holding evening meetings.

12. Commissioners' Comments

ADJOURN

PD = Planning District/CD = Council District

NOTICE: If you require special accommodation pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, please notify INCOG (918) 584-7526

Exhibits, Petitions, Pictures, etc., presented to the Planning Commission may be received and deposited in case files to be maintained at Land Development Services, INCOG.

Ringing/sound on all cell phones and pagers must be turned off during the Planning Commission.

Visit our website @ www.tmapc.org

The Mission of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (TMAPC) is to provide unbiased advice to the City Council and the County Commissioners on development and zoning matters, to provide a public forum that fosters public participation and transparency in land development and planning, to adopt and maintain a comprehensive plan for the metropolitan area, and to provide other planning, zoning and land division services that promote the harmonious development of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area and enhance and preserve the quality of life for the region's current and future residents.

TMAPC Mission Statement
AGENDA

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

WORK SESSION

INCOG
Two West 2nd Street, Suite 800
Large Conference Room/North
Wednesday, October 7, 2009
11:00 a.m.

CONSIDER, DISCUSS AND/OR TAKE ACTION ON:

1. Question and Answers with Planitulsa Vision Plan/Janet Tharp

Adjourn

www.tmapc.org
### Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Letters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,550.00</td>
<td>1,550.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,827.50</td>
<td>4,827.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL/DP &amp; Plan Reviews</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>512.50</td>
<td>1,512.50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4,718.50</td>
<td>4,718.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(200.00)</td>
<td>(200.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees Waived</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $697.50       $3,697.50 $12,805.00 $20,005.00 $19,012.00

### Land Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Subdivisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>532.50</td>
<td>532.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,175.50</td>
<td>1,175.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>845.52</td>
<td>845.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,691.05</td>
<td>1,691.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat Waivers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>625.00</td>
<td>625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Splits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>177.00</td>
<td>177.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>939.50</td>
<td>939.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Combinations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Changes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(150.00)</td>
<td>(150.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees Waived</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $2,205.01       $4,410.05 $6,719.53 $6,719.53 $13,439.05

### Boards of Adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$10,150.00</td>
<td>$10,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June Corrections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>($550.01)</td>
<td>($550.01)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees Waived</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $5,702.53       $4,451.51 $14,155.04 $26,375.53 $20,005.52 $46,401.05
Final Subdivision Plat

The Reserve at Stonebrooke-(8211) Final Plat (PD 8) (CD 2)  
West of the northwest corner of West 81st Street South and Elwood Avenue

This plat consists of 39 Lots in 2 Blocks on 24.49 acres.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Final Plat. All release letters have been received.
Final Subdivision Plat

Tom's Kids - (8333) (PD 26) (CD 8)
Southwest corner of 116th Street alignment and South Yale Avenue

This plat consists of 2 Lots in 1 Block on 40 acres.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Final Plat. All release letters have been received.
October 7, 2009

BOA-20964 (9330) (PD 6) (CD 9)
1347 East Skelly Drive, East of South Quaker Avenue, North of East 51st Street

The platting requirement is being triggered by a Board of Adjustment approval of a Special Exception to permit an apartment use in a CS district.

Staff provides the following information from TAC at their September 17, 2009 meeting:

ZONING:
- TMAPC Staff: The site has been previously platted.

STREETS:
- No comments.

SEWER:
- No comments.

WATER:
- No comments.

STORM DRAIN:
- No comments.

FIRE:
- No comments.

UTILITIES:
- No comments.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the plat waiver.

A YES answer to the following 3 questions would generally be FAVORABLE to a plat waiver:

1. Has Property previously been platted? X
2. Are there restrictive covenants contained in a previously filed plat? X
3. Is property adequately described by surrounding platted properties or street right-of-way? X
A YES answer to the remaining questions would generally NOT be favorable to a plat waiver:

4. Is right-of-way dedication required to comply with Major Street and Highway Plan? **YES**  **NO**  
   
5. Would restrictive covenants be required to be filed by separate instrument if the plat were waived? **X**
   
6. Infrastructure requirements:
   a) Water
      i. Is a main line water extension required? **X**
      ii. Is an internal system or fire line required? **X**
      iii. Are additional easements required? **X**
   
b) Sanitary Sewer
      i. Is a main line extension required? **X**
      ii. Is an internal system required? **X**
      iii. Are additional easements required? **X**
   
c) Storm Sewer
      i. Is a P.F.P.I. required? **X**
      ii. Is an Overland Drainage Easement required? **X**
      iii. Is on site detention required? **X**
      iv. Are additional easements required? **X**
   
7. Floodplain
   a) Does the property contain a City of Tulsa (Regulatory) Floodplain? **X**
   b) Does the property contain a F.E.M.A. (Federal) Floodplain? **X**
   
8. Change of Access
   a) Are revisions to existing access locations necessary? **X**
   
9. Is the property in a P.U.D.? **X**
   a) If yes, was plat recorded for the original P.U.D.
   
10. Is this a Major Amendment to a P.U.D.? **X**
    a) If yes, does the amendment make changes to the proposed physical development of the P.U.D.? **X**
   
11. Are mutual access easements needed to assure adequate access to the site? **X**
   
12. Are there existing or planned medians near the site which would necessitate additional right-of-way dedication or other special considerations? **X**
   
---

*The project includes interior remodeling only.*
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

PUD-600-A: Detail Site Plan – South and west of the southwest corner of 91st Street South and South Yale Avenue; Lot 6, Block 3 – Ashton Creek Office Park; TRS 8321; CZM 56; Atlas 1909; PD 18; CD 8; OL/PUD.

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for a 3,250 square foot (SF) office building. The proposed use, Use Unit 11 – Offices, Studios and Support Services is a permitted use within Development Area A of PUD-600-A.

The submitted site plan meets all applicable building floor area, open space, building height and setback limitations. Access to the site is provided from one point along the private South Toledo Avenue. Parking has been provided per the applicable use unit of the Zoning Code at a ratio of one space per 300 SF of building floor area. A six-foot screening fence has been constructed along the east boundary line per PUD requirements. Landscaping is provided per the Landscape Chapter of the Zoning Code with a minimum five-foot landscape buffer along the east, south and west boundary lines as required. There is no parking lot lighting proposed at this time.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the detail site plan for Lot 3, Block 6 – Ashton Creek Office Park.

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute landscape and/or sign plan approval.)
Huntsinger, Barbara

From: Fernandez, Diane
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 11:01 AM
To: Alberty, Wayne; Huntsinger, Barbara; Matthews, Dane
Subject: FW: Jet Port Industrial Park plat

Here is a continuance request for the 10/7 meeting.

Diane S. Fernandez
Senior Planner
INCOG
Two West 2nd Street
Suite 800
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103
Telephone: 918-584-7526, 918-579-9481
E-mail: dfernandez@incog.org
Facsimile: 579-9581

From: Tim Terral [mailto:T.Terral@tulsaengineering.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 10:57 AM
To: Fernandez, Diane
Cc: Russell Dixon; Jack Taber; Tamra Rowan
Subject: RE: Jet Port Industrial Park plat

Diane -

We will need to be continued to the Oct. 21st TMAPC, due to our needing to obtain information from ODOT concerning the road, ROW, sidewalks, etc. Every effort has been made on our part to keep this moving, but ODOT has been slow to respond to our queries. We apprerciate you help in this matter as well.

Allen Holdman is to be sending you a revised set of TAC comments for the water.

Russell Dixon will be forwarding you the information you are needing concerning the sign situation on our property and the out parcel, located in the northeast corner of our site.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thanks.

Tim Terral
Director of Land Planning

Tulsa Engineering and Planning Associates, Inc.
6737 South 85th East Avenue
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74133
918.252.9621
918.250.4566 (Fax)
t.terral@tulsaengineering.com

From: Fernandez, Diane [mailto dfernandez@incog.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 9:38 AM
Subject: FW: TMAPC night meetings

From: Joseph Westervelt [mailto:jwestervelt@mapleviewassociates.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 2:41 PM
To: Matthews, Dane
Cc: Alberty, Wayne
Subject: Re: TMAPC night meetings

Dane/Wayne,

Please let the TMAPC that I am opposed to night meetings for several reasons:

1. Granted, some citizen appointees and attendees of the meeting will not have potential work conflicts with evening meetings; but they would instead have take time from their families to attend/participate. I think that would be clearly a bad trade........for the parents, children, and the City of Tulsa.

2. There is an element introduced to evening meetings that make them more contentious than daytime meetings. Many things add to this conclusions, including but not limited to fatigue (both members, staff and attendees) consumption of alcohol, etc. If you think this is silly think about a few of those meetings that have run late. Notice how peoples temperaments tend to deteriorate as the evening progresses. How much fun would everyone have if your meetings continue until 11:00 or even midnight. I doubt the public is served by decisions made late at night after an long day.

3. I also have concern for citizens and particularly citizen appointees leaving evening meetings, particularly late in the evening, after contentious meetings. I recall walking several women members to their cars after long contentious meetings that continued into the evening. City Hall parking, or lack there of, adds to my security concerns.

4. All of these elements above also affect the TMAPC staff. In addition, how are we to compensate staff for working evenings (and late meetings)? Staff is underpaid in my opinion now; will we instead run a lean or understaffed office during the work day?

I hope you share this with some of your more experienced members on the TMAPC, as I believe they will recognize the items above to be reasonable and based on experience.

Best regards,

Joe Westervelt

---

Joseph Westervelt
Mapleview Associates Inc.
1630 S. Boston Ave.
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119
918-583-8808 (office) 918-583-8848 (fax)
jwestervelt@mapleviewassociates.com
Mr. Albery,

Please convey my support to the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission in considering evening meetings. If this step comes to reality, it will enhance the commission's decision as they listen to the local citizen.

Again, thank for considering holding evening meetings.

Respectfully,

Ernesto Mondragon

Lauren found her dream laptop. Find the PC that's right for you.
I have been made aware that an action item is on the TMAPC docket for 10/6 to change the time of this group's meeting to the evening. Please let all councilors and TMAPC board members know that I am IN FAVOR of this time change. It is much too difficult for those of us who work to go downtown in the middle of the day to take advantage of our civic rights to attend these meetings.

Thank you
Johnna Thurston
Tulsa