CONSIDER, DISCUSS AND/OR TAKE ACTION ON:

Call to Order:

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Work session Report:

Director's Report:
Review TMAPC Receipts for the month of April 2018

1. Minutes of May 16, 2018, Meeting No. 2770
2. Amend Minutes of April 18, 2018, Meeting No. 2768

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.

3. **LC-1025** (Lot-Combination) (CD 4) – Location: West of the northwest corner of South Xanthus Place and East 15th Street South

4. **LC-1026** (Lot-Combination) (CD 1) – Location: Southeast corner of North Rockford Avenue and East 48th Street North

5. **Z-5444-SP-1d Justin Schroeder** (CD 7) Location: West of the southwest corner of East 41st Street South and South Garnett Road requesting a **CO Minor Amendment** to increase the allowable floor area by 15 percent.

6. **Z-7345-a Gregory Helms** (CD 9) Location: East of the Southeast corner of South Peoria Avenue and East 35th Street South requesting a **Minor Amendment to optional development plan** to reduce the setback from 50 feet to 35 feet.
7. **PUD-712-5 Scott Eudey** (CD 6) Location: North of the northwest corner of East 51st Street South and South 193rd East Avenue requesting a **PUD Minor Amendment** to permit an additional ground sign.

**CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA:**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

8. **The Estates at the River III** (CD 8) Preliminary Plat, Location: South of the southwest corner of East 121st Street South and South Hudson Avenue

9. **Enclave II at Addison Creek** (CD 8) Preliminary Plat, Location: West of South Sheridan Road at East 123rd Street South

10. **PUD-737 Plat Waiver** (CD 6) Location: South of the southeast corner of East 11th Street South and South 161st East Avenue

11. **Z-7444 Deborah Richards** (CD 4) Location: East of the southeast corner of South Peoria Avenue and East 10th Street South requesting rezoning from **RM-2 to PK (Withdrawn by applicant)**

12. **Z-7440 Kyle Sewell** (CD 2) Location: East of the southeast corner of West 71st Street South and South Elwood Avenue requesting rezoning from **AG to CG with optional development plan** (Continued from May 2, 2018)

13. **LS-21134** (Lot-Split) (CD 8) – Location: North and east of the northeast corner of East 98th Street South and South Sandusky Avenue (Related to LC-1023)

14. **LC-1023** (Lot-Combination) (CD 8) – Location: South and west of the southwest corner of East 97th Place South and South Urbana Avenue (Related to LS-21134)

15. **Z-7445 Curtis Branch** (CD 2) Location: East of the southeast corner of South 26th West Avenue and West 71st Street South requesting rezoning from **RS-3/PUD-159 to AG** (related to PUD-159-B)

16. **PUD-159-B Curtis Branch** (CD 2) Location: East of the southeast corner of South 26th West Avenue and West 71st Street South requesting **PUD Major Amendment** to abandon the PUD and rezone to AG (related to Z-7445)

17. **ZCA-10, TMAPC.** Amendment of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code to Section 55.090-F3 (Maximum Width of Residential Driveways in RE and RS Districts) to revise the maximum driveway width regulations established by that section. (Continued from May 2, 2018)
OTHER BUSINESS

18. Commissioners' Comments

ADJOURN

CD = Council District

NOTE: 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 at www.tmapc.org email address: esubmit@incog.org

TMAPC Mission Statement: 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 RECEIPTS

**Month of April 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL RECEIVED</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Letters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$187.50</td>
<td>$187.50</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$4,825.00</td>
<td>$4,825.00</td>
<td>$9,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20,425.00</td>
<td>20,425.00</td>
<td>40,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Reviews</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2,575.00</td>
<td>2,575.00</td>
<td>5,150.00</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>27,915.00</td>
<td>27,915.00</td>
<td>55,830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RECEIVED**

$3,762.50  
$3,762.50  
$7,525.00  
$3,165.00  
$3,165.00  
$106,330.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND DIVISION</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL RECEIVED</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Subdivision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$435.00</td>
<td>$435.00</td>
<td>$870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,185.95</td>
<td>2,185.95</td>
<td>4,371.90</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$10,408.30</td>
<td>$10,408.30</td>
<td>20,816.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,017.50</td>
<td>1,017.50</td>
<td>2,035.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$10,652.78</td>
<td>$10,652.78</td>
<td>21,305.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat Waviers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$3,450.00</td>
<td>$3,450.00</td>
<td>6,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Splits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$5,775.00</td>
<td>$5,775.00</td>
<td>11,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Combinations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$4,825.00</td>
<td>$4,825.00</td>
<td>9,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>$850.00</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refunds</td>
<td>(100.00)</td>
<td>(100.00)</td>
<td>(200.00)</td>
<td>($150.00)</td>
<td>($150.00)</td>
<td>($300.00)</td>
<td>($300.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RECEIVED**

$4,153.45  
$4,153.45  
$8,306.90  
$36,246.08  
$36,246.08  
$72,492.15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMAPC COMP</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL RECEIVED</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>TOTAL RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comp Plan Amendment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refund</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL RECEIVED**

$4,400.00  
$500.00  
$4,900.00  
$36,750.00  
$17,150.00  
$73,900.00

**TOTAL**

$12,315.95  
$8,415.95  
$20,731.90  
$147,161.08  
$106,561.08  
$253,722.15

**LESS WAIVED FEES**

($8,131.05)  
($8,131.05)  
($14,646.71)  
($14,646.71)

**GRAND TOTALS**

$4,184.90  
$8,415.95  
$12,600.85  
$132,514.37  
$106,561.08  
$239,075.44

* Advertising, Signs & Postage Expenses for City of Tulsa Applications with Fee Waivers.
April 2018 receipt comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>April 2018</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>April 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Letters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Reviews</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Subdivisions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Plats</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Plats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plat Waivers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots Splits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Combinations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp Plan Amendments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/23/2018
**Case Number:** Z-5444-SP-1d  
**Minor Amendment**  

**Hearing Date:** June 6, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Case Report Prepared by:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Owner and Applicant Information:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Jay Hoyt                     | Applicant: Justin Schroeder – Ross Group  
Property Owner: Wyndham Tulsa |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location Map:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Applicant Proposal:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (shown with City Council Districts) | Concept summary: Corridor Minor amendment to increase the allowable floor area by 15%.  
Gross Land Area: 7.11 acres  
Location: West of the SW/c E 41st St S and S Garnett Rd  
10918 E 41st St S  
Lot 1, Block 1 Atria |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zoning:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Staff Recommendation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Existing Zoning: CO  
Proposed Zoning: No Change | Staff recommends approval |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Comprehensive Plan:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Staff Data:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Land Use Map: Town Center  
Growth and Stability Map: Growth | TRS: 9430  
CZM: 49  
Atlas: 752 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>City Council District:</strong></th>
<th><strong>County Commission District:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Councilor Name:** Anna America  
**Commissioner Name:** John Smaligo |
STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Amendment Request: Modify the Corridor Plan to increase the allowable floor area 15%.

Currently, the allowable floor area permitted by the development plan is 221,000 sf. The applicant is proposing to increase the allowable floor area by 15%, or 33,150 sf, for a total of 254,150 sf allowable.

The requested increase is due to an addition of a 3,000 sf gym facility to the existing hotel, which would have exceeded the total allowable area for the hotel. The requested 15% increase would allow this expansion and provide for some additional room for expansion in the future, if so desired. Even with the requested 15% added, the proposed floor total floor area of 254,150 sf would be significantly less than the 387,372 sf of floor area max that would be allowed in a CO district, based on a Floor Area Ratio of 1.25 allowed.

Staff Comment: This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 25.040D.3.b(5) of the Corridor District Provisions of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

"Minor amendments to an approved corridor development plan may be authorized by the Planning Commission, which may direct the processing of an amended development plan and subdivision plat, incorporating such changes, so long as substantial compliance is maintained with the approved development plan."

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the Corridor Development Plan.

2) All remaining development standards defined in Z-5444-SP-1 and subsequent minor amendments shall remain in effect.

Exhibits included with staff recommendation:
- INCOG zoning case map
- INCOG aerial photo
- INCOG aerial photo (enlarged)

Applicant Exhibits:
- Site Plan
- Enlarged Site Plan Aerial

With considerations listed above, staff recommends approval of the minor amendment request to increase the allowable floor area by 15%.
EXISTING ACCESSIBLE PARKING

EXISTING ACCESSIBLE ENTRY/EXIT

AREA OF NEW ADDITION RE: A-100 SITE PLAN

EXISTING ACCESSIBLE PARKING
**Case Report Prepared by:**
Jay Hoyt

**Owner and Applicant Information:**
Applicant: Gregory Helms
Property Owner: Henry Aberson

**Location Map:**
(Shown with City Council Districts)

**Concept Summary:**
Modify the Optional Development Plan standards to reduce the setback for kitchen exhaust equipment from an R district from 50 feet to 35 feet.

**Gross Land Area:** 1.18 Acres

**Location:** East of the SE/c of S Peoria Ave and E 35th St S
1326 E 35th St S
Lot 6, Block 3 Olivers Addition

**Zoning:**
Existing Zoning: CH with optional development plan
Proposed Zoning: No Change

**Comprehensive Plan:**
Land Use Map: Main Street
Growth and Stability Map: Growth

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends approval.

**Staff Data:**
TRS: 9319
CZM: 47
Atlas: 189

**City Council District:** 9
Councilor Name: Ben Kimbro

**County Commission District:** 2
Commissioner Name: Karen Keith
SECTION I: Z-7345-a Minor Amendment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Amendment Request: Modify the Optional Development Plan standards to reduce the setback for kitchen exhaust equipment from an R district from 50 feet to 35 feet.

The applicant is proposing to revise the setback standard for the kitchen exhaust equipment due to the nature of the existing building. The furthest wall from the adjacent R building is 40 feet distant. This would mean that the existing building could not comply with the 50 ft restriction. The reduction to 35 ft would allow an exhaust hood to be installed on the existing building.

The applicant states that the exhaust hood will be on the opposite side of the building’s ridge line from the adjacent R district and will be shielded by that ridgeline, or otherwise screened from the R district if the ridge line is not sufficient. Based on the information provided by the applicant, the reduction in setback would not adversely affect the adjacent R district properties.

Staff Comment: This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 70.0401.1.a of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

"The planning commission is authorized to approve amendments to approved development plans as minor amendments if the planning commission determines that substantial compliance is maintained with the approved development plan."

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the Optional Development Plan.

2) All remaining development standards defined in Z-7345 shall remain in effect.
Exhibits included with staff recommendation:

INCOG zoning case map
INCOG aerial photo
INCOG aerial photo (enlarged)
Applicant Exhibits:
  Summary of Modification Request
  Exhibits B-E - Equipment Information
  Exhibit F - Exterior Elevations

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **approval** of the minor amendment request to reduce the setback for kitchen exhaust equipment from an R district.
Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
April 25, 2018

Request for Modification to Approved Zoning Case Z-7345

1326 East 35th Street South
Tulsa, OK 74105

SUMMARY OF MODIFICATION REQUEST

Previous re-zoning approval was based upon an Optional Development Plan (refer to Section II: Z-7345, Exhibit A).

Use Limitation 1 in the Optional Development Plan requires that kitchen exhaust equipment be located not less than 50 feet from R Districts and directed toward the west or south. Air handling units may be placed anywhere on the site except for a building greater than 5,000 square feet when the above mentioned spacing standard applies.

This request would reduce the required separation distance from 50 feet to 35 feet for kitchen exhaust equipment. The west wall of the existing building is located 40 feet south of the nearest R District, therefore a separation distance greater than 35 feet would be difficult to achieve. The information below illustrates that reducing the separation distance will not adversely affect the outdoor or indoor enjoyment of the adjacent R District properties.

1. Currently, the restaurant HVAC equipment is located between the restaurant building and the R District property directly east. According to Lennox Industries (Exhibit B), typical outside noise levels of air conditioning units is between a garbage disposal (80 db) and a dishwasher (75 db). A typical kitchen exhaust fan has an outside noise level of 25 sones (85 db). According to Seng Piel Audio’s online sound level calculator (Exhibit B) the kitchen exhaust fan noise level would be 54.12 db at the R District property line if located 35 feet away. This noise level is similar to Quiet Urban Daytime noise levels as well as a Dishwasher in the next room (Exhibit D). The sound level would be reduced even more inside the residence by the exterior walls. The standard STC rating for a wood stud wall is 38. This would drop the interior noise level from the kitchen exhaust fan to 16.12 db (Broadcast / Recording Studio level).

2. Since the kitchen exhaust fan is proposed on the west side of the building, the equipment should be shielded from view from the R District by the roof ridge. It is proposed that if the equipment does extend higher than the ridge line, it would be screened from view from the east (Exhibit E).

Modification to no other Use Limitations is requested.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this request or need any additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gregory S. Helms
Is There Really That Much Difference in Air Conditioner and Heat Pump Sound Levels?

WE’RE GLAD YOU ASKED!

Because the answer is most definitely YES! Until recently, noisy air conditioners and heat pumps were accepted as the norm. High noise levels were even associated with the “power” of heating and cooling systems. But today’s technology lets you choose an air conditioner or heat pump that is not only highly efficient, but also exceptionally quiet.

HOW IS SOUND MEASURED?
Sound is measured in decibels (db). A decibel describes the relative loudness of a sound.

WHY IS A SOUND RATING IMPORTANT?
Although no financial savings are tied to it, the sound rating of a cooling system can directly affect your comfort. Your ears tell you what is too noisy, and what seems quiet. The chart below shows sound ratings for some common sounds that you are used to hearing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON NOISE</th>
<th>DECIBEL LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blender</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage Disposal</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice (normal level)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, the sound an air conditioner or heat pump makes depends on a variety of factors, not the least of which are the age of the unit and whether or not the compressor is insulated. On average, the noise level of air conditioners and heat pumps rate somewhere between a dishwasher and a garbage disposal.

ARE ALL AIR CONDITIONERS AND HEAT PUMPS QUIET?
Most heating and cooling systems manufactured today are quieter than those produced in past years. But there is still a great difference in the sound levels of products on the market today. Be sure to compare sound ratings when you shop for a new air conditioner or heat pump...your good night’s sleep depends on it.

LENNOX...DESIGNED TO BE QUIET
Lennox designs each air conditioner and heat pump to be as quiet as possible. Through extensive testing, Lennox has come up with many features that, either alone or in combination, make our air conditioners and heat pumps some of the quietest available.

Insulated compressor compartments, discharge mufflers and unique fan designs work to soften the sound of a hard-working, high-efficiency compressor. Top-panel orifices, compressor wrappers and indoor blowers are all designed to further enhance smooth, quiet airflow.

Purchasing an air conditioner or heat pump system with a low sound rating will make you more comfortable...because even on the hottest summer days or coldest winter nights, you’ll feel your air conditioner or heat pump working, not hear it.

Call your independent Lennox dealer to find out about a new Lennox heating and cooling system that offers maximum comfort with minimum noise.

LENNOX
ONE LESS THING TO WORRY ABOUT.™
Enter the three gray boxes and get the answer in the white box.

Sound is here the sound level in decibels, no matter if it is the sound pressure level or the sound intensity level – but not the sound power level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation of the sound level $L_2$, which is found at the distance $r_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference distance $r_1$ from sound source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1$ m or ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sound level $L_1$ at reference distance $r_1$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85$ dBSPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Search for $L_2$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Another distance $r_2$ from sound source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35$ m or ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sound level $L_2$ at another distance $r_2$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$54.12$ dBSPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sound level difference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$AL = L_1 - L_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30.88$ dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhaust fan noise level 1 foot away from fan is 85 dB.

Exhaust fan noise level 35 feet away from fan is 54.12 dB.
# LOUDNESS COMPARISON CHART (dBA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Outdoor Activities</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Common Indoor Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jet Fly-over at 1000 ft</td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td>Rock Band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Lawn Mower at 3 ft</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Truck at 50 ft at 50 mph</td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td>Food Blender at 3 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Urban Area, Daytime</td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td>Garbage Disposal at 3 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Lawn Mower at 100 ft</td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td>Vacuum Cleaner at 10 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Area</td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>Normal Speech at 3 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Traffic at 300 ft</td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td>Large Business Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Urban, Daytime</td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td>Dishwasher Next Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Urban, Nighttime</td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td>Theater,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Suburban, Nighttime</td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td>Large Conference Room (Background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Rural, Nighttime</td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>Bedroom at Night,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concert Hall (Background)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadcast/Recording Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing</td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>Lowest Threshold of Human Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An increase of 3 dBA is barely perceptible to the human ear.

INFORMATION TAKEN FROM REDDING, CA NOISE STUDY
Sound Transmission Coefficient

The **STC** is a single number rating scale that measures a wall, ceiling, or floor assembly’s ability to block sound transmission. The higher the number, the greater the drop in decibel level is blocking through the surface. A standard studded wall with drywall has an average Sound Transmission Coefficient rating of 38. A luxury grade assembly will boast STC values of more than 55-60. Stronger STC values for new build or existing walls are triggered using the barrier treatments outlined in our course on Transmission Loss here at the Academy, and applied in detail in our Walls, Ceilings and Floor sections of our Applications Guide. These soundproofing treatments target the isolation of a sound wave as depicted here:

Using the STC code is simple math. If one room is producing loud stereo music with levels exceeding 100 decibels, and the dividing surface assembly to the adjoining room held an **STC** rating of 55, one could reasonably expect the dB level from that music in the adjoining room to carry a reading of 45. In a laboratory setting, this result can be measured in a vacuum. In a field test, this result will decay due to leakage, vibrations, and other sound sources that will combine to alter the results.

Regardless of the field results, remember that the lowering of the decibel is on an algorithmic scale. For every 3 dB your treatment will drop, another 50% of the remaining sound level exposure will be eliminated. Using this math, a simple 10-12 dB drop triggered by a product with an STC rating of 27 can still deliver more than a 90% drop in perceived noise. This **STC** scale is broadcast for your reference in our Sound Chamber.

The Uniform Building Code assigns a required **STC** value for multi-dwelling units that include a standard rating for town homes, condominiums, hotels and motels. The walls will typically require an **STC** rating of 50+ when field tested. Luxury units will boast STC values over 55. In comparison, the standard wall configuration in a residential home illustrated here will carry an average **STC** rating of 38:

**INFORMATION TAKEN FROM NETWELL NOISE CONTROL (CONTROLNOISE.COM)**
PROPOSED KITCHEN EXHAUST FAN

EXISTING RESTAURANT BUILDING

PROPOSED KITCHEN EXHAUST FAN

GUARDRAIL

south exterior elevation

west exterior elevation
**Case Number:** PUD-712-5  
Minor Amendment

**Hearing Date:** June 6, 2018

**Case Report Prepared by:**  
Jay Hoyt

**Owner and Applicant Information:**  
Applicant: Scott R. Eudey, Ross & Eudey, PLLP  
Property Owner: National Self Storage, LLC

**Location Map:**  
(shown with City Council Districts)

![Location Map](image)

**Applicant Proposal:**  
Concept summary: PUD minor amendment to amend the sign standards to permit an additional ground sign.

Gross Land Area: 0.59 acres

Location: North of the NW/c of E 51st St S and S 193rd E Ave

Lot 3 Block 1, Stone Creek Commercial Center

Development Area A

**Zoning:**  
Existing Zoning: OL/PUD-712  
Proposed Zoning: No Change

**Comprehensive Plan:**  
Land Use Map: Neighborhood Center  
Growth and Stability Map: Growth

**Staff Recommendation:**  
Staff recommends approval.

**Staff Data:**  
TRS: 9425  
CZM: 50  
Atlas: N/A

**City Council District:** 6  
**Councilor Name:** Connie Dodson

**County Commission District:** 1  
**Commissioner Name:** John Smaligo
SECTION I: Z-5444-SP-1d Minor Amendment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Amendment Request: Modify the Corridor Plan to increase the allowable floor area 15%.

Currently, the allowable floor area permitted by the development plan is 221,000 sf. The applicant is proposing to increase the allowable floor area by 15%, or 33,150 sf, for a total of 254,150 sf allowable.

The requested increase is due to an addition of a 3,000 sf gym facility to the existing hotel, which would have exceeded the total allowable area for the hotel. The requested 15% increase would allow this expansion and provide for some additional room for expansion in the future, if so desired. Even with the requested 15% added, the proposed total floor area of 254,150 sf would be significantly less than the 387,372 sf of floor area maximum that would be allowed in a CO district, based on an allowed 1.25 Floor Area Ratio.

Staff Comment: This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 25.040D.3.b(5) of the Corridor District Provisions of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

"Minor amendments to an approved corridor development plan may be authorized by the Planning Commission, which may direct the processing of an amended development plan and subdivision plat, incorporating such changes, so long as substantial compliance is maintained with the approved development plan."

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the Corridor Development Plan.

2) All remaining development standards defined in Z-5444-SP-1 and subsequent minor amendments shall remain in effect.

Exhibits included with staff recommendation:
  INCOG zoning case map
  INCOG aerial photo
  INCOG aerial photo (enlarged)
Applicant Exhibits:
  Site Plan
  Enlarged Site Plan Aerial

With considerations listed above, staff recommends approval of the minor amendment request to increase the allowable floor area by 15%.
Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
Narrative:

Stone Creek Commercial Center (previously Stone Creek Center) Comprises a total of 13.26 acres (gross) located at the Northwest corner of East 51st Street South and South 193rd E. Ave. The specific property in question (Lot 3, Block 1) is zoned Office Light and is planned for retail commercial facilities pursuant to Planned Unit Development No. 712 as amended by minor amendment No. 712-1.

The application for minor amendment proposes an amendment of permitted signs to include an additional sign on Lot 3, Block 1 to identify the business occupying a retail shopping center. Drawings of the center and the proposed location of the sign are attached hereto as well as a depiction of the sign to be installed.

No change in the permitted uses is proposed and no change of underlying zoning is proposed.

Modifications of permitted signs are proposed as follows:

Permitted signs as approved for PUD No. 712-1 are as follows:

Signs: (Development Area A)

***** “Signs shall be limited to:

(a) wall or canopy signs not exceeding 1.5 feet of display surface area per lineal foot of the main building wall to which affixed, provided however, the aggregate length of wall signs shall not exceed 75% of the wall or canopy to which affixed and no wall signs shall be affixed to the west and south building walls or canopies.

(b) one ground sign at the intersection of 193rd and 51st identifying the center and/or tenants therein, not exceeding 25 feet in height and 200 square feet of display surface area, and

(c) one ground sign along 193rd identifying the ministorage use not exceeding 20 feet in height and 120 square feet of display surface area,

(d) one ground sign within the east 1/2 of Lot 1, Block 1, identifying the tenants therein, not exceeding 20 feet in height and 160 square feet of display surface area.”
Proposed permitted signs are as follows:

Signs: (Development Area A)

****** “Signs shall be limited to:

(a) wall or canopy signs not exceeding 1.5 feet of display surface area per lineal foot of the main building wall to which affixed, provided however, the aggregate length of wall signs shall not exceed 75% of the wall or canopy to which affixed and no wall signs shall be affixed to the west and south building walls or canopies, and

(b) one ground sign at the intersection of 193rd and 51st identifying the center and/or tenants therein, not exceeding 25 feet in height and 200 square feet of display surface area, and

(c) one ground sign along 193rd identifying the ministorage use not exceeding 20 feet in height and 120 square feet of display surface area, and

(d) one ground sign within the east 1/2 of Lot 1, Block 1, identifying the tenants therein, not exceeding 20 feet in height and 160 square feet of display surface area, and

(e) one ground sign within Lot 3, Block 1 along 193rd East Avenue identifying the tenants therein, not exceeding 20 feet in height and 160 square feet of display surface area.”

[The underlined area depicts changes or additions]
GRADING PLAN

Erosion Control Notes:
1. All Cut Slopes shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
2. All Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
3. Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
4. All Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
5. Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
6. Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
7. Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
8. Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
9. Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
10. Cut slopes above 20% shall be protected with erosion control blankets.

BENCHMARK

Feet

1234567890

PAVING AND HORIZONTAL CONTROL PLAN

STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE NOTES:
1. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
2. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
3. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
4. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
5. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
6. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
7. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
8. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
9. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.
10. The entrance to the stabilized area shall be protected with erosion control blankets.

ROCK BAG SEDIMENT BARRIERS NOTES:
1. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
2. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
3. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
4. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
5. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
6. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
7. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
8. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
9. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.
10. Rock bag sediment barriers shall be placed at the base of the slope.

= sign
Sidewalk and landscaping will move to widen for sign to be centered in area.
Design C: lighted monument. Tenant panels are white acrylic back lit. Top lettering metal punch thru. Brushed alun accent.
**Case Report Prepared by:** Nathan Foster

**Owner and Applicant Information:**

*Applicant:* Tanner Consulting, LLC  
*Owner:* 121st Street Property, LLC

**Location Map:**  
(Shown with City Council districts)

**Applicant Proposal:**

Preliminary Plat  
60 lots, 5 blocks, 17.86 ± acres  
*Location:* South of the southwest corner of East 121st Street South and South Hudson Avenue

**Zoning:** RS-3 / PUD-803

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends **approval** of the preliminary plat

**City Council District:** 8  
*Councilor Name:* Phil Lakin  
**County Commission District:** 3  
*Commissioner Name:* Ron Peters

**EXHIBITS:** Site Map, Aerial, Land Use, Growth & Stability, Preliminary Plat Submittal, Conceptual Improvements
PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT

The Estates at the River III - (CD 8)
South of the southwest corner of East 121st Street South and South Hudson Avenue

This plat consists of 60 lots, 5 blocks, 17.86 ± acres.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on May 17, 2018 and provided the following conditions:

1. **Zoning:** Proposed lot conforms to the requirements RS-3 zoning. PUD-803 permits a gated subdivision.

2. **Addressing:** Address will be assigned to final plat. Provide lot address graphically on the face of the final plat.

3. **Transportation & Traffic:** Reserve C should be excluded from the plat or language should be added to permit use of the area for future extension of South Hudson Avenue and a connection to proposed subdivisions to the east.

4. **Sewer:** Proposed fence easement along 125th Place has a sanitary sewer located under it. Agreements will be required prior to construction in any easement.

5. **Water:** IDP submittal must be approved prior to approval of the final plat.

6. **Engineering Graphics:** Submit a subdivision data control sheet with final plat submittal. Graphically show all pins found or set associated with this plat. Add legend entries for found/set property pins. Platted subdivisions at the time of final plat approval must be shown in the location map. All other property should be labeled unplatted. Label plat location as “Site” or “Project Location”.

7. **Fire:** No comments.

8. **Stormwater, Drainage, & Floodplain:** Illustrate existing FEMA floodplain boundary on the face of the plat.

9. **Utilities:** Telephone, Electric, Gas, Cable, Pipeline, Others: All utilities indicated to serve the site must provide a release prior to final plat approval. Provide a Certificate of Records Search from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission to verify no oil & gas activity on the site.

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the conditions provided by TAC and the requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations.
SUBJECT TRACT

THE ESTATES AT THE RIVER III

LEGEND
- Jenks Corporate Limits
- Tulsa Corporate Limits

17-13 03
The Estates at the River III

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: February 2018
SUBJECT TRACT
LAND USE PLAN
NEW NEIGHBORHOOD

Land Use Plan Categories:
- Downtown
- Downtown Neighborhood
- Main Street
- Mixed-Use Corridor
- Regional Center
- Town Center
- Neighborhood Center
- Employment
- New Neighborhood
- Existing Neighborhood
- Park and Open Space
- Arkansas River Corridor

THE ESTATES
AT THE RIVER III
17-13 03

0 250 500 Feet
Preliminary Plat

THE ESTATES AT THE RIVER III

PARTIAL OF THE NORTHEAST, NORTHWEST, SOUTHEAST, AND SOUTHWEST QUARTERS OF SECTION THIRTEEN (13), TOWNSHIP SEVENTEEN (17) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST, OF THE THIRD Principal Meridian, A Location Within The City Of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State Of Oklahoma.

OWNER:
121st Street Property, L.L.C.
1731 S. South 20 Road
Claremore, Oklahoma 74017
Phone: (918) 462-0860

SURVEYOR/ENGINEER:
Tanner Consulting, L.L.C.
Suite A, 5329 South Lewis Avenue
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74105
Phone: (918) 755-9910

Notes:
1. This plat shows thedeveloper's intended plan for the plat area of land submitted as proposed by the Oklahoma State Board of Land Surveyors for approval and adoption as an adopted plat.
2. The plat also includes the location of the survey points and the boundaries of the property.
3. The plat is subject to change and may be amended by the developer at any time.
4. The plat is intended for use by the developer and may be amended at any time.

Curve Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curve Table</th>
<th>Radius (FT)</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Right</th>
<th>Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval Date: TOTTUS

City of Tulsa, Oklahoma

Certification

Approver: [Signature]

City Attorney

The approval of this plat is subject to review and approval by the City Council, and any amendments to this plat must be approved by the City Council before any platting or development.
PUD-803-4

THE ESTATES AT THE RIVER III

PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER NORTHWEST QUARTER SEcorner of backtown in the city of PUEBLO, COLORADO, TO BE KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS "THE ESTATES AT THE RIVER III" (hereinafter referred to as "PUD") and as shown on the survey plat of the PUD filed with the PUEBLO COUNTY Recorder of Deeds on January 1, 2023, and any amendment thereto.

Section 1: Preliminary Statement

The PUD is a planned unit development ("PUD") as defined in the Pueblo County Zoning Ordinance. The PUD is located in the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the city of Pueblo, Colorado. The PUD is subject to the provisions of the Pueblo County Zoning Ordinance and the Pueblo County Comprehensive Plan.

Section 2: Reserve Areas

2.1. General

The reserve areas consist of open space, parks, and recreation areas, as shown on the survey plat of the PUD. The reserve areas are intended to provide public access to the natural setting of the PUD, and to provide recreational opportunities for the residents of the PUD.

2.2. Open Space

The open space consists of undeveloped land within the PUD. The open space is intended to provide public access to the natural setting of the PUD, and to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation.

2.3. Parks

The parks consist of developed land within the PUD. The parks are intended to provide public access to the natural setting of the PUD, and to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation.

2.4. Recreational Areas

The recreational areas consist of developed land within the PUD that is dedicated to public use. The recreational areas are intended to provide public access to the natural setting of the PUD, and to provide opportunities for outdoor recreation.

Section 3: Planned Unit Development Restrictions

3.1. General

The PUD is subject to the provisions of the Pueblo County Zoning Ordinance and the Pueblo County Comprehensive Plan. The PUD is also subject to the provisions of this section, which are designed to protect the natural setting of the PUD and to preserve its character.

3.2. Rezoning

No portion of the PUD may be rezoned without the written consent of the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

3.3. Development of Reserve Areas

No portion of the reserve areas may be developed without the written consent of the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

3.4. Minimum Lot Size

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless each lot is at least 10,000 square feet in size.

3.5. Minimum Lot Coverage

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the building covering on each lot is no greater than 30% of the total usable lot area.

3.6.建築高度限制

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the maximum building height is limited to 30 feet.

3.7. Maximum Lot Coverage

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the total area of all buildings on each lot is no greater than 30% of the total usable lot area.

3.8. Minimum Setback

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless each building is set back a minimum of 20 feet from the property line.

3.9. Minimum Frontage

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless each building has a minimum frontage of 100 feet.

3.10. Minimum Lot Width

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless each lot has a minimum width of 100 feet.

Section 4: Street System

4.1. General

The street system consists of the public roads and alleys within the PUD. The street system is intended to provide access to the reserve areas and to provide for the circulation of traffic within the PUD.

4.2. Street Names

The street names consist of the names of the public roads and alleys within the PUD. The street names are intended to identify the streets and to provide a reference for people.

4.3. Street Width

The street width consists of the width of the public roads and alleys within the PUD. The street width is intended to provide for the circulation of traffic and to provide for the protection of the natural setting of the PUD.

4.4. Street Design

The street design consists of the design of the public roads and alleys within the PUD. The street design is intended to provide for the circulation of traffic and to provide for the protection of the natural setting of the PUD.

Section 5: Utilities

5.1. General

The utilities consist of the public utilities within the PUD. The utilities are intended to provide for the services necessary for the development of the PUD.

5.2. Water Supply

The water supply consists of the public water system within the PUD. The water supply is intended to provide for the delivery of water to the residences in the PUD.

5.3. Sewer System

The sewer system consists of the public sewer system within the PUD. The sewer system is intended to provide for the removal of sewage from the residences in the PUD.

5.4. Gas System

The gas system consists of the public gas system within the PUD. The gas system is intended to provide for the delivery of gas to the residences in the PUD.

5.5. Electrical System

The electrical system consists of the public electrical system within the PUD. The electrical system is intended to provide for the delivery of electricity to the residences in the PUD.

Section 6: Environmental Protection

6.1. General

The environmental protection consists of the provisions designed to protect the natural setting of the PUD and to preserve its character.

6.2. Wetlands

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the wetlands are properly protected.

6.3. Native Vegetation

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the native vegetation is properly protected.

6.4. Water Quality

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the water quality is properly protected.

6.5. Air Quality

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the air quality is properly protected.

Section 7: Other Restrictions

7.1. General

Other restrictions consist of the provisions designed to protect the natural setting of the PUD and to preserve its character.

7.2. setbacks

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the setbacks are properly protected.

7.3. pedestrian walkways

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the pedestrian walkways are properly protected.

7.4. sidewalks

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the sidewalks are properly protected.

7.5. driveways

No portion of the PUD may be developed unless the driveways are properly protected.

Section 8: Signage

8.1. General

The signage consists of the signs within the PUD. The signage is intended to identify the streets and to provide a reference for people.

8.2. Street Names

The street names consist of the signs for the streets and alleys within the PUD.

8.3. Street Numbers

The street numbers consist of the signs for the street numbers on the streets within the PUD.

8.4. Property Numbers

The property numbers consist of the signs for the property numbers on the residences within the PUD.

8.5. Directional Signs

The directional signs consist of the signs for the directional information on the streets within the PUD.

Section 9: Enforcement

9.1. General

The enforcement consists of the provisions designed to ensure compliance with the provisions of this declaration.

9.2. Violations

Any violation of the provisions of this declaration shall be enforced by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

9.3. Penalties

Any person who violates the provisions of this declaration shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 for each violation.

Section 10: Amendments

10.1. General

This declaration may be amended by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners, subject to the provisions of the Pueblo County Zoning Ordinance.

10.2. Amendment Procedure

Any amendment to this declaration shall be approved by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

Section 11: Recording

11.1. General

This declaration shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds for the county of Pueblo, Colorado.

11.2. Recording Costs

All costs of recording this declaration shall be paid by the person or persons who cause it to be recorded.

Section 12: Enforcement

12.1. General

This declaration shall be enforced by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

12.2. Violations

Any violation of the provisions of this declaration shall be enforced by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

12.3. Penalties

Any person who violates the provisions of this declaration shall be subject to a fine of not more than $1,000 for each violation.

Section 13: Amendments

13.1. General

This declaration may be amended by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners, subject to the provisions of the Pueblo County Zoning Ordinance.

13.2. Amendment Procedure

Any amendment to this declaration shall be approved by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

13.3. Recording

This declaration shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds for the county of Pueblo, Colorado.

13.4. Recording Costs

All costs of recording this declaration shall be paid by the person or persons who cause it to be recorded.

Section 14: Enforcement

This declaration shall be enforced by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

This declaration shall be enforced by the Pueblo County Planning Commission and the Pueblo County Board of County Commissioners.

I, (signature), do hereby certify that I have read and understand the provisions of this declaration.

Date: May 1, 2023
PRELIMINARY PLAT

THE ESTATES AT THE RIVER III

PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER NORTHWEST QUADRANT EAGLE COUNTY, (WASHINGTON) 9A-5TH-7TH, 7TH TOWN OF EAGLE, IN THE CITY OF VAIL, VAIL, COOK COUNTY, STATE OF ILLINOIS

DEED OF DEDICATION (Continued)

SECTION 16. PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

1.2. Membership.

Theascending order of the record owners of each subdivision and the names of each member of the association, as determined by the corporation, shall be on file in the office of the corporation. The corporation shall maintain a record of all changes in ownership of any property within the subdivisions and shall make the record available to the members of the association.

2.4. Association of Property Owners

The corporation shall maintain a record of all changes in ownership of any property within the subdivisions and shall make the record available to the members of the association.

SECTION 17. PRELIMINARY RECLAMATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Reclamations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

2. Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

3.1. Preliminary Reclamation and Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

4. Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

5. Preliminary Reclamation and Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

6.1. Preliminary Reclamation and Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

7. Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

8. Preliminary Reclamation and Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

9. Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

10. Preliminary Reclamation and Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.

11. Environmental Considerations

The corporation shall make all reclamations necessary to bring the land into a condition suitable for development. The corporation shall submit a plan to the appropriate authorities for approval before beginning any reclamations.
**Case:** Enclave II at Addison Creek  
**Hearing Date:** June 6, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Case Report Prepared by:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Owner and Applicant Information:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nathan Foster | Applicant: Tanner Consulting, LLC  
Owner: Stone Horse Development, LLC |

| **Location Map:**  
(Shown with City Council districts) | **Applicant Proposal:** |
| --- | --- |
| | Preliminary Plat  
106 lots, 9 blocks, 27.8 + acres  
Location: West of South Sheridan Road at East 123rd Street South |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zoning:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Staff Recommendation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS-3 / PUD-828</td>
<td>Staff recommends approval of the preliminary plat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>City Council District:</strong></th>
<th><strong>County Commission District:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Councilor Name:** Phil Lakin  
**Commissioner Name:** Ron Peters

**EXHIBITS:** Site Map, Aerial, Land Use, Growth & Stability, Preliminary Plat Submittal, Conceptual Improvements
PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT

Enclave II at Addison Creek - (CD 8)
West of South Sheridan Road at East 123rd Street South

This plat consists of 106 lots, 9 blocks, 27.8 ± acres.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on May 17, 2018 and provided the following conditions:

1. **Zoning:** Proposed lot conforms to the requirements RS-3 zoning. Boundary for PUD-828 should be delineated on the face of the plat to indicate which lots are included and subject to the development standards.

2. **Addressing:** Address will be assigned to final plat. Provide lot address graphically on the face of the final plat.

3. **Transportation & Traffic:** No comment.

4. **Sewer:** Easements in which sanitary sewer is located must be a minimum of 15' wide. Revise easements or obtain release from City of Tulsa for reduced easement widths.

5. **Water:** IDP submittal must be approved prior to approval of the final plat.

6. **Engineering Graphics:** Submit a subdivision data control sheet with final plat submittal. Graphically show all pins found or set associated with this plat. Add legend entries for found/set property pins. Platted subdivisions at the time of final plat approval must be shown in the location map. All other property should be labeled unplatted. Label plat location as “Site” or “Project Location”.

7. **Fire:** No comments.

8. **Stormwater, Drainage, & Floodplain:** Illustrate existing FEMA floodplain boundary on the face of the plat.

9. **Utilities: Telephone, Electric, Gas, Cable, Pipeline, Others:** All utilities indicated to serve the site must provide a release prior to final plat approval. Provide a Certificate of Records Search from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission to verify no oil & gas activity on the site.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the conditions provided by TAC and the requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations.
ENCLAVE II AT ADDISON CREEK

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
Aerial Photo Date: February 2010
Subject Tract Land Use Plan
New Neighborhood

Land Use Plan Categories
- Downtown
- Downtown Neighborhood
- Main Street
- Mixed-Use Corridor
- Regional Center
- Neighborhood Center
- Employment
- New Neighborhood
- Existing Neighborhood
- Park and Open Space
- Arkansas River Corridor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Report Prepared by:</th>
<th>Location Map: (Shown with City Council districts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Foster</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Location Map" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner and Applicant Information:</th>
<th>Applicant Proposal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant: Ruben Najera</td>
<td>Plat Waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner: Ruben Najera</td>
<td>Location: South of the southeast corner of East 11th Street South and South 161st East Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning: RS-3 / PUD-737</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff recommends approval of the plat waiver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Council District: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councilor Name: Connie Dodson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Commission District: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner Name: Mike Craddock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXHIBITS:** Site Map, Aerial, Land Use, Growth & Stability, Site Plan
PLAT WAIVER

**PUD-737** – (CD 6)
South and east of the southeast corner of East 11th Street South and South 161st East Avenue

The platting requirement for this property is being triggered by the approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD-737) in 2007 that was never developed. In 2010, the landowner divided the property into several large tracts and sold tracts to individual owners without addressing the need or requirement to plat the property. The current proposal is to permit the construction of one single-family home on the subject property.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on May 17, 2018 and the following items were determined:

1. Single-family residential uses are a permitted use on the site.
2. No additional easements are required at this time.
3. A right-of-way dedication is required for S 161st East Ave to comply with the Major Street and Highway Plan
4. Water service is available on the site through service connections.
5. The property meets and exceeds the minimum requirements of the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality to permit on-site sewage disposal.

Staff recommends approval of the plat waiver with the following conditions:

1. The required right-of-way dedication for S 161st East Ave must be made.
2. An ALTA survey is required to be filed of record with Tulsa County due to the property being unplatted.
Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: February 2018
From: Deborah Richards [mailto:deborah@inter-projects.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 12:15 PM
To: Foster, Nathan <NFoster@incog.org>
Cc: Miller, Susan <SMiller@incog.org>; Kolibas, Robert <RKolibas@cityoftulsa.org>; Austin Mitchell <austin@inter-projects.com>; Jones, Robi <rjones@incog.org>
Subject: Re: 1007 S Peoria Ave, Meeting Followup

Hi Nathan,

I have confirmation from the client that we should pull the rezoning permit and we will use our existing parking lot (with re-striping and regrading) as outlined in the first email. Please let me know if you see any issues with this or if I need to apply for any other variances/special exceptions.

Thank you,
Deborah

Deborah Richards, RA
Inter-Projects Architecture, PLLC
inter-projects.com
work: 212-335-0849
cell: 973-441-0898

Please be advised this message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy or re-transmit this communication. If you have received this communication in error, please delete this message and any attachments.

On Wed, May 9, 2018 at 8:59 AM, Foster, Nathan <NFoster@incog.org> wrote:

Deborah,

That is fine. I will pull it off the agenda. If something else is decided later just let me know and I can distribute it.

Thanks!
Hi Susan,

Thank you for following up with me. I have a meeting with my client at 11am this morning to discuss this. I believe that we will pull the application. Is it OK for you to assume that we will pull it unless you hear otherwise from me between 12 and 1pm? Or do you need something definitive now?

Thank you

Deborah Richards, RA
Inter-Projects Architecture, PLLC
inter-projects.com

work: 212-335-0849

cell: 973-441-0898

Please be advised this message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, copy or re-transmit this communication. If you have received this communication in error, please delete this message and any attachments.
**Case Number:** Z-7440 with optional development plan

**Hearing Date:** June 6, 2018
Applicant requested continuance from 5.2.2018 for preparation of an optional development plan

**Case Report Prepared by:**
Dwayne Wilkerson

**Owner and Applicant Information:**
**Applicant:** Kyle Sewell
**Property Owner:** BEALL, JAMES E AND LILYAN MAXEEN

**Location Map:**
(Shown with City Council Districts)

![Location Map Image]

**Applicant Proposal:**
**Present Use:** Vacant
**Proposed Use:** Carwash on east portion, unknown on west portion.
**Concept summary:** Rezoning request to support potential car wash use.
**Tract Size:** 2.61 ± acres
**Location:** East of the southeast corner of West 71st Street South at South Elwood.

**Zoning:**
**Existing Zoning:** AG
**Proposed Zoning:** CG with optional development plan

**Comprehensive Plan:**
**Land Use Map:** Employment
**Stability and Growth Map:** Area of Growth

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends approval but only with the provisions of the optional development plan as outlined in Section II.

**Staff Data:**
**TRS:** 8212
**CZM:** 51
**Atlas:** 1141

**City Council District:** 2
**Councilor Name:** Jeannie Cue

**County Commission District:** 2
**Commissioner Name:** Karen Keith
SECTION I: Z-7440

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT:

The anticipated immediate use for a portion of this site is an automobile car wash. The applicant has provided design standards which help integrate this site into the expected development along west 71st Street South near the Turkey Mountain Wilderness area.

The applicant has stated that the allowed uses are consistent with the Employment Land Use designation of the comprehensive plan.

EXHIBITS:

INCOG Case map
INCOG Aerial (small scale)
INCOG Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Areas of Stability and Growth Map
Applicant Exhibits:
   Support letter from abutting property owner

SECTION II: OPTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN STANDARDS

The following Use Categories, Subcategories and Specific Uses shall be allowed in conjunction with all supplemental regulations and all other zoning regulations as defined in the Tulsa Zoning Code except as further limited below:

PERMITTED USE CATEGORIES:

1. Commercial Use Category: Limited to the following Subcategories
   a. Public, Civic and Institutional
      i. College or University
      ii. Day Care
      iii. Hospital
      iv. Library or Cultural Exhibit
      v. Religious Assembly
      vi. Safety Service
      vii. School
      viii. Utilities and Public Service Facility (Minor)
   b. Commercial
      i. Animal Service and all specific uses
      ii. Assembly and Entertainment (Small)
      iii. Broadcast or Recording Studio
      iv. Commercial Service and all specific uses
      v. Financial Services and all specific uses
      vi. Funeral or Mortuary Service
      vii. Lodging (Hotel/motel)
      viii. Office and all specific uses
      ix. Restaurants and Bars and all specific uses
      x. Retail Sales with all specific uses
      xi. Studio, Artist or Instructional Service
      xii. Trade School
      xiii. Vehicle Sales and Services
1. Personal Vehicle repair & maintenance within this specific use only automatic car washes with accessory vacuum bays are permitted.

c. Other
   i. Drive-in or Drive-through Facility (as a component of an allowed principal use)

BUILDING SETBACKS:
The minimum Building Setback from the 71st Street right of way line shall not be less than 25 feet.

BUILDING STANDARDS:
The first anticipated use for the property is an automatic car wash facility. That use will not exceed a maximum building footprint greater than 5000 square feet. All future uses shall conform to the lot and building regulations of a CS district.

The car wash and all future buildings shall meet the following building design standards.
1) The front of the building cladding will be a minimum 75% masonry (CMU, brick and mortar, or decorative concrete panel) excluding window or door openings.
2) All sides of the building will have a minimum 50% hard surface (CMU, brick and mortar, or decorative concrete panel). Trash enclosures shall be masonry construction with metal gates.
3) No outdoor storage will be permitted.
4) Mechanical equipment such as condensing units, car wash vacuums, etc. shall be a minimum of 25' from any lot line

LANDSCAPE STANDARDS:
All lots within the boundary of the optional development plan shall provide the following landscape and screening standards except where penetrated by vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems.
1) Deciduous and evergreen trees shall be placed on the lot within 20 feet of the street right of way.
2) Deciduous and evergreen trees shall be placed within 20 feet of the east and west boundary of the development plan area.
3) The quantity of trees shall be identified on the landscape plan however those trees shall be placed so no tree is further than 25 feet from any other tree as measured in any horizontal dimension to the trunk of the tree. These required trees are additional to any other landscape requirements identified in the Zoning Code.
4) Landscaping shall be installed prior to release of an occupancy permit for any building.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND CIRCULATION:
1) Provide sidewalks within the street right of way as required by the Tulsa Subdivision regulations and shall be constructed to meet or exceed the design standards for sidewalks along an arterial street right of way.

SIGN STANDARDS:
1) All freestanding signs shall be monument style with a maximum height not exceed 25 feet.
2) Signage shall conform to all City of Tulsa Sign standards for signs in a CS district as defined in the Tulsa Zoning Code.
3) Signage on any south facing wall may not be illuminated.

LIGHT STANDARDS:
The maximum height of all wall or pole mounted lighting shall not exceed 16 feet within 50 feet of the street right of way. The maximum fixture height for the remainder of the site shall not exceed 25 feet.
DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Many uses allowed in a CG zoning district may be consistent with expected the employment land use designation recognized in the comprehensive plan however some uses offer very little employment opportunities and some uses allowed in a CG district are not compatible with the surrounding property. CG zoning allows some uses that are not consistent with the goals of the employment land use designation. Staff has reviewed the development plan and determined that the objectionable uses have not been included in the development plan and,

Z-7440 abuts property with design and use limitations and is directly south across W. 71st Street South from the Turkey Mountain Wilderness area. The small area plan recognizes that this area should be treated with a higher level of aesthetics and encourage development that is complimentary with the employment opportunities near the wilderness area. The optional development plan provides building material limitations and landscaping requirements that are consistent with the expected development across the street from Turkey Mountain wilderness area and,

CG zoning as requested by Z-7440 with the optional development plan prohibits some uses that are not compatible with the existing surrounding office properties east and west of the site therefore,

Staff recommends Denial of Z-7440 where the applicant has requested rezoning from AG to CG but only with the optional development plan as identified in Section II.

SECTION III: Supporting Documentation

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: This site abuts the east edge of the West Highlands Small Area Plan boundary. CG zoning with an optional development plan is consistent with the recommendations of the small area plan.

Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: Employment

Employment areas contain office, warehousing, light manufacturing and high tech uses such as clean manufacturing or information technology. Sometimes big-box retail or warehouse retail clubs are found in these areas. These areas are distinguished from mixed-use centers in that they have few residences and typically have more extensive commercial activity.

Employment areas require access to major arterials or interstates. Those areas, with manufacturing and warehousing uses must be able to accommodate extensive truck traffic, and rail in some instances. Due to the special transportation requirements of these districts, attention to design, screening and open space buffering is necessary when employment districts are near other districts that include moderate residential use.

Areas of Stability and Growth designation: Area of Growth

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.
Areas of Growth are found throughout Tulsa. These areas have many different characteristics but some of the more common traits are close proximity to or abutting an arterial street, major employment and industrial areas, or areas of the city with an abundance of vacant land. Also, several of the Areas of Growth are in or near downtown. Areas of Growth provide Tulsa with the opportunity to focus growth in a way that benefits the City as a whole. Development in these areas will provide housing choice and excellent access to efficient forms of transportation including walking, biking, transit, and the automobile.

**Transportation Vision:**

**Major Street and Highway Plan:** The Commuter Corridor consideration of West 71st Street South is a high capacity traffic corridor that is generally not pedestrian oriented.

**Trail System Master Plan Considerations:** None, but it should be noted that this site is immediately south of the Turkey Mountain Wilderness Area. Existing sidewalks provide access to the trail system on the north of West 71st Street.

**Small Area Plan:** West Highlands Small Area Plan

**Special District Considerations:** None

**Historic Preservation Overlay:** None

**DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

**Staff Summary:** The site is vacant except the remnants of a single-family residence driveway and fencing.

**Environmental Considerations:** No known environmental concerns that affect site redevelopment.

**Streets:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exist. Access</th>
<th>MSHP Design</th>
<th>MSHP R/W</th>
<th>Exist. # Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West 71st Street</td>
<td>Primary Arterial with Commuter Corridor</td>
<td>120 feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utilities:**

The subject tract has municipal water and sewer available.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Area of Stability or Growth</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Park and Open Space</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Turkey Mountain Wilderness Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>CS with PUD 384-A</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Vacant immediately east but Mini Storage within the PUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>AG with</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV: Relevant Zoning History

ZONING ORDINANCE: Ordinance number 11827 dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Subject Property: no relevant history

Surrounding Property:

Z-7432 April 2018: (pending) TMAPC concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a 20+ acre tract of land from AG to RS-3, for residential use, on property located south of the southwest corner of East 71st Street and South Elwood Avenue. (Case is pending approval from City Council.)

Z-7375 (with optional development plan) March 2017: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a 2+ acre tract of land from AG to CG on property located east of the southeast corner of West 71st Street South and South Elwood Avenue.

Z-7366 December 2016: All concurred in denial of a request for rezoning a 1.47+ acre tract of land from AG to CG on property located south of the southeast corner of South Elwood Avenue and West 71st Street South.

Z-7052/ PUD-738 May 2007: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a 39.19+ acre tract of land from AG to RS-3/RM-0/CS and a Planned Unit Development for a mixed use development on property located at the southwest corner of West 71st Street South and South Elwood Avenue.

PUD-660/ Z-6858 July 2002: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 2.2+ acre tract of land and in approval of a request for rezoning from AG to CS/PUD for commercial uses, on property located east of the southeast corner of South Elwood Avenue and West 71st Street.

PUD-384A April 1987: The applicant requested a major amendment to PUD-384 to abandon previous uses that had originally been allowed and requested approval for Use Units 11, 14, 15, and 17. All concurred in approval of the request subject to conditions for the following uses, a mini-storage facility, a retail lawn and garden business with office and showroom. Use Unit 17 permitted the mini-storage facility only and all outdoor display for retail lawn and garden business would be only for seasonal merchandise, on property located east of the southeast corner of South Elwood Avenue and West 71st Street South.

Z-6017/ PUD-384 May 1985: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a 10+ acre tract of land from AG to CS zoning on the north 550' and denial of the requested IL zoning and all concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development, on property located east of the southeast corner of South Elwood Avenue and West 71st Street South.

Z-6006 October 1984: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a tract of land from AG to CS, for commercial use, on property located on the southeast corner of East 71st Street and South Elwood Avenue.

6/6/2018 1:30 PM
Subject Tract

Z-7440
18-12 12

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: February 2016
05/03/18

To whom it may concern:

My name is Dr. Keith A. Bailey, and I am the veterinarian at 71st and Elwood. Our practice was established in Tulsa by my father in 1965 and we have been at this location for fourteen years. I have recently been made aware that there is a plan in the works for a major car wash on the property next door to us. I would encourage you to approve zoning so that this project can begin as soon as possible. I feel that quality businesses along this street, such as this, will help our community, as well as all of Tulsa, and I welcome it with open arms. If I may be of help in any way just let me know. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Keith A. Bailey, DVM

Keith A. Bailey, DVM
### Case Report Prepared by:

Austin Chapman

### Owner and Applicant Information:

**Applicant:** Russell and Sylynda Thrash

**Property Owners:** William Morgan/Russell and Sylynda Thrash

### Location Map:

(Shown with City Council Districts)

![Location Map](image)

### Applicant Proposal:

Proposal to split an RS-1 tract into two tracts and combine the back tract with a separate parcel.

The lot-split/combination requires a waiver of the Subdivision Regulations that no lot have more than three side lot lines.

**Existing Use:** Residential

**Tract 1 Size:** 0.397 ± acres

**Tract 2 Size:** 0.743 ± acres

**Tract 3 Size:** 0.784 ± acres

**Location:** South and West of the SW/c of East 97th Place South and South Urbana Avenue

### Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the lot-split/combination and the waiver of the Subdivision Regulations that no lot have more than three side lot lines.

**City Council District:** 8

**Councilor Name:** Phil Lakin

**County Commission District:** 3

**Commissioner Name:** Ron Peters

---

**Comprehensive Plan:**

**Land Use Map:**

*Existing Neighborhood*

**Stability and Growth Map:**

*Area of Stability*

**Zoning:**

**Existing Zoning:** RS-1/PUD-216
Lot-Split and Waiver of Subdivision Regulations

June 6, 2018

LS-21134
Russell and Sylynda Thrash, (1404) (RS-1/PUD 216) (City)
Location: South and West of the SW/c of East 97th Place South and South Urbana Avenue

The Lot-Split/Combination proposal is to split a portion of the property located at 9703 S. Sandusky and combine it with the property located at 9726 S. Urbana. Both tracts will meet the Lot and Area requirements of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code for an RS-1 zoning District and for PUD-216.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on May 17, 2018 and had no comments.

The proposed lot-split/combination would not have an adverse affect on the surrounding properties and staff recommends APPROVAL of the lot-split/combination and the waiver of the Subdivision Regulations that no lot have more than three side lot lines.
Subject Tract

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: February 2016
### Case Report Prepared by:
Dwayne Wilkerson

### Owner and Applicant Information:
**Applicant:** Curtis Branch

**Property Owner:** BRANCH, CURTIS R & RACHAEL L

### Applicant Proposal:
**Present Use:** Vacant

**Proposed Use:** Uses as allowed by an AG district.

**Concept summary:** Abandon PUD-159 and re-zone property to AG.

**Tract Size:** 5.81 ± acres

**Location:** East of southeast corner of South 26th West Avenue & West 71st Street South

### Location Map:
(Shown with City Council Districts)

### Zoning:
**Existing Zoning:** RS-3

**Proposed Zoning:** AG

### Comprehensive Plan:
**Land Use Map:** Existing Neighborhood

**Stability and Growth Map:** Area of Stability

### Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends approval of rezoning only if that part of the PUD has been abandoned.

The configuration of PUD development area SF-3 has created an area that is unlikely to see developed in a manner consistent with the West Highlands Small area plan.

### Staff Data:
**TRS:** 8210

**CZM:** 51

**Atlas:**

### City Council District:
2

**Councilor Name:** Jeannie Cue

### County Commission District:
2

**Commissioner Name:** Karen Keith

---

**Situation:**

Case Number: Z-7445

Related to PUD 159-B (abandonment)

**Hearing Date:** June 6, 2018
SECTION I: Z-7445

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT: The applicant is requesting AG rezoning and abandonment of the PUD is requested to allow agricultural uses and building types on the property.

EXHIBITS:
- INCOG Case map
- INCOG Aerial (small scale)
- INCOG Aerial (large scale)
- Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
- Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Areas of Stability and Growth Map

Applicant Exhibits:
- None provided

DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Large lot development required in AG zoning is consistent with West Highlands Small area plan at this location and,

Uses as allowed in AG zoning are not considered injurious to the surrounding properties and,

Abandonment of a portion of PUD 159 does not adversely affect the remaining developable property in the PUD therefore,

Staff recommends Approval of Z-7445 to rezone property from RS-3/ to AG only if the accompanying PUD 159-B is also approved.

SECTION II: Supporting Documentation

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: AG zoning is consistent with the Existing Neighborhood and Area of Stability components of the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and with the West Highlands Small Area Plan

Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: Existing Neighborhood
The Existing Neighborhood category is intended to preserve and enhance Tulsa's existing single-family neighborhoods. Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill projects, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code. In cooperation with the existing community, the city should make improvements to sidewalks, bicycle routes, and transit so residents can better access parks, schools, churches, and other civic amenities.

Areas of Stability and Growth designation: Area of Stability
The Areas of Stability includes approximately 75% of the city's total parcels. Existing residential neighborhoods, where change is expected to be minimal, make up a large proportion of the Areas of Stability. The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of
existing homes, and small scale infill projects. The concept of stability and growth is specifically designed to enhance the unique qualities of older neighborhoods that are looking for new ways to preserve their character and quality of life.

Transportation Vision:

Major Street and Highway Plan: Secondary arterial with a commuter street overlay

The most widespread commercial street type is the strip commercial arterial, these arterials typically serve commercial areas that contain many small retail strip centers with buildings set back from front parking lots. Because of this, strip commercial arterials have many intersections and driveways that provide access to adjacent businesses. Historically, this type of street is highly auto-oriented and tends to discourage walking and bicycling. On-street parking is infrequent.

Commuter streets are designed with multiple lanes divided by a landscaped median or a continuous two way left turn lane in the center. Commuter streets are designed to balance traffic mobility with access to nearby businesses. However, because there are so many intersections and access points on commuter streets, they often become congested. Improvements to these streets should come in the form of access management, traffic signal timing and creative intersection lane capacity improvements.

Trail System Master Plan Considerations: None

Small Area Plan: West Highlands Small Area Plan

This portion of the small area plan is considered an area of stability and an existing neighborhood. One of the major threats to the agricultural character favored by the residents in this area is increased density that would be allowed if the RS-3 zoning remained on this site.

Special District Considerations: None

Historic Preservation Overlay: None

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Staff Summary: The site is currently wooded and has a private pool and recreational area.

Environmental Considerations: None that would affect the possible uses in an AG district.

Streets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exist. Access</th>
<th>MSHP Design</th>
<th>MSHP R/W</th>
<th>Exist. # Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. 71st Street South</td>
<td>Secondary Arterial with Commuter Street Overlay</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilities:

The subject tract does not abut municipal water service.
Connections to municipal sanitary sewer will require an extension or an on site solution.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Area of Stability or Growth</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-3 / PUD 159</td>
<td>Park and Open Space</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-3 / PUD 159</td>
<td>Park and open space</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3 / PUD 159</td>
<td>Existing Neighborhood</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Existing Neighborhood</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PUD 159-B Summary**

Abandonment of a portion of development area SF-3 south of 71st street will reduce that area to 13.2 acres. Detached single family residential uses are the only uses allowed in that development area. The uses along with the bulk and area requirements identified in the remainder of SF-3 will remain unchanged.

**DEVELOPMENT AREA MAP FOR PUD 159 SOUTH OF W. 71ST STREET SOUTH:**

**SECTION III: Relevant Zoning History**

History: Z-7445
ZONING ORDINANCE: Ordinance number 11827 dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Subject Property:

PUD-159 April 1974: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 597+ acre tract of land to develop the entire residential zoned portion of Section 3 and an RS-3 zoned area near the SW corner of West 71st Street and South Union Avenue. Permitted were 954 houses, 876 apartments and a 36-hole golf course.

Surrounding Property:

PUD-606 March 1999: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 30.3+ acre tract of land for residential development, on property located south of the southwest corner of West 71st Street South and South Union Avenue.

BOA-18183 September 1998: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance to permit 0' frontage in an AG District, per plan submitted, on property located at 7424 ± S. Union.

BOA-18163 September 1998: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance of the required 30' frontage on a public street to 25', per plan submitted, on property located west of the southwest corner of West 73rd Street South and South 26th West Avenue.

BOA-17869 November 1997: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance to allow two dwelling units on one lot of record (guesthouse), per plan submitted and subject to a covenant being filed or record stating that the second dwelling may not be used as rental property, on property located at 7354 South 26th West Avenue.

BOA-17098 July 1995: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance of the required rear yard from 40' to 15' to permit construction of a new residence and detached garage, per plan submitted, on property located at 7171 South 26th West Avenue.

BOA-15898 December 1991: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance of the required 30' of frontage on a public street or dedicated ROW to 0' to permit access by mutual access easement, and dedicated of necessary easements to serve the lots, on property located at 7500 S. Union.

BOA-14188 September 1986: The Board of Adjustment denied a variance of lot width and area to permit lots with 165' and 168' widths and lot areas of approximately 1.2 acres each in an AG district to permit a lot-split located at Lot 4, Block 2, and Lots 2-4, Block 2, Rosewood Acres 2nd, on property located on the northeast corner of West 73rd Street South and South 26th West Avenue.
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**Case Report Prepared by:**

Dwayne Wilkerson

---

**Owner and Applicant Information:**

**Applicant:** Curtis Branch

**Property Owner:** BRANCH, CURTIS R & RACHAEL L

---

**Location Map:**

*(shown with City Council Districts)*

![Location Map](image)

---

**Applicant Proposal:**

**Present Use:** Vacant

**Proposed Use:** Uses as allowed by an AG district.

**Concept summary:** Abandon a 5.81 acre portion of development area SF-3 in PUD-159 and re-zone property to AG.

**Tract Size:** 5.81 ± acres

**Location:** East of southeast corner of South 26th West Avenue & West 71st Street South

---

**Zoning:**

**Existing Zoning:** PUD-159 / RS-3

**Proposed Zoning:** AG

**Comprehensive Plan:**

**Land Use Map:** Existing Neighborhood

**Stability and Growth Map:** Area of Stability

---

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends approval of the abandonment for a portion of PUD 159.

The configuration of PUD development area SF-3 has created property that is unlikely to be developed in a manner consistent with the West Highlands Small area plan. Also, a subdivision east of the site in Cluster 2 has blocked vehicular access to and from S. Union Ave.

---

**City Council District:** 2

**Councilor Name:** Jeannie Cue

**County Commission District:** 2

**Commissioner Name:** Karen Keith
SECTION I: PUD-159-B

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT: The applicant is requesting AG rezoning and abandonment of the PUD is requested to allow agricultural uses and building types on the property.

EXHIBITS:
INCOG Case map
INCOG Aerial (small scale)
INCOG Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Areas of Stability and Growth Map
Applicant Exhibits: None provided

DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
Large lot development required in AG zoning is consistent with West Highlands Small area plan at this location and,
Uses as allowed in AG zoning are not considered injurious to the surrounding properties and,
Abandonment of a portion of PUD 159 does not adversely affect the remaining developable property in the PUD therefore,
Staff recommends Approval of PUD 159-B which will abandon a portion of PUD 159.

SECTION II: Supporting Documentation

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: AG zoning is consistent with the Existing Neighborhood and Area of Stability components of the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and with the West Highlands Small Area Plan

Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: Existing Neighborhood
The Existing Neighborhood category is intended to preserve and enhance Tulsa’s existing single-family neighborhoods. Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill projects, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code. In cooperation with the existing community, the city should make improvements to sidewalks, bicycle routes, and transit so residents can better access parks, schools, churches, and other civic amenities.

Areas of Stability and Growth designation: Area of Stability
The Areas of Stability includes approximately 75% of the city’s total parcels. Existing residential neighborhoods, where change is expected to be minimal, make up a large proportion of the Areas of Stability. The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small scale infill projects. The concept of stability and growth is specifically
designed to enhance the unique qualities of older neighborhoods that are looking for new ways to preserve their character and quality of life.

Transportation Vision:

Major Street and Highway Plan: Secondary arterial with a commuter street overlay

The most widespread commercial street type is the strip commercial arterial, these arterials typically serve commercial areas that contain many small retail strip centers with buildings set back from front parking lots. Because of this, strip commercial arterials have many intersections and driveways that provide access to adjacent businesses. Historically, this type of street is highly auto-oriented and tends to discourage walking and bicycling. On-street parking is infrequent.

Commuter streets are designed with multiple lanes divided by a landscaped median or a continuous two way left turn lane in the center. Commuter streets are designed to balance traffic mobility with access to nearby businesses. However, because there are so many intersections and access points on commuter streets, they often become congested. Improvements to these streets should come in the form of access management, traffic signal timing and creative intersection lane capacity improvements.

Trail System Master Plan Considerations: None

Small Area Plan: West Highlands Small Area Plan

This portion of the small area plan is considered an area of stability and an existing neighborhood. One of the major threats to the agricultural character favored by the residents in this area is increased density that would be allowed if the RS-3 zoning remained on this site.

Special District Considerations: None

Historic Preservation Overlay: None

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Staff Summary: The site is currently wooded and has a private pool and recreational area.

Environmental Considerations: None that would affect the possible uses in an AG district.

Streets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exist. Access</th>
<th>MSHP Design</th>
<th>MSHP R/W</th>
<th>Exist. # Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. 71st Street South</td>
<td>Secondary Arterial with Commuter Street Overlay</td>
<td>100 feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilities:

The subject tract does not abut municipal water service.

Connections to municipal sanitary sewer will require an extension or an onsite solution.
Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Area of Stability or Growth</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-3 / PUD 159</td>
<td>Park and Open Space</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-3 / PUD 159</td>
<td>Park and open space</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Golf Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3 / PUD 159</td>
<td>Existing Neighborhood</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Existing Neighborhood</td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUD 159-B Summary

Abandonment of a portion of development area SF-3 south of 71st street will reduce that area to 13.2 acres. Detached single family residential uses are the only uses allowed in that development area. The uses along with the bulk and area requirements identified in the remainder of SF-3 will remain unchanged.

DEVELOPMENT AREA MAP FOR PUD 159 SOUTH OF W. 71ST STREET SOUTH:

SECTION III: Relevant Zoning History

History: Z-7445
ZONING ORDINANCE: Ordinance number 11827 dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Subject Property:

PUD-159 April 1974: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 597+ acre tract of land to develop the entire residential zoned portion of Section 3 and an RS-3 zoned area near the SW corner of West 71st Street and South Union Avenue. Permitted were 954 houses, 876 apartments and a 36-hole golf course.

Surrounding Property:

PUD-606 March 1999: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 30.3+ acre tract of land for residential development, on property located south of the southwest corner of West 71st Street South and South Union Avenue.

BOA-18183 September 1998: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance to permit 0' frontage in an AG District, per plan submitted, on property located at 7424 S. Union.

BOA-18163 September 1998: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance of the required 30' frontage on a public street to 25', per plan submitted, on property located west of the southwest corner of West 73rd Street South and South 26th West Avenue.

BOA-17869 November 1997: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance to allow two dwelling units on one lot of record (guesthouse), per plan submitted and subject to a covenant being filed or record stating that the second dwelling may not be used as rental property, on property located at 7354 South 26th West Avenue.

BOA-17098 July 1995: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance of the required rear yard from 40' to 15' to permit construction of a new residence and detached garage, per plan submitted, on property located at 7171 South 26th West Avenue.

BOA-15898 December 1991: The Board of Adjustment approved a variance of the required 30' of frontage on a public street or dedicated ROW to 0' to permit access by mutual access easement, and dedicated of necessary easements to serve the lots, on property located at 7500 S. Union.

BOA-14188 September 1986: The Board of Adjustment denied a variance of lot width and area to permit lots with 165' and 168' widths and lot areas of approximately 1.2 acres each in an AG district to permit a lot-split located at Lot 4, Block 2, and Lots 2-4, Block 2, Rosewood Acres 2nd, on property located on the northeast corner of West 73rd Street South and South 26th West Avenue.
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Item: Zoning Code text amendments to modify standards for residential driveways Chapter 55
Parking: Sections 55.090-F

A. Background: The City was asked by the Home Builders Association of Greater Tulsa, to consider amendments to the residential driveway requirements to better facilitate market demands for wider driveways. Once a proposal was developed and vetted, the TMAPC, on April 4, 2018, initiated text amendments to the Zoning Code. The May 2, 2018 TMAPC hearing for this item was continued in order to conduct an additional work session which occurred on May 16, 2018. Additional adjustments to the proposal were made as a result of the discussion at the work session.

The Tulsa Zoning Code establishes a maximum width for residential driveways based on zoning district. This measurement sets the width of driveways both on private property and within the public right of way. Generally, the purpose for having a maximum width is to support the residential character of neighborhoods and prevent lots from becoming fully paved parking areas in front of single family homes. Narrower driveways on smaller lots are more consistent with existing development patterns in older parts of the community. As average home sizes have increased, market demands have resulted in properties having three garages, for vehicles, boats, storage, or any number of other uses.

Under previous versions of the City’s zoning code developers used a PUD as a means of modifying open space requirements to allow additional paved (impervious) surface for wider driveways accessing three-car garages. The current code provides that a greater driveway width may be approved by special exception or by amendment of existing PUDs.

Proposed amendments address lot dimensions instead of zoning district which allows the amount of lot frontage along the street to serve as context for the maximum width of a driveway within the public right of way. This proposal allows larger lots to install wider driveways, which seems consistent with the request under consideration.

Open space requirements are not proposed to change and will take precedence if they are more stringent than the allowed maximum driveway width. A provision is included to ensure no more than 50% of the lot frontage is occupied by a driveway. This proposal was adjusted after the May 16, 2018 work session to add; 1) a provision for very narrow lots (30’ or less) to have maximum 12’ wide driveways, and 2) a cap on the overall driveway area within the required street setback which is not to exceed 50% of the required street setback area.
The following table compares methodologies for determining maximum driveway width:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-2016 Zoning Code</th>
<th>Current Code</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on zoning district</td>
<td>Based on zoning district</td>
<td>Based on lot frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum coverage calculation within street setback (17% - 36%)</td>
<td>Specific dimensions within right-of-way &amp; on the lot (12' - 30')</td>
<td>Specific dimensions within right-of-way; Maximum coverage within street setback (50%); Maximum width of all driveways (50% of lot frontage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livability space required</td>
<td>Open space per unit required</td>
<td>Open space per unit required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The definition of “Open Space per Unit” in the current code closely matches the definition (and prescribed dimensions) of “Livability Space” from the previous zoning code.

Engineering standards for residential driveways have been amended to allow widths ranging from 10'-30'. The previous standard limited residential driveways to a maximum width of 24'.

Proposed amendments to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code, Title 42 Tulsa Revised Ordinances, are shown in strike-through/underline format in Attachment I.

The new City of Tulsa Zoning Code became effective on January 1, 2016. Since that time, fourteen (14) applications for special exceptions allowing wider residential driveways have been processed; all were approved. Attachment II includes examples of special exception requests which have been granted by the Board of Adjustment. These approvals allow wider driveway widths based on individual review relative to the approval criteria for all special exceptions. While some of these applications would no longer be required under the proposed amendments, others would still have needed BOA approval to be permitted. Attachment III shows the single PUD amendment that was approved to allow for wider driveways.

Attachment IV contains graphic examples of proposed maximum driveway widths for lots with various frontages/dimensions. These examples show the difference between earlier proposals and the current version which reflects changes made after the May 16, 2018 TMAPC work session.

Attachment V is a document provided by the HBA of Greater Tulsa at the request of the TMAPC for discussion at the May 16, 2018 Work Session.
And Attachment VI is a code comparison showing driveway allowances for cities within the region as well as for comparable cities nationally.

Public comment received by the TMAPC staff prior to distribution for this public hearing is found in Attachment VII.

B. **Staff Recommends APPROVAL** of proposed amendments to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code as shown in Attachment I.
Proposed Amendments:

55.090-F Surfacing

3. In RE and RS zoning districts, driveways serving residential dwelling units within the street right-of-way may not exceed 50% of the lot frontage or the following maximum widths, whichever is less, unless a greater width is approved in accordance with the special exception procedures of Section 70.123, or, if in a PUD, in accordance with the amendment procedures of Section 30.010-1.2. (Refer to City of Tulsa Standard Specifications and Details for Residential Driveways #701-704).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Driveway Width</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>RS-1</th>
<th>RS-2</th>
<th>RS-3</th>
<th>RS-4</th>
<th>RS-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Right-of-Way (feet)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Lot (Outside ROW) (feet)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For approvals granted under the terms of the zoning code in effect prior to January 1, 2016, including (1) variances of maximum driveway coverage measured by width, square footage or percentage of yard and (2) establishment of PUD development standards that increase the maximum permitted driveway coverage measured by any such means, the foregoing maximums do not apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Frontage</th>
<th>Maximum Driveway Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60' - 74'</td>
<td>28'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46' - 59'</td>
<td>24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30' - 45'</td>
<td>20'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30'</td>
<td>12' [2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Maximum width applies to the composite of all driveways if multiple curb cuts are provided.

[2] For lot frontages less than 30 feet, a maximum driveway width of 12' is permitted.

In RE and RS zoning districts, the total area of all driveways within the required street setback may not exceed 50% of the area of the required street setback.
Attachment II

Examples of Approved Special Exceptions:
Special Exception Approvals for Driveways

1 inch = 1,000 feet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received Date</th>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Maximum Driveway Width (per code)</th>
<th>Proposed Driveway Width</th>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/9/2016</td>
<td>21104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>07/12/16</td>
<td>Amalea Valdez</td>
<td>2915 E 4th Pl S</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>±70'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>existing house; driveway expansion</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2016</td>
<td>21139</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>08/13/16</td>
<td>Nik Hooper</td>
<td>2663 E 20th St S</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>±49'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>34'</td>
<td>new build; part of newly created subdivision</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/26/2016</td>
<td>21155</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11/06/18</td>
<td>Charles Sanders Homes Inc</td>
<td>18521 E 44th St</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>±67'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; in established neighborhood</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/2016</td>
<td>21159</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Nick Puna</td>
<td>5033 E 11th St S</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>±152' (Combined lots)</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; part of newly created subdivision</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2016</td>
<td>22191</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>01/11/17</td>
<td>J.D. Hargen</td>
<td>West and South of the SWc of S 103 E Ave and E 41 ST S</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>±55-72' (14 lots in subdivision)</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; in established neighborhood</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/26/2017</td>
<td>22229</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>04/25/17</td>
<td>Phil Roush</td>
<td>12051 S URBANA AV E</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>±158'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>existing house; added on to the garage which required driveway expansion</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10/2017</td>
<td>22244</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>05/23/17</td>
<td>Ronnie Heron</td>
<td>3220 E 51st St</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>±200'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; infill in established neighborhood</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/3/2017</td>
<td>22246</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>06/13/17</td>
<td>Barry Goldstein</td>
<td>1366 E 32 Pl S</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>±157'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; infill in established neighborhood</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10/2017</td>
<td>22546</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>06/13/17</td>
<td>Gribin Smith</td>
<td>4110 S 120th Ave E</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>±157'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; part of newly created subdivision</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/4/2017</td>
<td>22580</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>06/27/17</td>
<td>Philip Enyie</td>
<td>7611 S Center Ave</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>±166' (combined lots)</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>existing house; added on to the garage which required driveway expansion</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/2017</td>
<td>22923</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>08/08/17</td>
<td>Richard Winn</td>
<td>2523 E 30th St S</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>±190' (combined lots)</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; in established neighborhood</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10/2017</td>
<td>23231</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>09/12/17</td>
<td>Jack Arnold</td>
<td>2521 E 34th St S</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>±157'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; in established neighborhood</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/2017</td>
<td>23289</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/05/18</td>
<td>Kenneth Barr</td>
<td>5650 N. Harford Ave. E</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>±152'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; part of newly created subdivision</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/3/2018</td>
<td>12396</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>02/27/18</td>
<td>Jeremy Barnes</td>
<td>18058 E 43rd St S</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>±86'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; part of newly created subdivision</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/2018</td>
<td>12418</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>03/30/18</td>
<td>J.O. Harp</td>
<td>18508 E 43rd Street</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>±86'</td>
<td>20' x 20'</td>
<td>new build; part of newly created subdivision</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Example | Approved Special Exception
(compliant with proposed changes)
Driveway Width Assessment | Special Exception B
City of Tulsa Planning Department | 30 May 2018

Example | RS-3 Zoning

Example | Approved Special Exception (compliant with proposed changes)
Driveway Width Assessment | Special Exception C
City of Tulsa Planning Department | 30 May 2018

Example | RS-2 Zoning

Example | Approved Special Exception
(NOT compliant with proposed changes)

Composite of all driveways is greater than maximum width allowed within the R.O.W.

residence
driveway

residence
driveway

ROW
street

street

105'
Driveway Width Assessment | Special Exception D
City of Tulsa Planning Department | 30 May 2018

Example | RS-4 Zoning

Example | Approved Special Exception
(NOT compliant with proposed changes)

Driveway width within R.O.W. is greater than the maximum allowable width.

---

Image of a residential area with a focus on a property at 18521 E 44th St.

Diagram of a residence with the following labels:
- residence
- building setback
- driveway
- ROW
- sidewalk
- street
Attachment III

PUD Amendment to Address Driveway Width:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolved Date</th>
<th>Case #</th>
<th>Council District</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>Lot Width</th>
<th>Maximum Distance, Width (per code)</th>
<th>Proposed Distance, Width</th>
<th>Type of Construction</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/24/2017</td>
<td>PUD-834-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>03/16/17</td>
<td>Brandon Jackson</td>
<td>4504 W 19th &amp; 19th</td>
<td>Zoning Museum Rd</td>
<td>200x100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>new build; part of newly created subdivision</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Proposed Residential Driveway Regulations:
HAMMERHEAD DRIVEWAY | RS-3

Initial Proposal
Driveway width within R.O.W. based on lot frontage.

After Work Session
Driveway width within R.O.W based on lot frontage, including 50% rule within street setback.
3-CAR DRIVEWAY | RS-2

Initial Proposal
Driveway width within R.O.W. based on lot frontage.

RESIDENCE FOOTPRINT: 3351.5 sq.ft.

After Work Session
Driveway width within R.O.W based on lot frontage, including 50% rule within street setback.
Initial Proposal
Driveway width within R.O.W. based on lot frontage.

After Work Session
Driveway width within R.O.W based on lot frontage, including 50% rule within street setback.
HBA Prepared Response to TMAPC Questions:
Material presented and discussed at May 16, 2018 TMAPC Work Session
HBA Response to Commissioner Questions

Why did the HBA (or those representing the HBA) agree to / not oppose the current zoning code pertaining to residential driveways during the CAT process and/or the drafting / hearings of the current zoning code?

Paul Kane, past HBA Executive Officer, was a member of the Zoning Code Update Citizen Advisory Team (CAT). He resigned to accept another position out-of-state before the TMAPC public hearings and City Council meeting adoption. He advises that a request was made for driveway widths to be limited at a maximum of 30', but that this issue was not fully vetted during the CAT’s participation. Mr. Kane also advised that driveway width was not a negotiating tool to receive favorable consideration on other zoning code update issues. Like other zoning code issues with unintended consequences which have been subject to post-adoption amendment, driveway widths became an issue for builders during the transition from the previous zoning code to the new.

Why exactly does the HBA want to amend the current zoning code pertaining to residential driveways? How precisely does it adversely affect the HBA or those it represents?

The HBA supports providing housing choices, a basic tenet of PLANITULSA. With the announcement of the Gathering Place and continuing investment in downtown redevelopment there has been increased demand for single-family residential infill development. Whether new construction or renovation, these new home buyers are demanding larger homes - some with 3-car garages to accommodate off-street vehicle parking and/or storage. The current zoning code only allows for a 20’ wide driveway in the right of way, which limits a resident’s ability for direct access into a third garage or full driveway width for sports or exercise. The proposed changes to the zoning code not only increase the amount of paved area by 40 to 100 square feet within the right of way, but create more opportunity for families to enjoy complete use of their private property. There is no proposal to change to the 50% open space coverage on a lot, so the maximum amount of paved area will not be affected by this zoning code amendment. Any adverse effect is not on the HBA or its members, but to the City of Tulsa’s ability to increase property and sales tax dollars within its city limits. In 2017, 128 of the 156 homes in the Greater Tulsa Parade of Homes were constructed with at least a 3-car garage. When access is limited by a bottleneck driveway, we are finding that home buyers seek out houses with direct access elsewhere. While comparing Tulsa to other peer cities in the nation is recommended, the City cannot afford to continue to lose population and businesses to surrounding municipalities.

How do Tulsa’s peer cities handle the issue of residential driveway widths? Not surrounding cities, but peer cities.

More detail and excerpts from zoning codes are included on a separate sheet. Research was done on 5 peer cities, Portland, OR; Fort Worth, TX; Nashville, TN; Raleigh, NC; and Cleveland, OH. Two of our peer cities noted that 50% of the total lot must be open space which is less restrictive than Tulsa. We could not locate any open space requirement on the other three cities. Portland, OR specifically calls out for no more than 40% of paved area in the front yard and Fort Worth, TX specifically calls out for no more than 50% of paved area in the front yard. Cleveland, OH calls out for a maximum of 30’ in width for driveways.

The proposed amendment would fall in common ground with the average of these five peer cities.
Does the HBA have any alternatives to proposed revisions to the zoning code regarding residential driveway widths? For example, a city wide overlay pertaining only to new construction in platted subdivisions? Other?

The HBA has worked with city staff for the past 15 months and this proposed zoning code amendment has staff approval. This amendment is minor in context to existing neighborhoods as it increases the driveway width in the right-of-way by 4'-10", but does not affect the overall amount of paved area on a lot. The zoning code still requires open space in the range of 52%-57% of the lot. The HBA does not support a city-wide overlay pertaining only to new construction in platted subdivisions. In our opinion, a zoning amendment best addresses this issue – not another overlay district which serves to undermine the purpose of the zoning code. There should be a place for everyone in the City of Tulsa.

Have you looked at any planning alternatives to facing three garage doors and their required concrete to the street?

Have you looked at "stacking" the third garage space out the back of a two car garage? The third space is many times used for a boat or a utility vehicle. The third space projecting out the back could also serve as a room off a rear courtyard.

Have you looked at installing the garage in the rear detached? Utilizing a 12'-0" drive at the side of the home? Again, a detached garage can become a flex space as well for the back yard.

Have you looked at the use of alleys in a completely new development to access a detached garage and provide a "shared" easement for utilities on a full block?

The HBA and members of the residential development and construction industry evaluates all options that pique homebuyer interest. What’s important to note is that the one thing that distinguishes Tulsa’s housing stock is its diversity. Garages may be constructed in any orientation, size, or style from detached to front facing, side or rear entry, or perhaps just a porte cochere. Options are limited by lot size and street access. These options are best left to the homebuyer in determining their preference for what is typically the biggest investment of their lifetime.
Peer City Driveway Comparison

Portland, OR

3. Frontage limitation. a. The standard of this subparagraph applies outside the Central City plan district in the R3, R2 and R1 zones. No more than 50 percent of the frontage on a street may be used for vehicle areas. On sites with more than one street frontage, this standard applies to the street with the highest transit designation. If two streets have the same highest transit classification, the applicant may choose on which street to meet the standard. Sites where there is less than 100 square feet of net building area are exempt from this standard.

3. Front yard restrictions. a. No more than 40 percent of the land area between the front lot line and the front building line may be paved or used for vehicle areas. In addition, on corner lots, no more than 20 percent of the land area between the side street lot line and the side street building line may be paved or used for vehicle areas.

3. Standards. a. The length of the garage wall facing the street may be up to 50 percent of the length of the street-facing building façade

Fort Worth, TX

Driveway coverage, including ribbon drives, shall not exceed 50% of the front yard, and any additional parking on the property shall be provided on the driveway. Circular drives shall not exceed 65% maximum coverage. Parking pads are permitted if they are attached to the primary driveway and constructed of the same material, and shall be included in the calculation of driveway coverage.

Nashville, TN

Minimum of two off street parking spaces. No maximum measurement or percentage found.

Raleigh, NC

Minimum of two off street parking spaces. No maximum measurement or percentage found.

Cleveland, OH

(3) The maximum width of such driveway shall be thirty (30) feet measured at right angles to the angle of the driveway entrance. Such driveway shall have an apron of six (6) feet radius at the curb, and provide a means for motor vehicles to enter and leave without obstructing traffic.
Attachment VI

Code Comparisons:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>Maximum Driveway Width (feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Right-of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On the Lot (Outside ROW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bixby</td>
<td>Street Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenks</td>
<td>No maximum driveway width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owasso</td>
<td>Driveways shall be a maximum of 35 feet in width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Arrow</td>
<td>Driveway ingress width shall be no greater than 25 feet exclusive of curb returns at the street curb or pavement edge for two-car garages and no more than 27 feet for three-car garages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenpool</td>
<td>No maximum driveway width.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Driveway Width Ordinance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tulsa - Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Width (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tulsa - Proposed</strong></td>
<td>Maximum Length (ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oklahoma City, OK</strong></td>
<td>Driveway area must have min width of 8.5 ft for each automobile and parking area must be located more than 5 ft from street pavement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garage Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 car or none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 car or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Worth, TX</strong></td>
<td>^ Majority of residential districts allow for two parking spaces per dwelling unit, located behind the front building wall or line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^ Additional requirements in Historic districts and Urban Villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum curb cut width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 38 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cincinnati, OH</strong></td>
<td>^ Parking is prohibited in the private yard area and is permitted only in driveways that lead to a garage or rear yard parking area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max driveway width of 20 ft in front or side yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Louisville, KY</strong></td>
<td>^ The width of the driveway at the property line shall not exceed the width of the garages or parking spaces to which the driveway leads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^ Maximum percentage of pavement in front yard - 40 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^ Maximum percentage of pavement in street-side yard - 20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kansas City, MO</strong></td>
<td>^ Maximum 25-55 percent impervious coverage of lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^ Minimum 1.5-2 automobile spaces per residential unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>^ Frontages of 60 ft or less shall be limited to 1 driveway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Omaha, NE</strong></td>
<td>^ Maximum 2-4 automobile spaces per residential unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum driveway width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 30 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittsburgh, PA</strong></td>
<td>^ Maximum curb cut width - 36 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment VII

Public Comment:
April 25, 2018

Re: Proposed amendment to section 55.090-F of the zoning code

Commissioners:

As pedestrian advocates, BPAC strongly opposes the proposed changes to the zoning code related to residential driveway width.

Wide driveways cause several negative impacts to the comfort and safety of people on foot.

- Driveways, by definition, cross pedestrian pathways. Wider driveways increase the size of this conflict zone, and reduce the comfort and safety of people who walk.
- Wide driveways enable higher driving speeds on residential streets and encourage drivers to make faster turns. The extra width allows for a wide turn radius, and eliminates the need to slow while approaching a turn.
- Wide driveways are associated with street-facing multi-car garages. Street-facing garages mean more blank walls, fewer windows, and fewer “eyes on the street.”
- Wider driveways mean more asphalt and less green space. They contribute to heat islands, eliminate space for shade trees, and increase runoff to local stormwater sewer systems.

The proposed amendment, if adopted, would mean that residential driveways could be wider than many neighborhood streets throughout Tulsa. It would also allow people to pave their entire front yards, assuming the “open space” requirements could be met elsewhere on the lot. Tulsa deserves better than this.

For the above reasons, BPAC opposes the proposed amendment.

Thank you,

Larry Mitchell
President, BPAC
Kim, I have just read your email to Mitch Drummond and his response. I wish to urge you to vote against the proposed driveway zoning change for all the reasons mentioned. 35 year Maple Ridge homeowner, Beverly Schafer
Good morning,

I would like to state my objections to the proposal to allow larger driveways in our vintage neighborhood. We do not want more concrete nor the negative aesthetics of them. Let’s preserve our lovely heritage.

Thank you,

Julie Anderson
2812 S. Cincinnati Ave.
281/352-7589

Sent from my iPhone
I received today the agenda for the May 2, 2018 TMAPC meeting and I am writing with regard to item 23. I am adamantly opposed to this amendment as it is an assault on the character of midtown neighborhoods. While other cities value their neighborhoods close to their downtown hub it seems for some reason Tulsa is all too willing to destroy them. These neighborhoods are highly sought for their unique character and property values steadily increase. Any request for a giant driveway should be considered on an individual basis and not an overall zoning change.

As a 30 year resident of midtown I must say that the TMAPC process is truly flawed and highly suspect. Citizens are automatically put at a disadvantage when a zoning request is made and the public is kept in the dark until the approval process is well on its way. The public should be notified before and not after the TMAPC decides to research a zoning request and determine whether or not they support approval. Again I reiterate my opposition to ZCA-10 and respectfully request the TMAPC deny its approval.
As a resident of Yorktown Historic Preservation District, I would like to express my opposition to allowing larger driveways to reduce front yard size. My husband and I specifically chose to live in a historic area because of its charm and because its guidelines would guarantee that the character and tradition of the neighborhood would be maintained. I am a life-long Tulsan. I know what midtown neighborhoods should look like and cry when driving through so many of them that are being ruined by tearing down traditional homes only to erect huge cookie cutter monstrosities that are a total disregard for what was there originally. While these new buildings cannot be stopped in most parts of town, I am asking the committee to consider what will happen to our historic preservation districts if they are included in this change. We don’t have 3 car garages. Our lots are small and our driveways are narrow. Our own is difficult to maneuver, but it’s a trade off that we were willing to make to live in an area that looks like a 1920’s or 1930’s movie set. Please consider the ramifications of this zoning change and keep our historic preservation areas sacred.

Mike and Jo Farrimond
2215 E 20 ST
Hi, Kay. I'm a resident of Maple Ridge who cannot understand the need to expand driveways in our beautiful historic neighborhoods or anywhere else in our charming mid-town communities. In what way does this enhance our neighborhoods? And, can we not just leave them alone?

I fail to see how this adds value. Is it necessary to put south Tulsa in our mid-town yards? Can we not just appreciate the differences and leave our quaint neighborhoods as they are. As they have always been? I so value what we have here and I would gladly move to Jenks were it what I wanted to come home to.

Sincere thanks for your consideration.
Terry Heller-Auxter

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Kim!

Wanted to send a quick note about the proposed zoning change to increase the maximum driveway width in residential neighborhoods.
I'm strongly opposed to any changes which would allow wider driveways than what is currently allowed in the code. In fact, I would support changes to REDUCE the allowable width both within the property and within the ROW.

The current garage-centric design of many of the modern infill houses is distasteful, out of character for the neighborhoods, and is fundamentally anti-social. In addition to reducing the green space area for water absorption within front yards, this proposed change sends the message that our houses and yards exist to accommodate vehicles, not people.

If widening is being looked at, how about some of the major arterial streets like Peoria and 31st street which aren’t even wide enough to fit a large SUV within the lanes. This is said somewhat tongue in cheek as I realize this is a completely different set of codes which govern but I feel makes the point: why should residential driveways be allowed to be wider than many of our major streets?

Thanks for taking and passing along this feedback and for all that you do.
Best Regards,
Matt
Hello,

As a Tulsa resident and homeowner, I am writing to register my opposition to the proposed Zoning Code amendments regarding maximum driveway width (ZCA-10). I can't imagine why we would want to allow people to pave as much of their front yard as they like without having to seek an exception (other than the obvious reason that it's financially beneficial to homebuilders). My home is in an older midtown neighborhood and I am concerned that such developments would have a negative impact on the character of the neighborhood as well as our property values.

Best regards,

Rachel Piotraschke
2219 E 13th St.
Tulsa, OK
Good morning,

I am disheartened to hear about a proposal to allow wide driveways no matter the neighborhood.

I leave in the Brookside addition, southwest corner of 31st and Peoria. My neighborhood is starting seeing builders building big houses (all grey so far), which do not fit the quaint look of the neighborhood.

Allowing wide driveway will further destroy the beauty of a the neighborhood, with less green spaces and making it unsafe as well.
I moved there because of walkability and beauty of the surroundings.

I would love to see us preserve the beautiful architecture we have, or at least build to fit the neighborhood instead of letting builders build mc mansions to make their profits.

Sincerely,
Virginie Cochard
3124 S Owasso av
Tulsa, OK 74105
Greetings.
I would like to express my serious concerns about Public Hearing Item 23: ZCA-10, a proposal to change zoning to allow much wider driveways. Now, if this was allowed in a brand new subdivision, in which a large percentage of homeowners wanted 3-car garages and giant driveways, I have no problem. But to change zoning for existing neighborhoods will create eyesores; increase safety risk to bikers and pedestrians (full disclosure: I'm a walker and my husband is a biker); and reduce greenery in neighborhoods. This can be seen in my own neighborhood. Just drive down Trenton south of 71st, and you will see an expanded driveway close to Riverside. It is hideous, having turned what was once a lovely front yard with a big tree with a swing hanging from it into what is now essentially a parking lot. This is probably against zoning, but it's done and there's no going back. Changing zoning will produce many such driveways. So, while this might make a few builders happy, when a client wants a three-car garage on a new house being built in an existing neighborhood, it will lead to all kinds of unattractive results, as people will widen driveways on smaller lots with only two car garages, to better accommodate their three, four, or five car households. The love people have for their city begins with the fondness and attachment they have for their neighborhoods, including neighborhood parks and walkable streets. Bigger driveways damage neighborhood personality and charm, and in so doing, are a net loss for Tulsa.

Thank you for your consideration of all sides of this matter.

Sincerely,
Audrey L. Alcorn
Mr. Covey,

As a resident of Yorktown Historic Preservation District, I would like to express my opposition to allowing larger driveways and thereby reducing front yard sizes. My husband and I specifically chose to live in a historic area because of its charm and because its guidelines would guarantee that the character and tradition of the neighborhood would be maintained. I am a life-long Tulsan. I know what midtown neighborhoods should look like and cry when driving through so many of them that are being ruined by tearing down traditional homes only to erect huge cookie cutter monstrosities that are a total disregard for what was there originally. While these new buildings cannot be stopped in most parts of town, I am asking the committee to consider what will happen to our historic preservation districts if they are included in this change. We don’t have, want, or need 3 car garages. Our lots are small and our driveways are narrow. Our own is difficult to maneuver, but it’s a trade off that we were willing to make to live in an area that looks like a 1920’s or 1930’s movie set. Please consider the ramifications of this zoning change and keep our historic preservation areas sacred.

Mike and Jo Farrimond
2215 E 20 ST
Ms. Sawyer,

I saw on Nextdoor that there are proposed - and recommended - zoning code changes to allow larger/wider driveways in Tulsa neighborhoods. This is a VERY BAD idea, especially for the older city neighborhoods, and should not be approved. I've seen this done before and it looks bad even in newer neighborhoods, it would absolutely ruin the character of older neighborhoods.

I live in Lewiston Gardens and realize that living in these older neighborhoods with their generally small homes and small lots involves certain compromises, but I could certainly live somewhere else if I didn't want to deal with those compromises. Let the people that must have larger homes/garages/driveways live somewhere else, frankly - don't allow our older neighborhoods to be ruined by changes such as this which don't belong there.

Thank you,

Mark Wenner
Dear Chairman Covey,

I am writing to advise you of my opposition to the above-referenced proposed amendment to the zoning code.

As you are aware, current regulations prohibit driveways wider than 20’ inside the public right of way. I’m not certain why the HBA advocates a blanket amendment to the current regulations rather than continuing its current available remedy of applying for a special exemption. Perhaps this proposal is designed to make their lives easier. I would urge the TMAPC Planning Commissioners to consider the lives of those who live in existing Tulsa neighborhoods. We are watching our neighborhoods slowly eroded by giant homes, crowded lot lines and ever-widening expanses of concrete.

The HBA members already have the option of pouring ever-widening driveways: apply for special exceptions, which they routinely do. But I urge you to oppose this blanket change to the zoning code so that home builders no longer even have to take those steps, which, in theory, provide notice to surrounding landowners and provide them with the opportunity to speak to how exemptions impact them.

Sincerely,

Julie T. Rowland
2721 East 22nd Place
Tulsa, OK. 74114

Sent from my iPad
I am against expanding driveways in midtown. We have small yards and not only will it reduce our green areas, but ruin the aesthetics of our 1920/30 cottage style homes.

I do not want to look like a south side neighborhood that is all garage and driveways.

Thank you in advance for considering my opinion.

Sincerely,
Diana Boatman
1128 S Lewis Pl
Tulsa, Ok 74104

Sent from my iPhone
Builders continue to want to insert homes in areas that were designed for beauty and taste. They pay a premium for a home, tear it down and build a large sometimes architecturally ‘inappropriate’ structure in order to recoup the price they paid scrunching as large a home as possible with amenities what people expect on less expensive property. Half less green space?

“Pave paradise put up a parking lot.”

Alice RODGERS
Terwilleger Heights

Sent from my iPhone
Concerning item number 23:ZCA-10 This would be a really bad idea for established neighborhoods. Our neighborhoods were not planned to have this kind of a driveway situation. Please do not allow this special interest take away the beauty of midtown! It would sell our city short.
Dear Planning Commission members;

I’m writing on behalf of the 1,100 members and 6,300 followers of Smart Growth Tulsa, a local non-profit corporation whose mission is To Advocate and Shape Smart Public Policy. We urge you to oppose Item #23, ZCA-10, Amendment of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code to Section 55.090-F3.

This amendment is effectively “blanket zoning.” It is uncalled for and represents a serious threat to the character of Tulsa’s beautiful established neighborhoods. There are several zoning tools available to the Home Builders Association of Greater Tulsa for developing new neighborhoods where the demand might exist for wider driveways, without the potential damaging consequences to the rest of the city’s residents.

If you were to approve this ill-advised idea and the Council agreed, you would essentially be opting-in every neighborhood and homeowner without their knowledge or consent. There has been virtually no media attention or public discussion about this matter, and the exhibits attached to the Agenda do not in my view paint a true or balanced picture of what the potential outcomes of this amendment could or would look like in Sunset Terrace or the many hundreds of other established neighborhoods in Tulsa.

Please support the existing residential character and development patterns in the older parts of our community; and prevent the possibility of lots becoming fully paved parking areas in front of single family homes.

We support but will not repeat the concerns outlined in BPAC’s letter to you that illustrates why this is a bad idea. Without the influence of perceived political pressure, I suspect most professional planners would be outspoken about the lack of merits of this city-wide change to the zoning code. I’m quite confident that that a legitimate professional review and staff recommendation would conclude that this amendment is inconsistent with our adopted comprehensive plan.

Please vote no on this item in favor of another more reasoned approach to solve what some perceive as a problem.

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Leighty, Chair
Smart Growth Tulsa
918.605.5520
Bill@SmarthGrowthTulsa.Org
https://www.smartgrowthtulsa.org/
I am against the widening of driveways included in the Item 23:ZCA-10 at the Public Hearing.
I have owned a home in this area for over 22 years and know first hand this would not be a positive change for everyone. For our neighborhood, this change would not be helpful to our midtown culture of a small town neighborhood where every neighbor knows you and watches out for you.
Thank you, Daven Tackett
Dear Mr Covey,

I am writing to inform you that I strongly oppose the proposed changes to the zoning code related to residential driveway width.

Wide driveways cause several negative impacts to the comfort and safety of people on foot:

- Driveways, by definition, cross pedestrian pathways. Wider driveways increase the size of this conflict zone, and reduce the comfort and safety of people, especially children who are smaller and less visible, who walk and play in the streets and sidewalk.

- Wide driveways enable higher driving speeds on residential streets and encourage drivers to make faster turns. The extra width allows for a wide turn radius, and eliminates the need to slow while approaching a turn.

- Wide driveways are associated with street-facing multi-car garages. Street-facing garages mean more blank walls, fewer windows, and fewer "eyes on the street."

- Wider driveways mean more asphalt and less green space. They contribute to heat islands, eliminate space for shade trees, and increase runoff to local stormwater sewer systems.

The proposed amendment, if adopted, would mean that residential driveways could be wider than many neighborhood streets throughout Tulsa. It would also allow people to pave their entire front yards, assuming the "open space" requirements could be met elsewhere on the lot. Tulsa deserves better than this. For the above reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed amendment.

--
coleman downing
www.colemandowning.com
347-645-8727
We feel that 20’ is wide enough for any driveway in the city limits. Please leave it at that.

Thank you.
Shirley Moore
918-646-3952

Sent from my iPhone
Hello Kim,

Please include in this week's packet, thank you.

Cherie

April 30, 2018

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting No. 2769
May 2, 2018, 1:30 PM
175 East 2nd Street, 2nd Level, One Technology Center
Tulsa City Council Chamber

RE: ZCA-10, TMAPC
TO: ksawyer@incoq.org
FROM: COHN-Coalition of Historic Neighborhoods

COHN is a conduit for broadening awareness of zoning changes that affect the midtown area, especially those with HP designations. Communication was forwarded to our group, last Thursday evening, upon receipt of this week’s Agenda, not one resident who contacted COHN were in favor of this change.

This board will hear specifics from those members and other interested parties, each of whom will provide relevant zoning and ordinance details, with pictures and maps, as to why this proposal carries significant detrimental impact on all residential zoning.

Our general belief, is that it is loosely written with unintended consequences and is being offered on behalf of one special interest group, vs. the overall results for a majority of Tulsa residents.
We urge caution and would ask, this proposal, as currently drafted, be denied.

Thank you.

Cherie Cook
COHN, Founding Member, Board of Directors
The Coalition of Historic Neighborhoods of Tulsa COHN Neighborhoods represented under this Coalition are as follows:
Brady Heights
Crosbie Heights
Mayo Meadow
Riverview
Tracy Park
Owen Park
White City
Lewiston Gardens
Swan Lake
Maple Ridge
Gillette
Ranch Acres
Renaissance
Yorktown
Terwilliger Heights
To the Planning Commission:

I am a resident and Terrace Drive Neighborhood, in the heart of midtown (11th to 15th, Utica to Lewis), and am vice-president of the Neighborhood Association. Our neighborhood (and my street in particular, 14th place, which is south of the BA expressway) consists mostly of small lots and bungalows built circa the 1920s. Most have one car detached garages which sit towards the back of the property. They use single width driveways. Some houses have wider garages, but they too utilize single width driveways and curb cuts until they widen far back on the property closer to the detached garage. This setup has served our neighborhood well. It preserves walkability and is consistent with the time during which the houses were built. Two car households such as mine either double up in the single width driveway or use street parking, none of which has been a subject of controversy.

The proposed zoning code amendment is greatly over-inclusive and harmful to older established neighborhoods that dominate midtown. The amendment appears to be for the benefit of newer homes with attached garages that take up significant frontage of the home. As describe above, this does not apply to my neighborhood and dozens like it in midtown, where most garages are detached and to the rear of the property. The proposal is clearly intended to give a single special interest group (the Home Builders Association of Greater Tulsa) the right to build suburban style driveways in existing neighborhoods in midtown without exception. Special exceptions are the only protection midtowners have when a homebuilder tries to build suburban style homes which do not match the existing character of the neighborhood. The special exception process is not onerous and is simply the cost of doing business when tearing down homes and rebuilding in older established neighborhoods. The special exception process should remain the standard.

To the extent homebuilders want more freedom for new neighborhoods in sprawling areas, there are much better solutions that can apply solely to those neighborhoods without removing existing protections for established neighborhoods. Developers can request broad relief applicable to an entire new neighborhood, or can request overlays, or utilize other parts of the zoning code. To make this change city-wide is significantly over-inclusive. The risk to older established neighborhoods vastly outweighs any interest homebuilders have to broad, permanent, city-wide changes to the zoning code. The staff report shows that the special exception process has only been needed 14 times since January 2016, and all have been approved. It is therefore difficult to see the harm to homebuilders in seeking these exceptions.

I further am in full agreement with the comments and objections made by the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee concerning the harm to walkability and our city’s more recent support for bike friendliness. My street in particular has active sidewalks with kids riding bikes and and parents pushing strollers. We walk often to Cherry Street and its amenities, and is used by pedestrians and cyclists cutting through on their commutes. If a homebuilder wants to change the character of our neighborhood, it is only fair that they make a case to the commission specific to their plan. I again reiterate that applying this broad amendment city-wide is greatly over-inclusive.

I know that many others in midtown feel the same. Please do not let a single special interest obtain overly broad relief at the expense of concerns citizens of older, established neighborhoods. Please reject the proposed amendment and let the special exception process remain the proper procedure, or find a narrower plan that avoids application to established neighborhoods which work hard to preserve their urban character.
Kim Sawyer,

I live at 2540 S. Florence Ave. #4 Tulsa, OK 74114.

I wanted to voice my concern in regards to the proposed changes to the city Zoning Code in regards to increasing driveway widths. Please do not accept this proposed change.

This change would potentially do the following:

1. Alter the character of many established neighborhoods in Tulsa.
2. Create wider distances for people crossing vehicular zones like driveways. This would discourage walk-ability and make it more unsafe for children to play and people to use their neighborhoods for recreational activity like jogging, walking, biking, etc.
3. Increase storm water by adding more pavement in Tulsa, negatively impacting our watersheds and increasing the volume of water to areas that already have flooding issues.
4. In general, the proposal is to allow for three car garages and/or three cars to park side by side on a single driveway. This would potentially make it more financially feasible to demolish older homes for for larger homes with 3 car garages, which would alter the character of many neighborhoods that many Tulsan's take pride in.
5. This proposed change is also a contradiction to the goals in Tulsa's Comprehensive Plan, by further encouraging vehicular dependence while at the same discouraging alternative means of transit through consequence.

Thank you,

Tony
Kim:

Please advise the Commission of a request to continue the above proposed Zoning Code Amendment regarding wider drive-ways for future consideration or deny the proposal for the above Amendments scheduled as Item 23 for the MPAC Meeting No. 2769 to be held on May 2, 2018 meeting date. [http://www.tmopc.org/current_agenda.html](http://www.tmopc.org/current_agenda.html)

I am the President of the Museum Neighborhood Association which represents home owners in the neighborhood surrounding the Philbrook Museum.

We became aware of this proposal yesterday, April 30.

I have reviewed the Staff Report and note that as of today, May 1, 2018, the report does not include Examples of how the proposed amendment would operate, however, within the Mid-Town area 30 foot wide drive-ways on 75 foot wide lots would be a significant disruption to the character of the area.

We are experiencing significant teardown / rebuild and remodeling in the area and have properties creating significant hard surface use of the properties (who is checking on the 80% maximum? What if the whole area goes to 80%) as well as questionable uses, such as, astro-turf front yards!

We find the letter you received in opposition to the proposed Amendment from the Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee, dated August 25, 2018, to be compelling.

Our membership is having an Annual Meeting at Philbrook on Wednesday, May 2, and we will advise them of this situation and request their further in-put.

The parties copied on this email are members of the Board of the Association and other interested residents who have raised the issue and support the request to defer action or deny the Amendment at this time.

I have also copied the President of the Maple Ridge Home Owners Association.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement of recipient of this email and its transmittal to the Commission.

Very truly yours,

Robert Brejcha
President, Museum Neighborhood Association
918-605-8272
This e-mail, including attachments, if any, may include confidential information and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or his or her authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.
Attn: Chairman Michael Covey Susan Miller has confirmed for me that if this proposed amendment is passed nearly my entire front yard could be turned into a driveway/parking lot if I wanted. This is something I would never do as it would destroy my home and neighborhood near 15th and Utica. I've attached a pic of my 1920's craftsman which has been lovingly updated and cared for. Please deny this zoning amendment as it is builder overreach and would signal a death knell to midtown neighborhoods as we know them.
Robert,

I am in receipt of your memo to Kim Sawyer. As a homeowner in the Museum Neighborhood, I am concerned that you have decided to speak on behalf of others in the neighborhood, that may not share your personal position on three car driveways. I also take exception to your notion that our neighborhood fabric is being threatened by “tear downs.” Surely you are not speaking about the Day home, Thomas home, etc. The new homes that have been constructed by our neighborhood in recent years are of high quality and are additions to the Museum Neighborhood that will be admired years from now for their beauty and style.

The changes being sought by the home building industry will have little affect on homes in our area. Home prices and land prices on our neighborhood are well above the price point that this policy change will affect.

Smaller homes in the Brookside area between Riverside and Peoria, where lot prices have risen from the $60k mark to well over $200k and similar areas in the Tulsa market, that this change is intended to help. This escalation of value in Midtown is due to the positive impact of the Gathering Place, that is attracting young families back into the Midtown area, that have in recent years moved to more suburban areas where schools and amenities that they require were available. The impact on our neighborhood will be modest if at all.

We should embrace the change in demographics that is occurring in the older areas of Tulsa, rather than take a position that is based on creating a fear that is unfounded and inaccurate.

I would remind you that the letter you have submitted to the TMAPC has not had a vote of the members of the Museum Neighborhood, that should determine the positron our neighborhood chooses to support. That vote has not occurred to my knowledge, and I would suggest that you provide concrete examples of the threat to our neighborhood and have an open and honest discussion with the rest of your neighbors, before allowing your personal bias and ignorance of this issue appear to be shared by the association.

At this time your memo should be considered your personal position, and not that of the Museum Neighborhood.

Joe Westervelt

Joseph Westervelt
Mapleview Associates Inc.
1630 S. Boston Ave.
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119
918-583-8808 (office)
918-607-8808 (cell)
jwestervelt@mapleviewassociates.com
Kim:

Please advise the Commission of a request to continue the above proposed Zoning Code Amendment regarding wider drive-ways for future consideration or deny the proposal for the above Amendments scheduled as Item 23 for the MPAC Meeting No. 2769 to be held on May 2, 2018 meeting date. [http://www.tmapc.org/current_agenda.html](http://www.tmapc.org/current_agenda.html)

I found out about this proposed amendment only today, and although I have not yet advised the Southern Pointe Homeowners Association, I will do so tomorrow and I believe the Association would vote to deny this proposal. Thanks for your consideration.

Bill Ramsay
8727 S Hudson
Tulsa, Ok 74137
Good morning Kim,

Please find below our statement for TMAPC review regarding the proposed Zoning Code Amendment to Driveway Widths:

Maple Ridge Neighbors (Maple Ridge neighborhood association) supports the current City of Tulsa Zoning Code regarding driveway width. When it is proposed that a residential single family property wishes to increase the width of their driveway beyond the current Code restrictions, Maple Ridge Neighbors supports the careful review of each application, on a case by case basis, to determine if the exception is in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code.

The proposed Amendment to the current Code could lead to unintended safety issues and prove detrimental to the historical and aesthetic character of neighborhoods under Historic Preservation Overlay as well as those that embrace our unique urban forest setting and celebrate the intrinsic value of green spaces.

Respectfully,

Cullen Koger
MRN, President
Kim:

It has been brought to my attention that despite my statements below as follows:

"The parties copied on this email (emphasis added) are members of the Board of the Association and other interested residents who have raised the issue and support the request to defer action or (emphasis added) deny the Amendment at this time."

And,

"Our membership is having an Annual Meeting at Philbrook on Wednesday, May 2, and we will advise them of this situation and request their further input."

There may be an impression that this matter has been voted upon by our general membership.

So let me be clear – The Museum Neighborhood Association has not had a vote on this matter – the request to defer or deny "at this time" represents the various opinions of those copied on the email and is not a representation of the general membership of the Association.

Obviously for those requesting a deferment of action, the opportunity to review the matter with the Exhibits you provided this morning and to discuss the matter with a reasonable time for consideration is desirable.

Please transmit this clarification to the Commission.

Thank you

Robert Brejcha
President, Museum Neighborhood Association
918-605-8272

This e-mail, including attachments, if any, may include confidential information and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or his or her authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.
Very this entity This Advisory Committee,
The reader is 918-605-8272
President, Museum Our membership goes
Robert I would appreciate
I have also copied
I would appreciate your acknowledgement of recipient of this email and its transmittal to the Commission.

Kim:

Please advise the Commission of a request to continue the above proposed Zoning Code Amendment regarding wider drive-ways for future consideration or deny the proposal for the above Amendments scheduled as Item 23 for the MPAC Meeting No. 2769 to be held on May 2, 2018 meeting date.  http://www.tmapc.org/current_agenda.html

I am the President of the Museum Neighborhood Association which represents home owners in the neighborhood surrounding the Philbrook Museum.

We became aware of this proposal yesterday, April 30.

I have reviewed the Staff Report and note that as of today, May 1, 2018, the report does not include Examples of how the proposed amendment would operate, however, within the Mid-Town area 30 foot wide drive-ways on 75 foot wide lots would be a significant disruption to the character of the area.

We are experiencing significant teardown / rebuild and remodeling in the area and have properties creating significant hard surface use of the properties (who is checking on the 80% maximum? What if the whole area goes to 80%) as well as questionable uses, such as, astro-turf front yards!

We find the letter you received in opposition to the proposed Amendment from the Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee, dated August 25, 2018, to be compelling.

Our membership is having an Annual Meeting at Philbrook on Wednesday, May 2, and we will advise them of this situation and request their further input.

The parties copied on this email are members of the Board of the Association and other interested residents who have raised the issue and support the request to defer action or deny the Amendment at this time.

I have also copied the President of the Maple Ridge Home Owners Association.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement of recipient of this email and its transmittal to the Commission.

Very truly yours,

Robert Brejcha
President, Museum Neighborhood Association
918-605-8272

This e-mail, including attachments, if any, may include confidential information and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or his or her authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.
Robert Brejcha
President, Museum Neighborhood Association
918-605-8272

This e-mail, including attachments, if any, may include confidential information and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or his or her authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.

Kim:

It has been brought to my attention that despite my statements below as follows:

"The parties copied on this email (emphasis added) are members of the Board of the Association and other interested residents who have raised the issue and support the request to defer action or (emphasis added) deny the Amendment at this time.";

And,

"Our membership is having an Annual Meeting at Philbrook on Wednesday, May 2, and we will advise them of this situation and request their further in-put.";

There may be an impression that this matter has been voted upon by our general membership.
So let me be clear – The Museum Neighborhood Association has not had a vote on this matter – the request to defer or deny “at this time” represents the various opinions of those copied on the email and is not a representation of the general membership of the Association.

Obviously for those requesting a deferment of action, the opportunity to review the matter with the Exhibits you provided this morning and to discuss the matter with a reasonable time for consideration is desirable.

Please transmit this clarification to the Commission.

Thank you

Robert Brejcha
President, Museum Neighborhood Association
918-605-8272

This e-mail, including attachments, if any, may include confidential information and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or his or her authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.

From: Robert Brejcha <bobbrejcha@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 1, 2018 11:04 AM
To: ‘ksawyer@incog.org’ <ksawyer@incog.org>
Cc: ‘Alice Rodgers’ <cainsgal@icloud.com>; Martha Blevins (mmblevins@hotmail.com) <mmblevins@hotmail.com>; ‘Mike Keys’ <michaeldekeys@aol.com>; Greg Dukes (Gregdukes@sbcglobal.net) <Gregdukes@sbcglobal.net>; Rodney Schewey (Rshewey@swbell.net) <Rshewey@swbell.net>; Debbie Favell (debbie@favell.com) <debbie@favell.com>; 'cullen koger' <cullenk13@gmail.com>; 'HALL Tracey' <tahallco@cox.net>; 'okpops@cox.net' <okpops@cox.net>; 'john@favell.com' <john@favell.com>; 'Alice Rodgers' <cainsgal@icloud.com>; ‘HALL Tracey’ <tahallco@cox.net>; Martha Blevins (mmblevins@hotmail.com) <mmblevins@hotmail.com>; ‘Mike Keys’ <michaeldekeys@aol.com>; Greg Dukes (Gregdukes@sbcglobal.net) <Gregdukes@sbcglobal.net>; Rodney Schewey (Rshewey@swbell.net) <Rshewey@swbell.net>; Debbie Favell (debbie@favell.com) <debbie@favell.com>; 'cullen koger' <cullenk13@gmail.com>
Subject: May 2, 2018 - ZCA-LO, Residential Driveway Width PROPOSED Zoning Code Amendments
Importance: High

Kim:

Please advise the Commission of a request to continue the above proposed Zoning Code Amendment regarding wider drive-ways for future consideration or deny the proposal for the above Amendments scheduled as Item 23 for the MPAC Meeting No. 2769 to be held on May 2, 2018 meeting date. http://www.tmapc.org/current_agenda.html

I am the President of the Museum Neighborhood Association which represents home owners in the neighborhood surrounding the Philbrook Museum.

We became aware of this proposal yesterday, April 30.

I have reviewed the Staff Report and note that as of today, May 1, 2018, the report does not include Examples of how the proposed amendment would operate, however, within the Mid-Town area 30 foot wide drive-ways on 75 foot wide lots would be a significant disruption to the character of the area.

Robert Brejcha
President, Museum Neighborhood Association
918-605-8272
We are experiencing significant teardown / rebuild and remodeling in the area and have properties creating significant hard surface use of the properties (who is checking on the 80% maximum? What if the whole area goes to 80%) as well as questionable uses, such as, astro-turf front yards!

We find the letter you received in opposition to the proposed Amendment from the Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee, dated August 25, 2018, to be compelling.

Our membership is having an Annual Meeting at Philbrook on Wednesday, May 2, and we will advise them of this situation and request their further input.

The parties copied on this email are members of the Board of the Association and other interested residents who have raised the issue and support the request to defer action or deny the Amendment at this time.

I have also copied the President of the Maple Ridge Home Owners Association.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement of recipient of this email and its transmittal to the Commission.

Very truly yours,

Robert Brejcha
President, Museum Neighborhood Association
918-605-8272

This e-mail, including attachments, if any, may include confidential information and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or his or her authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.
Mr. Michael Covey:

RE: Item: Amendment of Section 55.090-F3 of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code (Maximum Width of Residential Driveways in RE and RS Districts) to revise the maximum driveway width regulations established by that section.

I would like to express my disgust with TMAPC and the City of Tulsa, in general. I know making money is important to the City, but to render our older established midtown areas to look like all of the south Tulsa neighborhoods is unforgiveable.

I have lived in Tulsa for 70 years and in my current home for 39 years near 22nd and Lewis. What has been happening to the pride of midtown Tulsa is unforgiveable. Brookside neighborhoods have almost disappeared.

Tulsa needs to stop allowing builders to put money in their pockets at the expense of midtown Tulsans who have lived in these areas because we love the history of our city and the architecture of our homes. We know what a wonderful area this is to live, but to allow builders to remove all the homes just so they can make money does not seem to be preserving what adds to the beauty of our City. During my 30 years as a realtor, I have given many clients moving to Tulsa a "welcome tour" down Riverside Drive and through the older neighborhoods to show just what Tulsa has to offer - a little bit of everything!

Please help midtowners keep what is left of our little area of Tulsa by getting the above amendment turned down. Allowing builders to add three car driveways and garages is not what midtown is about. Please - let's preserve what is left of this area so that our grandchildren and their grandchildren can also enjoy this part of Tulsa's history.

Sincerely,

Susan White
If we ever forget that we're one nation under God,
then we will be a nation gone under!  (Ronald Reagan)
Midtown needs to be preserved - the City is allowing too much construction - like the Marshall property - the is ruining the property value.

Sent from my iPhone
Kim and Dwayne,

My name is Bill Thomas; I reside at 1376 East 29th Street, having built that home between 2010 and 2012. Additionally, our family has lived in the mid-town area for over forty years. Our family also contributed to the Gathering Place. We are very excited about the positive impact it will have on Tulsa, mid-town and beyond. I remember well my first move into mid-town with kids in tow. To see new opportunities in this new age for such a youthful influx is very exciting, again.

A neighbor brought to my attention this morning that a hearing is scheduled this afternoon to consider certain proposed restrictions that may affect midtown residential properties. I was also made aware that Bob Brejcha (copied here) has reached out to you by letter with recommendations on and/or about such matters. Because Bob lives in the neighborhood surrounding Philbrook Museum of Art and very kindly (and voluntarily) serves as the President of the Museum Neighborhood Association (Association), I am cautiously concerned that you (INCOG or others) may interpret Bob’s personal recommendations as recommendations made on behalf of the Association. Accordingly, I spoke with my neighbor and friend Mike Keys, who serves as Vice President and Communications officer of the Association, to ascertain that the letter reflected Bob’s personal views only.

Mike assured me that Bob’s letter to you was appropriately only his personal entreaties on the matters.

So in my caution to make be clear on this, I am writing you to make sure that you do not interpret Bob’s letter recommendations as on behalf of the Association; otherwise, you may tangentially misconstrue my personal thinking on the matters, merely because I am a dues-paying member of the Association.

Hopefully, this clarifies my concern. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact me. My cell is 918-691-0348.

Kindly,
~Bill

Note: Copied are the officers of Association. I much appreciate their service to the Association whose original founding in 2010, was exclusively to serve a neighborhood fully unified in security/safety concerns.
Co-Owner
1516 S. Boston Avenue, Ste. 301 • Tulsa, OK 74119
P (918) 592-4400

CARF Accredited for
Excellence in Care & Service
Click Here to visit seniorstar.com
I am a resident of a mid-city historic district neighborhood. I am opposed to allowing an increase in the allowable size of parking areas and drives in my neighborhood. A two car garage and curb parking should be ample for a family. I suspect this is proposal is being shopped by the Airbnb industry that has ruined so many formerly desirable districts around the world.

Paul Moore
1611 S Detroit Ave
Tulsa OK 74120

Sent from my HTC phone.
May 2, 2018

Mr. Michael Covey, Chairman
Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission
Two West 2nd Street, Suite 800
Tulsa, OK 74103
Delivered in person at TMAPC meeting

Subject: ZCA-10, Residential Driveway Width-Zoning Code Amendment

Dear Commissioner Covey,

Allow me to first apologize for being out of state and not being in attendance at today’s TMAPC meeting where ZCA-10, the proposed zoning code amendment regarding residential driveway width will be heard.

I have been meeting with Dawn Warrick, Susan Miller, and the Mayor’s office for the last 14 months to develop a zoning code amendment that facilitates consumer demand for wider driveways in the City of Tulsa. With construction of the Gathering Place nearing completion as well as other area attractions and amenities, the city is experiencing increased demand for new residential construction. This demand is coming primarily from young families who want to live and work near these developments. This is exciting news for the City of Tulsa as we expect increased population growth to result. For those who are raising families comes the need for maximum garage space and corresponding driveway width to accommodate off-street vehicle parking, storage needs, and family sports and activities.

Yesterday, I became aware of one objection in particular from an existing homeowner who has been led to believe that “if this proposed amendment is passed nearly my entire front yard could be turned into a driveway/parking lot if I wanted”. Nothing could be further from the truth since the Zoning Code’s open space coverage requirement is not subject to change. For example, a RS-3 zoned property requires a minimum of 7,200 square feet with an open space of 4,000 square feet. That leaves 3,200 square feet for the home’s living space, garage, patios, driveway, and walkways. This will not result in a paving all or nearly all of the front yard because the open space requirement simply won’t allow it.

This amendment has been specifically developed with City of Tulsa staff input to promote residential development and to protect existing neighborhoods. TMAPC approval of this proposed amendment serves to provide a variety of housing options that accommodates both housing types and affordability in all areas of the city in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. The HBA is in agreement with the
staff recommendation for approval of the proposed amendments to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code as shown in Attachment I.

I am, however, concerned that the exhibit packet for this agenda item did not include all referenced attachments when the agenda was released for public notice, and that Attachments II and III have been distributed to TMAPC members less than 24 hours in advance of this meeting. I believe it is in everyone's best interest to continue this item to another date so that all attachments pertaining to this proposed amendment receive the attention they deserve by all interested parties, and that this material accurately communicates what will and will not be allowed.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Smith
Executive Vice President/CEO
I volunteer to be on committee to discuss driveway widening proposal.

Alice RODGERS
1519 East 26th Pl
Tulsa, OK 74114

9183448701
cainsgal@aol.com

Sent from my iPhone
TMAPC,

Please do not consider increasing widths for driveways. I live in midtown and do not want my neighborhood to be filled with mcmansion driveways on lots meant for bungalow houses. This decreases the livability of the neighborhood and decreases property value. If a person would like to live in a mcmansion with a three car garage, they can purchase one in other Tulsa neighborhoods where lots are larger.

Thank you for your time.

Ronnie Cookson

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
My husband and myself are very much against changing the plan for South Maple Ridge. Wider streets would change the Looking and feeling of our family neighborhood. Wide driveways would destroy trees and landscaping that have been here for decades upon decades. It would encourage "dead cars" in driveways and much more water in our yards and streets. Banking you in advance for your support.

Eileen and John Shane
2828 S Cincinnati Ave
I am troubled by this specific proposed amendment to the zoning code. The amendment would arguably be a step backwards in achieving the goals of Midtown neighborhoods' comprehensive plan. Current regulations prohibit driveways that are wider than 20' inside the public right of way, and for good reason. Driveways generally cross pedestrian pathways and keeping them narrow helps create the kind of safe, walkable neighborhoods that are typically high priorities in the place-making strategies of smart cities.

The current zoning code establishes residential driveway width based on zoning districts by applying specific dimensions, which was determined to be easier for applicants to calculate and for staff to administer.

Sincerely,
Mark Leavitt
Renaissance Neighborhood
Dear Mr. Covey,

As a licensed architect and District 4 Midtown resident, I am contacting you to voice my opposition to the proposal to allow increased paving surface for driveways.

I oppose the measure for the following reasons:

- **Impact on water run off**
  - As you know, infill in older neighborhoods has impacted the community in many ways, both good and bad. Due to the smaller lot size and relative high cost of land acquisition (land prices + (frequently) the cost to demolish existing structures to make room for new), builders choose to dramatically increase the size of building footprint on a lot thereby also decreasing pervious land area, creating greater water runoff. The older sewer systems have a difficult time processing the water and our high level of vegetation in Midtown often exacerbates this issue due to clogged collection points. Additionally, my experience has been that builders often change existing drainage patterns as part of the process, thereby causing adjacent properties to be negatively affected, sometimes with more minor consequences (standing water, silted patios, ruined landscaping) and other times with major problems such as house/basement flooding. Allowing larger expanses of paving will amplify the issue by further decreasing the percolation area on the lot.
  - Our zoning codes contain green space requirements requiring minimum pervious open area on properties. Midtown is primarily composed of RS-1, RS-2, and RS-3 properties. For these, the green (impervious) space required is 53% - 58% of the lot space (see charts below). It has been my observation that this ordinance is rarely followed nor enforced, neither in new construction nor in additions to existing structures. One does not have to be a design professional to recognize this, one only has to drive through our Midtown neighborhoods to see structures built from setback to setback (even in the backyard) to know that the lot does not comply with these green space requirements of greater than 50%. Allowing additional driveway width will further hinder compliance and increase water runoff issues.

---

**FROM 5/10/18 Tulsa Zoning Code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulations</th>
<th>RS-1</th>
<th>RS-2</th>
<th>RS-3</th>
<th>RS-4</th>
<th>RS-5</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>RM-1</th>
<th>RM-2</th>
<th>RM-3</th>
<th>RMH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached House</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage House</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Sunday, May 20, 2018 12:28 PM**

Sawyer, Kim

From: karen mcall dunning <kmdunninga@juno.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 20, 2018 12:28 PM
To: esubmit
Cc: Miller, Susan; mayor@cityoftulsa.org; 'dist4@tulsacouncil.org'
Subject: Public Hearing Item 23: ZCA-10
Neighborhood aesthetics, viability, and value
  - Data shows that "walkability" is a key factor in the value and desirability of our inner neighborhoods. It is my contention that promoting greater vehicle use and increasing the size of curb cuts will negatively affect this aspect of Midtown living.
  - From the zoning charts above, one can see that in an RS-1, RS-2, or RS3 districts, (most of Midtown), the minimum lot width is 100', 70', 60' (resp.). Allowing larger driveways and wider curb cuts would result in driveway access being as much as 50% of the street frontage. I suggest that this increases risk to pedestrians and decreases the aesthetic appeal of our older neighborhoods. While there may not be a statistically measurable cause/effect relationship, I would contend that both these will negatively affect Midtown neighborhood viability and value.

Thank you for considering these potential ramifications when you assess the proposed changes to the code. Feel free to contact me by return email or at 918.851.5058 with any questions.

Karen McCall Dunning

Unbelievable German World War 2 Photo Shocks Americans
pro.naturalhealthresponse.com
http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TG13125b01b06824e9b30662180st03duc
Attn: Chairman Michael Covey

My email addresses inaccurate statements in the May 2, 2018 letter to you from Jeffrey Smith with the HBA. In paragraph 3, Mr. Smith discusses a particular objection from an existing homeowner and why that objection is without merit. While he does not state the homeowner's name it is clear that he is referencing my objection and my home at 1760 E., 14th Place. You may recall my objection as I attached a picture of my craftsman bungalow.

Surprisingly Mr. Smith apparently lacks a full understanding of the existing RS-3 zoning and it's application to my particular property which is typical of the many 1920's homes built in Tulsa's original footprint. His statements directly contradict the analysis of my home under the proposed zoning amendment that Susan Miller at INCOG was gracious enough to provide to me. I trust she has a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the zoning code and I have no reason to believe she would be anything other than accurate. I seriously doubt Susan Miller is wrong and I feel that if she discovered she had made an error she would have let me know and I have heard nothing from her to that effect. INCOG has been very helpful in helping me understand the scope of ZCA-10 and what it would look like in the real world. Clearly the HBA is confused and to avoid any possible confusion I would like the record to reflect the inaccuracy of Mr. Smith's statements in paragraph 3.