

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 2692

Wednesday, February 18, 2015, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Chamber

One Technology Center – 175 E. 2nd Street, 2nd Floor

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Carnes		Fernandez	VanValkenburgh, Legal
Covey		Hoyt	
Dix		Huntsinger	
Fretz		Miller	
Liotta		White	
Midget		Wilkerson	
Millikin			
Reeds			
Shivel			
Stirling			
Walker			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Wednesday, February 11, 2015 at 2:42 p.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair Covey called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

REPORTS:

Director's Report:

Ms. Miller reported on the TMAPC receipts, City Council agenda and Board of County Commissioner's agenda. Ms. Miller further reported on the Zoning Code update.

* * * * *

1. **Minutes:**

Approval of the minutes of February 4, 2015 Meeting No. 2691

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, the TMAPC voted 11-0-0 (Carnes, Covey, Dix, Fretz, Liotta, Midget, Millikin, Reeds, Shivel, Stirling, Walker “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; none “absent”) to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of February 4, 2015, Meeting No. 2691.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

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

2. **LS-20755** (Lot-Split) (County) – Location: South of the southeast corner of East 161st Street South and South Peoria Avenue
3. **LS-20756** (Lot-Split) (CD 7) – Location: East of the northeast corner of East 79th Street South and South Mingo Road
4. **LS-20757** (Lot-Split) (County) – Location: North and West of the northwest corner of East 96th Street North and North Mingo Road (Related to LC-643)
5. **LC-643** (Lot-Combination) (County) – Location: North and West of the northwest corner of East 96th Street North and North Mingo Road (Related to LS-20757)
6. **LS-20758** (Lot-Split) (CD 4) – Location: East of the southeast corner of East 11th Street South and South Atlanta Place (Related to LC-644)
7. **LC-644** (Lot-Combination) (CD 4) - East of the southeast corner of East 11th Street South and South Atlanta Place (Related to LS-20758)
8. **PUD-597-5 – Eller & Detrich/Lou Reynolds**, Location: West of the southwest corner of East 95th Court and South Mingo Road, requesting a PUD Minor Amendment to add Use Unit 5, Place of Worship to allowable uses, **OL/PUD-597**, (CD-7)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Amendment Request: Modify the PUD to add Use Unit 5 - Place of Worship to allowable uses.

The current permitted uses for PUD-597 are those that area allowed by right within an OL district. While Use Unit 5 is not allowed by right in an OL

district, it is allowed by Special Exception. Within a PUD, uses permitted by Special Exception may be included in allowable uses.

Staff Comment: This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 1107.H.15 PUD Section of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

“Changes in an approved use to another use may be permitted, provided the underlying zoning on the particular site within the PUD would otherwise permit such use by right and the proposed use will not result in any increase of incompatibility with the present and future use of the proximate properties.”

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

- 1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the PUD.
- 2) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-597 and subsequent minor amendments shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **approval** of the minor amendment request to add Use Unit 5 – Place of Worship to the permitted uses.

9. **PUD-815-2 – Costco Wholesale/Michael Okuma**, Location: Northwest corner of East 103rd Street and South Memorial Drive, requesting a PUD Minor Amendment to add Use Unit 4 to permitted uses, **CS/PUD-815**, (CD-8)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Amendment Request: Modify the PUD to add Use Unit 4 - Public Protection and Utility Facilities to permitted uses.

A cell tower currently exists on site at this location. This minor amendment is required to bring that tower into conformity with the PUD standards.

Staff Comment: This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 1107.H.15 PUD Section of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

“Changes in an approved use to another use may be permitted, provided the underlying zoning on the particular site within the PUD would otherwise permit such use by right

and the proposed use will not result in any increase of incompatibility with the present and future use of the proximate properties.”

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

- 1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the PUD.
- 2) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-815 and subsequent minor amendments shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the minor amendment request to add Use Unit 4 to the permitted uses.

10. **PUD-802-1 – Eller & Detrich/Lou Reynolds**, Location: Northeast corner of East 41st Place South and South Peoria Avenue, requesting a PUD Minor Amendment to modify Development Standards regarding, metal fence post on north boundary, wall signs on south wall, shielded ground lights and parking, **CH/CS/RM-2/PUD-802**, (CD-9)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Amendment Request: To modify Development Standards regarding: metal fence post on north boundary, wall signs on south wall, shielded ground lights and parking.

See Applicant’s Exhibit “B” for specific proposed changes.

Staff Comment: *This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 1107.H.9 PUD Section of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.*

“Changes in structure heights, building setbacks, yards, open spaces, building coverage and lot widths or frontages, provided the approved Development Plan, the approved PUD standards and the character of the development are not substantially altered.”

As well as Section 1107.H.12

“Modifications to approved signage, provided the size, location, number and character (type) of the sign(s) is not substantially altered.”

and Section 1107.H.13

“Modification to approved screening and landscaping plans, provided the modification is not a substantial deviation from the original approved 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 PUD.
- 2) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-802 shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the minor amendment request to modify the Development Standards regarding: metal fence post on north boundary, wall signs on south wall, shielded ground lights and parking.

11. **PUD-221-F-3 – Shaw Homes**, Location: Northwest corner of East 129th East Avenue and East 43rd Street South, requesting a PUD Minor Amendment to increase allowable front yard coverage from 30% to 50%, **RD/RS-3/PUD-221-F**, (CD-6)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Amendment Request: Modify the PUD to increase the allowable front yard coverage of the subject lots from 30% to 50%

The subject lots are currently restricted to 30% front yard coverage. The applicant is requesting the increase in allowable coverage to 50% due to the unusual shapes of the subject lots.

Staff Comment: *This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 1107.H.9 PUD Section of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.*

“Changes in structure heights, building setbacks, yards, open spaces, building coverage and lot widths or frontages, provided the approved Development Plan, the approved PUD standards and the character of the development are not substantially altered.”

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

- 1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the PUD.
- 2) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-221F and subsequent minor amendments shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **approval** of the minor amendment request to increase the allowable front yard coverage of the subject lots from 30% to 50%.

12. **PUD-678-4 – Green Country Outdoor Living**, Location: East of the southeast corner of South 74th East Avenue and East 97th Street South, requesting a PUD Minor Amendment to reduce the rear yard setback from 20 feet to 15 feet, **RS-3/PUD-678**, (CD-8)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Amendment Request: To reduce the required rear yard setback from 20 ft to 15 ft for Lot 9, Block 1 Audubon Village.

The applicant would like to construct a covered patio that would encroach 5 ft into the existing rear yard setback.

Staff Comment: *This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 1107.H.9 PUD Section of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.*

“Changes in structure heights, building setbacks, yards, open spaces, building coverage and lot widths or frontages, provided the approved Development Plan, the approved PUD standards and the character of the development are not substantially altered.”

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

- 1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the PUD.
- 2) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-678 and subsequent minor amendments shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the minor amendment request to reduce the rear yard setback from 20 ft to 15 ft.

13. **Z-5620-SP-14 – Eller & Detrich/Andrew A. Shank**, Location: Southeast corner of South Memorial Drive and East 91st Street, requesting a Corridor Detail Site Plan for a new retail building in a corridor district, **CO/Z-5620-SP-14**, (CD-7)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

CONCEPT STATEMENT:

The applicant is requesting detail site plan approval on a 0.69 Acre site in a Corridor District for a new retail building, including one, one story building.

PERMITTED USES:

Uses permitted as a matter of right are Use Unit 14 – Shopping Goods and Services, Use Unit 21 – Business Signs and Outdoor Advertising, and uses of a nature customarily accessory thereto, include, without limitation, Use Unit 23 – Warehousing and Wholesaling, as an accessory use. The retail building proposed for this project is allowed by right.

DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS:

The submitted site plan meets all applicable building height, floor area, density, open space, and setback limitations. No modifications of the previously approved Corridor Development Plan are required for approval of this site plan.

ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES:

The new building meets all applicable architectural guidelines in the Corridor Development Plan.

OFF-STREET PARKING AND VEHICULAR CIRCULATION:

The site plan meets the minimum parking defined in the Tulsa Zoning Code and the Corridor Development Plan.

LIGHTING:

Site lighting plans are not provided. Site lighting shall comply with the requirements of the Tulsa Zoning Code.

SIGNAGE:

The site plan illustrates wall sign locations. Any new signage will require a separate permit. All signage will be required to meet the Corridor Development Plan Standards. Any ground or monument signs placed in an easement will require a license agreement with the City prior to receiving a sign permit. This staff report does not remove the requirement for a separate sign plan review process.

SITE SCREENING AND LANDSCAPING:

The open space, landscape area and screening are consistent with the Corridor Development Plan requirements and meet the minimum standards of the Landscape portion of the Tulsa Zoning Code. This staff report does not remove the requirement for a separate landscape plan review process.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND CIRCULATION:

The plan displays sidewalks along East 91st Street and along South Memorial Drive, as well as internal pedestrian paths adjacent to the proposed building.

MISCELLANEOUS SITE CONSIDERATIONS:

There are no concerns regarding the development of this area.

SUMMARY:

Staff has reviewed the applicant's submittal of the site plan as it relates to the approved **Z-5620-SP-14**. The site plan submittal meets or exceeds the minimum requirements of the Corridor Development Plan. Staff finds that the uses and intensities proposed with this site plan are consistent with the approved Corridor Development Plan, and the stated purposes of the Corridor Development Plan section of the Zoning Code.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the detail site plan for the proposed new retail building.

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute sign plan or landscape plan approval.)

14. **PUD-817 – Khoury Engineering, Inc.**, Location: Southeast corner of East 4th Street and South Madison Avenue, requesting a PUD Detail Site Plan for a new micro-brewery to occupy an existing building within the PUD, **IL/PUD-817**, (CD-4)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

CONCEPT STATEMENT:

The applicant is requesting detail site plan approval on a 0.5 Acre site in a Planned Unit Development for a new micro-brewery to be located in an existing one story building.

PERMITTED USES:

Permitted Uses and accessory uses customarily incident to a principal use: Use Unit 1 (Area-wide uses); Use Unit 4 (Public Protection and Utility Facilities); Use Unit 11 (Offices, studios, and Support Services); Use Unit 12 (Eating Establishments, Other than Drive-ins; Use Unit 13

(Convenience Goods and Services); Use Unit 14 (Shopping Goods and Services); Use Unit 15 (Other Trades and Services); Use Unit 21 Business Signs, Outdoor Advertising); Use Unit 26 but limited to a micro-brewery with a production of less than 5,000 beer barrels annually. No outside storage of any kind allowed. The micro-brewery proposed for this project is allowed by right.

DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENTS:

The submitted site plan meets all applicable building height, floor area, density, open space, and setback limitations. No modifications of the previously approved Planned Unit Development are required for approval of this site plan.

ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES:

The existing building meets all applicable architectural guidelines in the Planned Unit Development.

OFF-STREET PARKING AND VEHICULAR CIRCULATION:

The site plan meets the minimum parking defined in the Tulsa Zoning Code and the Planned Unit Development.

LIGHTING:

Site lighting plans are not provided. Parking area light standards shall not exceed 20 feet in height and shall be equipped with deflectors directing the light downward and away from the south boundary of the property. Lighting shall be designed so that the light producing elements and the polished light reflecting elements of exterior lighting fixtures shall not be visible to a person standing within an adjacent residential area or street right-of-way.

SIGNAGE:

The site plan does not illustrate wall or ground sign locations. Any new signage will require a separate permit. All signage will be required to meet the Planned Unit Development Standards. Any ground or monument signs placed in an easement will require a license agreement with the City prior to receiving a sign permit. This staff report does not remove the requirement for a separate sign plan review process.

SITE SCREENING AND LANDSCAPING:

The open space and landscape area consistent with the Planned Unit Development requirements and meet the minimum standards of the Landscape portion of the Tulsa Zoning Code. This staff report does not remove the requirement for a separate landscape plan review process. The PUD requires the existing six-foot tall chain link fence to be replaced with a six-foot tall wood screening fence along the entire length of the

South property line. This has not been shown on the site plan provided by will be required.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND CIRCULATION:

The plan displays existing sidewalks along East 4th Street South and South Madison Avenue. A pedestrian path is shown adjacent to a portion of the existing building.

MISCELLANEOUS SITE CONSIDERATIONS:

There are no concerns regarding the development of this area.

SUMMARY:

Staff has reviewed the applicant’s submittal of the site plan as it relates to the approved **PUD-817**. The site plan submittal meets or exceeds the minimum requirements of the Planned Unit Development with the exception that a six-foot tall wood screening fence is required to replace the existing six-foot tall chain link fence along the entire length of the Southern property line. Staff finds that the uses and intensities proposed with this site plan are consistent with the approved Planned Unit Development, and the stated purposes of the Planned Unit Development section of the Zoning Code.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the detail site plan for the proposed micro-brewery with the understanding that the six-foot tall wood screening fence will replace the existing six-foot tall chain link fence along the entire length of the Southern property line.

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute sign plan or landscape plan approval.)

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff’s recommendation.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Carnes, Covey, Dix, Fretz, Liotta, Midget, Millikin, Reeds, Shivel, Stirling, Walker “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; none “absent”) to **APPROVE** the consent agenda Items 2 through 14 per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

Mr. Stirling read the opening statement and rules of conduct for the TMAPC meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

15. **Open Arms Minor Subdivision Plat**, Location: North of the northeast corner of East 51st Street South and South 177th East Avenue (Continued from December 17, 2014 to January 21, 2015, and to February 18, 2015) (CD 6) (**Applicant is requesting a continuance to March 18, 2015**)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Applicant has requested continuance due to their plat not being ready at this time to move forward.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Carnes, Covey, Dix, Fretz, Liotta, Midget, Millikin, Reeds, Shivel, Stirling, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** the minor subdivision plat for Open Arms to March 18, 2015.

* * * * *

16. **Luxe Cheer – Preliminary Plat**, Location: West of South 101st East Avenue, South of East 61st Street South, (CD 7)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of one lot, one block, on 2.35 acres.

The following issues were discussed February 5, 2015, at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting:

1. **Zoning:** The property is zoned Corridor Z-6078-SP-5.
2. **Streets:** Section I J refers to mutual access easement. Show these on plats if existing, Show sidewalk along 101st East Avenue.
3. **Sewer:** A sanitary sewer mainline extension is required to serve the platted area.
4. **Water:** A single service line in an 18-inch steel conduit is allowed across the roadway of a size that is able to handle fire sprinkler and domestic demands. All six-inch and larger lines must be ductile iron pipe.

5. **Storm Drainage:** Change name of chart submitted to Storm Water Summary Chart and add 100 in/hour column per Development Services staff.
6. **Utilities: Telephone, Electric, Gas, Cable, Pipeline, Others:** No comment.
7. **Other: Fire:** An additional fire hydrant will be needed to meet coverage.
8. **Other: GIS:** Identify subdivision as 71 Mingo Center in location map. Identify all unplatted areas in location map. Correct street names, location descriptions, show property pins properly, show scale properly.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary subdivision plat with the TAC recommendations and the special and standard conditions listed below.

Waivers of Subdivision Regulations:

1. None requested.

Special Conditions:

1. The concerns of the Development Services and Engineering Services staffs must be taken care of to their satisfaction.

Standard Conditions:

1. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements shall be tied to or related to property line and/or lot lines.
2. Water and sanitary sewer plans shall be approved by the Public Works Department prior to release of final plat. (Include language for W/S facilities in covenants.)
3. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures shall be borne by the owner(s) of the lot(s).
4. Any request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Public Works Department Engineer prior to release of final plat.
5. Paving and/or drainage plans (as required) shall be approved by the Public Works Department.

6. Any request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Public Works Department.
7. A topography map shall be submitted for review by TAC (Subdivision Regulations). (Submit with drainage plans as directed.)
8. Street names shall be approved by the Public Works Department and shown on plat.
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. Bearings, or true N/S, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by the County Engineer.
11. All adjacent streets, intersections and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
12. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with the Public Works Department during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for plat release.)
13. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City/County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
14. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department. [Percolation tests (if applicable) are required prior to preliminary approval of plat.]
15. The owner(s) shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot: type, size and general location. (This information to be included in restrictive covenants on plat.)
16. The method of water supply and plans therefor shall be approved by the City/County Health Department.
17. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
18. The key or location map shall be complete.

19. A Corporation Commission letter, Certificate of Non-Development, or other records as may be on file, shall be provided concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. (A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged. If plugged, provide plugging records.)
20. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be provided prior to release of final plat. (Including documents required under 3.6.5 Subdivision Regulations.)
21. Applicant is advised of his responsibility to contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regarding Section 404 of the Clean Waters Act.
22. All other Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.
23. All PUD standards and conditions shall be included in the covenants of the plat and adequate mechanisms established to assure initial and continued compliance with the standards and conditions.
24. Private streets shall be built to City or County standards (depending upon the jurisdiction in which the plat is located) and inspected and accepted by same prior to issuance of any building permits in the subdivision.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Carnes, Covey, Dix, Fretz, Liotta, Midget, Millikin, Reeds, Shivel, Stirling, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** the preliminary plat for Luxe Cheer per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

17. **Z-7291-PUD 470 A-** Plat Waiver, Location: Northeast corner of East 68th Street South and South Memorial Drive, (CD 7)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The platting requirement is being triggered by a rezoning from office to commercial use (OL to CS).

Staff provides the following information from TAC for their February 5, 2015 meeting:

ZONING: TMAPC Staff: The property has been previously platted in the Woodland Hills Mall addition.

STREETS: Sidewalks must be provided along Memorial and 68th Street. Mutual access easements and change of accesses would be required for lots split in the future.

SEWER: No comment.

WATER: No comment.

STORMWATER: Overland drainage easements may be required; Fees in lieu of detention will be allowed and will likely be needed.

FIRE: No comment.

UTILITIES: No comment.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the plat waiver for the platted property.

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

	Yes	NO
1. Has Property previously been platted?	X	
2. Are there restrictive covenants contained in a previously filed plat?	X	
3. Is property adequately described by surrounding platted properties or street right-of-way?	X	

A YES answer to the remaining questions would generally NOT be favorable to a plat waiver:

	YES	NO
4. Is right-of-way dedication required to comply with Major Street and Highway Plan?		X
5. Would restrictive covenants be required to be filed by separate instrument if the plat were waived?		X
6. Infrastructure requirements:		
a) Water		
i. Is a main line water extension required?		X
ii. Is an internal system or fire line required?		X
iii. Are additional easements required?		X
b) Sanitary Sewer		
i. Is a main line extension required?		X
ii. Is an internal system required?		X
iii. Are additional easements required?		X
c) Storm Sewer		

- i. Is a P.F.P.I. required? X
- ii. Is an Overland Drainage Easement required? X
- iii. Is on site detention required? X
- iv. Are additional easements required? X*
- 7. Floodplain
 - a) Does the property contain a City of Tulsa (Regulatory) Floodplain? X
 - b) Does the property contain a F.E.M.A. (Federal) Floodplain? X
- 8. Change of Access
 - a) Are revisions to existing access locations necessary? X*
- 9. Is the property in a P.U.D.?
 - a) If yes, was plat recorded for the original P.U.D.
- 10. Is this a Major Amendment to a P.U.D.? X
 - a) If yes, does the amendment make changes to the proposed physical development of the P.U.D.?
- 11. Are mutual access easements needed to assure adequate access to the site? X*
- 12. Are there existing or planned medians near the site which would necessitate additional right-of-way dedication or other special considerations? X

Note: If, after consideration of the above criteria, a plat waiver is granted on unplatted properties, a current ALTA/ACSM/NSPS Land Title Survey (and as subsequently revised) shall be required. Said survey shall be prepared in a recordable format and filed at the County Clerk's office by the applicant.

*Of concern especially if lots are split in the future.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Midget asked staff if this would come back before the Planning Commission if the applicant decided to split the subject property. Ms. Fernandez stated that Development Services will have the opportunity to comment on the lot-split and ask for other easements, etc.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Carnes, Covey, Dix, Fretz, Liotta, Midget, Millikin, Reeds, Shivel, Stirling, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** the plat waiver for Z-7291-PUD-490-A per staff recommendation.

OTHER BUSINESS

18. Adopt Resolution to select the next Small Area Plan for the City of Tulsa

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Item: Adopt Resolution to select the next Small Area Plan for the City of Tulsa

Background

Following completion of 4 small area plans – amendments to the 2010 Tulsa Comprehensive Plan (PLANiTULSA), the City of Tulsa initiated a process through which interested stakeholders could nominate areas for the next small area plan. The process incorporates objective criteria that define locations best suited for SAPs.

At a work session in July of 2014, City Planning staff briefed TMAPC on the status of the SAP program and introduced the selection process and criteria. On November 1, 2014, the information was released to the public (interested parties, business groups, neighborhood associations) through direct contact with City Council offices, e-mails and newsletters.

Nine (9) nominations were received by the December 31st deadline. Staff has evaluated the nominations and presented findings, analysis and general recommendations to the TMAPC at the Work Session on February 4, 2015.

Following the Comprehensive Plan criteria that supported the selection process, staff eliminated 7 of the 9 nominations, with nominations from Crosbie Heights and Council District 7 still under consideration. Staff recognizes, however, that the final selection rests with TMAPC.

TMAPC requested this item to be addressed at the February 18, 2015 Public Hearing. When TMAPC formally selects the area for the next small area plan, the City of Tulsa will begin the next planning process.

Ms. Miller stated that Ms. Schultz is present if there are any questions.

RESOLUTION

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Resolution No. 2692:931

A RESOLUTION OF THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION, PURSUANT TO TITLE 19 OKLAHOMA STATUTES, SECTION 863.7 SUPPORTING A PLANNING EFFORT TO DEVELOP A SMALL AREA PLAN FOR THE <NOMINATED AREA>C;

WHEREAS, the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission is required to prepare, adopt and amend, as needed, a master plan, also known as a comprehensive plan, for the Tulsa metropolitan area, in accord with Title 19 Oklahoma Statutes, Section 863.7; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of such a comprehensive plan is to bring about coordinated physical development of an area in accord with present and future needs and is developed so as to conserve the natural resources of an area, to ensure the efficient expenditure of public funds, and to promote the health, safety, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare of the people of the area; and

WHEREAS, the adopted City of Tulsa Comprehensive Plan, as amended, recommends the development of a focused planning effort, known as a "Small Area Plan", as an implementation strategy to address localized planning and development issues in specific areas of the City of Tulsa; and

WHEREAS, according to the Comprehensive Plan, small area plans, upon adoption by the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and approval by the City Council, shall amend the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City of Tulsa established a nomination process for citizen stakeholders to nominate areas suitable for small area planning based on criteria from the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, nine (9) such nominations were submitted, evaluated and presented to the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, to determine where the City of Tulsa should devote planning resources to develop a new small area plan;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission:

Section 1. That the small area plan nomination submitted by the <NOMINATED AREA> most effectively addresses key criteria for small area planning as set forth in the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan, as adopted by the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission on July 6, 2010.

Section 2. That a boundary description of the Crosbie Heights small area plan proposal is attached to this Resolution.

Section 3. That upon adoption by the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, this Resolution shall be transmitted and submitted to the City Council of the City of Tulsa for its consideration, action and requested approval that will authorize the City of Tulsa to initiate the planning process with stakeholders.

ADOPTED on this 18th day of February, 2015, by a majority of the full membership of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission, including its *ex officio* members.

Michael Covey, Chairman
TMAPC

ATTEST:

Ryon Stirling, Secretary
TMAPC

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Midget requested Ms. Schultz to explain about the LMI criteria when considering the nominations. Martha Schultz, City of Tulsa Planner, stated that one of the major criteria in identifying the areas that was most suitable for a small area plan was areas that

contained or included low to moderate income census tracts. There is a criteria within the Comprehensive Plan that states that we should do small area planning in those parts of the City that are economically disadvantaged. The other key element is that people are interested in seeing implementation and that takes funding. Another reason to look at areas with LMI is as follows: the only areas that are eligible for Community Development Block Grants, Federal funding, are areas with low to moderate income census tracts that serve those populations. By having this as key criteria, in our selection, we can couple our planning efforts, identification of priorities, getting them on the capital list, etc. with funding sources. Staff tries to do everything to leverage our scarce funding sources with our plans.

In response to Mr. Reeds, Ms. Schultz reiterated the location of the two areas being considered for a small area plan. Ms. Schultz stated that once the area is selected, staff will look carefully at the boundary to make sure that it cohesive.

Mr. Dix stated that he was very impressed at the last meeting with Ms. Schultz entire presentation and explaining the selection process, which made the TMAPC's job much easier. Ms. Schultz thanked Mr. Dix and stated that she appreciates the support and staff is here to make their jobs easier.

Mr. Carnes stated that an excellent job has been done redoing the downtown area and the Crosbie Heights would be the closest to it and it appears that the timing is right to try to clean this part up. Mr. Carnes indicated that he would support Crosbie Heights as being the selection and he would be happy to make that motion.

In response to Ms. Millikin, Ms. Schultz stated that when the selection was down to two subject areas from the original nine that were submitted, it was at a high level. Each of the areas had low to moderate income, they contained areas of growth from the Stability Growth map and these are the primary criteria. Council District 7 didn't have a previous small area plan, Charles Page Boulevard Plan includes Crosbie Heights and that was another criteria. The Crosbie Heights portion is very focused and concentrated on the eastern portion of the old Charles Page Boulevard Plan, which was adopted in 1996. Ms. Schultz stated that when looking more closely, the Crosbie Heights area is 100% low to moderate income and 100% in growth, not stability. The Council District 7 was a mixed

bag for both criterias. Ms. Schultz stated that the vision from the Comprehensive Plan has to do with transformation and staff's objective evaluation as planners, felt that Crosbie Heights area has more potential to be transformed through a small area plan. Ms. Schultz stated that all of the nominations were great and glad to have people to participate on this and each will be contacted to identify resources for them to pursue and address their issues that were in their nomination. Ms. Schultz stated that the small area plan does not a moratorium on development that is already approved. The Crosbie Heights area is located next to downtown and it has the potential to be transformative if it gets a little help and there is more equity balance in terms of rising relative to the other neighborhoods near downtown. The Comprehensive Plan states that strong neighborhoods near downtown support downtown and vice-a-versa. Ms. Schultz reiterated that unfortunately only one small area plan can be done this year.

Mr. Dix stated that he would like to see a small area plan along North Peoria next year. He requested that City Planning staff meet with them and explain to them what they could do to better meet the criteria. Ms. Schultz stated that staff will be meeting with all the nominations and work with them for the next round.

In response to Mr. Covey, Ms. Schultz reiterated that staff would meet with all of the participants and go over why they didn't make the nomination. Ms. Schultz explained that next year they plan to have a pre-qualifying meeting that is mandatory for everyone who intends to submit a nomination.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Carnes, Covey, Dix, Fretz, Liotta, Midget, Millikin, Reeds, Shivel, Stirling, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** the selection of Crosbie Heights for a small area plan for the City of Tulsa.

* * * * *

19. Commissioners' Comments:

Mr. Midget thanked everyone participating in the nominations for the small area plan.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Carnes, Covey, Dix, Fretz, Liotta, Midget, Millikin, Reeds, Shivel, Stirling, Walker "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; none "absent") to **ADJOURN** TMAPC meeting 2692.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

Date Approved:

03-04-2015


Chairman

ATTEST:


Secretary